



County of Santa Cruz

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4TH FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123
www.sccoplanning.com

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Date: October 19, 2021

Application Number: 191306

Project Name: 9041 Soquel Drive, Aptos **Staff Planner:** Lezanne Jeffs

I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

APPLICANT: Bill Kempf, Architect

APN: 041-141-56

OWNER: Human Spaces, LLC

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT: 2

PROJECT LOCATION: The project is located on the north side of Soquel Drive approximately 0.4 miles west of Rio Del Mar Boulevard, within the community of Aptos in unincorporated Santa Cruz County. Santa Cruz County is bounded on the north by San Mateo County, on the south by Monterey and San Benito counties, on the east by Santa Clara County, and on the south and west by the Monterey Bay and the Pacific Ocean.

SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This is a proposal to construct an approximately 10,981 square foot mixed-use building with a 1,929 square foot basement, 2,889 square feet of office space on the first floor with a covered carport for 5 vehicles, and three residential apartment units on the second floor, located in the PA (Professional-Administrative Office) district. This requires a Commercial Development permit including a Master Occupancy Permit for the two tenant spaces on the ground floor, and a Riparian Exception to allow for a portion of the parking lot and an associated retaining wall, that encroach into the riparian corridor within the arroyo along Valencia Creek. Valencia Creek crosses the northern edge of the parcel approximately 100 feet south of the proposed development site.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: *All of the following potential environmental impacts are evaluated in this Initial Study. Categories that are marked have been analyzed in greater detail based on project specific information.*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics and Visual Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: *All of the following potential environmental impacts are evaluated in this Initial Study. Categories that are marked have been analyzed in greater detail based on project specific information.*

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Supply/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | |

DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL(S) BEING CONSIDERED:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Development Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Division | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rezoning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Riparian Exception |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> LAFCO Annexation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sewer Connection Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
401 Permit	Regional Water Quality Control Board
1602 Permit	California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CONSULTATION WITH NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES: *Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?*

No California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the area of Santa Cruz County have requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1.

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

MATT JOHNSTON, Environmental Coordinator

Date



This page intentionally left blank.



Figure 1



This page intentionally left blank.



This page intentionally left blank.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

Parcel Size (acres): 31,712 square feet; 12,169 square feet net
 Existing Land Use: Vacant
 Vegetation: Trees including redwoods, live oaks, big leaf maple.
 Groundcover including brambles and poison oak
 Slope in area affected by project: 0 - 30% 31 – 100% N/A
 Nearby Watercourse: Valencia Creek (perennial stream)
 Distance To: Approximately 110 feet down steep slope

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS:

Water Supply Watershed:	Not Mapped	Fault Zone:	Not Mapped
Groundwater Recharge:	Yes/Portion	Scenic Corridor:	Scenic
Timber or Mineral:	Not Mapped	Historic:	Not Mapped
Agricultural Resource:	Not Mapped	Archaeology:	Potential
Biologically Sensitive Habitat:	Yes	Noise Constraint:	None
Fire Hazard:	Not Mapped	Electric Power Lines:	Yes
Floodplain:	Zone 6	Solar Access:	Adequate
Erosion:	Potential	Solar Orientation:	Adequate
Landslide:	Not Mapped	Hazardous Materials:	None
Liquefaction:	Very High	Other:	None

SERVICES:

Fire Protection:	Central FPD	Drainage District:	Zone 6
School District:	Pajaro Valley	Project Access:	Soquel Drive
Sewage Disposal:	SC County Sanitation	Water Supply:	Soquel Creek

PLANNING POLICIES:

Zone District: PA
 (Professional-Administrative Office)
 General Plan: C-O; O-U
 (Professional and Administrative Office); Urban Open Space Lands)
 Urban Services Line: Inside Outside
 Coastal Zone: Inside Outside

Special Designation:

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES:

Natural Environment

Santa Cruz County is uniquely situated along the northern end of Monterey Bay approximately 55 miles south of the City of San Francisco along the Central Coast. The Pacific Ocean and Monterey Bay to the west and south, the mountains inland, and the prime agricultural lands along both the northern and southern coast of the county create limitations on the style and amount of building that can take place. Simultaneously, these natural features create an environment that attracts both visitors and new residents every year. The natural landscape provides the basic features that set Santa Cruz apart from the surrounding counties and require specific accommodations to ensure building is done in a safe, responsible and environmentally respectful manner.

The California Coastal Zone affects nearly one third of the land in the urbanized area of the unincorporated County with special restrictions, regulations, and processing procedures required for development within that area. Steep hillsides require extensive review and engineering to ensure that slopes remain stable, buildings are safe, and water quality is not impacted by increased erosion. The farmland in Santa Cruz County is among the best in the world, and the agriculture industry is a primary economic generator for the County. Preserving this industry in the face of population growth requires that soils best suited to commercial agriculture remain active in crop production rather than converting to other land uses.

PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The upper portion of the project site is currently used as an unpermitted bicycle sales and repair shop with a pump track at the top of the arroyo slope. Discretionary Permit Application 89-0123 (Proposal to construct a 3,730 square foot, two-story commercial office building), which is filed under previous APN 041-141-32, was approved in August of 1989. This approval, however, was never exercised in that a building permit was never obtained to construct the office building. There were no other proposals for this site other than a consultation in 2009 to inquire about a 4,000 square foot medical building.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located on Soquel Drive just north of Highway One between Rio Del Mar Boulevard and Trout Gulch Road in Aptos. The parcel is approximately 32,000 square feet. While relatively flat at the front of the parcel, the parcel gently slopes downward towards the rear (north) followed by a sharp decline of about 50% slope where the parcel descends to Valencia Creek. The south side of Soquel Drive is lined with both deciduous and evergreen trees which screen views of the site from Highway One, a designated scenic road.

Surrounding land uses include a Goodwill donation center to the east and an interior design studio to the west. The neighborhood consists of several small-scale commercial businesses

including retail stores, restaurants, offices, and personal service establishments. Approximately one-quarter of a mile east of the site is Redwood Village which has an eclectic mix of shops and restaurants. West of the site along Soquel Drive are additional small-scale commercial businesses as well as several nonconforming single-family dwellings and a three-story apartment complex. Not including the apartment complex, these properties are developed with a mix of one - and two-story buildings with varying architectural styles built between the 1960s and 1980s. Aptos Village is located about one-half mile west of the site where Soquel Drive intersects Trout Gulch Road. Aptos Village supports a wide range of retail shops, restaurants, and medical offices.

The applicant is proposing to construct an approximately 10,981 square foot mixed-use building with office space on the first floor, three residential units on the second floor and a basement at the lower level. As shown on the project plans (Exhibit D), the proposed building will be located along the Soquel Drive frontage and includes parking in carports at the main floor, beneath the second floor of the building, as well as uncovered parking located on the eastern side of the parcel. From the street, the proposed building will appear to be two stories in height, with office tenant spaces on the lower floor and residential units above. Two of the three proposed residential units will be directly above the office space, with the third located over the covered parking area. Below the office space at the rear of the building, is a basement that will serve as storage for the tenants of the office space.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

A. AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099, would the project:

1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Discussion: The parcel is located within a mapped General Plan Scenic area due to its location along Highway One; however, as discussed below, the proposed mixed-use building will not be visible from the scenic road due to existing mature vegetation between the project site and the highway. The project will not directly impact any other public scenic vistas in the area, in that the proposed building is not visible from any other vantage point due to the presence dense woodland to the north, east and west of the project site within the adjacent Valencia Creek arroyo. Therefore, the impact on any scenic vista will be less than significant.

2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Discussion: The project site is located on the north side of Soquel Drive in an area where this street runs parallel and immediately adjacent to Highway One, which is a state scenic highway. However, on the south side of Soquel Drive, between the travelled roadway at Highway One and the project site, there is a thick row of trees and shrubs ranging in height between thirty and one hundred feet, that runs for around 680 feet along the southern edge of Soquel Drive, east toward Rio Del Mar Boulevard. The project site, which is located on the northern side of Soquel Drive between lots that are developed with other two-story commercial structures, is almost entirely hidden behind this existing landscaping. Therefore, because of the screening provided by the existing mature trees and shrubs and because the proposed structure will blend with other existing developments along Soquel Drive, the project would not be noticeably visible from public viewpoints within Highway One, and impacts will be less than significant.

3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Discussion: The existing visual setting is a mix of commercial and residential structures that run east and west of the project site along the north side of Soquel Drive, backed by dense woodland running along Valencia Creek. Opposite the commercial buildings, between Soquel Drive and Highway One, there is a row of dense of trees and shrubs. Adjacent sites are developed with a mix of one- and two-story buildings with varying architectural styles built between the 1960s and 1980s. The project has been designed and landscaped to fit into this existing setting. The landscape plan includes two new Crape Myrtle trees along the front of the building to replace the two small trees being removed on the west side of the project site, and twelve tall shrubs will be planted between the parking strip and the adjacent building along the eastern side to provide a buffer between the parking strip and the existing Good Will store. A new sidewalk will be installed along the front property line that will connect with a concrete walkway that leads to the entrance to the lower (office) floor, stairs and an elevator leading to the apartment units above, and to stairs in the rear that go down to the basement.

The project is designed to be consistent with County Code sections that regulate height, bulk, density, setback, landscaping, and design of new structures in the County, including County Code Chapter 13.11, Site, Architectural and Landscape Design Review, including all applicable design guidelines. Therefore, impacts from the project will be less than significant.

4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Discussion: The project would create an incremental increase in night lighting. However, this increase would be small, and would be similar in character to the lighting associated with the surrounding existing uses. As required by County Code, and as included as conditions of approval of this project, all site, building, security and landscape lighting shall be directed downwards onto the site and away from adjacent properties and away from the adjacent riparian corridor. Further, light sources shall not be visible from adjacent properties and shall be shielded by landscaping, structure, fixture design or other physical means. Building and security lighting shall be integrated into the building design. Project impacts are therefore expected to be less than significant.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies

may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. In addition, the project does not contain Farmland of Local Importance. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Farmland of Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur from project implementation.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is zoned PA (Professional-Administrative Office), which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. No impact is anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located near land designated as Timber Resource. Therefore, the project would not affect the resource or access to harvest the resource in the future. Timberland as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526, would not support harvesting of redwood trees within the riparian corridor adjacent to Valencia Creek but, if any redwood

trees were required to be removed in the future for safety reasons, the timber resource may only be removed from the site in accordance with California Department of Forestry timber harvest rules and regulations. No trees are within the proposed development area and no trees will be removed as a result of project implementation. No impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. <i>Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: No forest land will be impacted as a result of this project. See discussion under B-3 above. No impact is anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. <i>Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site and surrounding area east and west of Soquel drive does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The nearest parcel zoned Agriculture is on the other side of Highway One which will not be affected by the project site and proposal. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide, or Farmland of Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use. In addition, the project site contains no forest land, and no forest land occurs within one half of a mile of the project site. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

C. AIR QUALITY

The significance criteria established by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD)¹ has been relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <i>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not conflict with or obstruct any long-range air quality plans of the MBARD. Because general construction activity related emissions (i.e., temporary sources) are accounted for in the emission inventories included in the air quality plans, impacts to air quality plan objectives are less than significant.

¹ Formerly known as the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD).

General estimated basin-wide construction-related emissions are included in the MBARD emission inventory (which, in part, form the basis for the air quality plans cited below) and are not expected to prevent long-term attainment or maintenance of the ozone and particulate matter standards within the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB). Therefore, temporary construction impacts related to air quality plans for these pollutants from the project would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required, since they are presently estimated and accounted for in the District’s emission inventory, as described below. No stationary sources would be constructed that would be long-term permanent sources of emissions.

Santa Cruz County is located within the NCCAB. The NCCAB does not meet state standards for ozone (reactive organic gases [ROGs] and nitrogen oxides [NOx]) and fine particulate matter (PM₁₀). Therefore, the regional pollutants of concern that would be emitted by the project are ozone precursors and PM₁₀.

The primary sources of ROG within the air basin are on- and off-road motor vehicles, petroleum production and marketing, solvent evaporation, and prescribed burning. The primary sources of NOx are on- and off-road motor vehicles, stationary source fuel combustion, and industrial processes. In 2010, daily emissions of ROGs were estimated at 63 tons per day. Of this, area-wide sources represented 49%, mobile sources represented 36%, and stationary sources represented 15%. Daily emissions of NOx were estimated at 54 tons per day with 69% from mobile sources, 22% from stationary sources, and 9% from area-wide sources. In addition, the region is “NOx sensitive,” meaning that ozone formation due to local emissions is more limited by the availability of NOx as opposed to the availability of ROGs (MBUAPCD, 2013b).

PM₁₀ is the other major pollutant of concern for the NCCAB. In the NCCAB, highest particulate levels and most frequent violations occur in the coastal corridor. In this area, fugitive dust from various geological and man-made sources combines to exceed the standard. The majority of NCCAB exceedances occur at coastal sites, where sea salt is often the main factor causing exceedance. In 2005 daily emissions of PM₁₀ were estimated at 102 tons per day. Of this, entrained road dust represented 35% of all PM₁₀ emission, windblown dust 20%, agricultural tilling operations 15%, waste burning 17%, construction 4%, and mobile sources, industrial processes, and other sources made up 9% (MBUAPCD, 2008).

Given the modest amount of new traffic that would be generated by the project there is no indication that new emissions of ROGs or NOx would exceed MBARD thresholds for these pollutants; and therefore, there would not be a significant contribution to an existing air quality violation.

Project construction may result in a short term, localized decrease in air quality due to generation of PM₁₀. However, standard dust control best management practices (BMPs), such

as periodic watering, would be implemented during construction to avoid significant air quality impacts from the generation of PM₁₀.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. <i>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The primary pollutants of concern for the NCCAB are ozone and PM₁₀, as those are the pollutants for which the district is in nonattainment. Project construction would have a limited and temporary potential to contribute to existing violations of California air quality standards for ozone and PM₁₀ primarily through diesel engine exhaust and fugitive dust. The criteria for assessing cumulative impacts on localized air quality are the same as those for assessing individual project impacts. Projects that do not exceed MBARD’s construction or operational thresholds and are consistent with the AQMP would not have cumulatively considerable impacts on regional air quality (MBARD, 2008). Because the project would not exceed MBARD’s thresholds and is consistent with the AQMP, there would not be cumulative impacts on regional air quality.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. <i>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed mixed-use project would not generate substantial pollutant concentrations. Emissions from construction activities represent temporary impacts that are typically short in duration. Impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. <i>Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Land uses typically producing objectionable odors include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed project does not include any uses that would be associated with objectionable odors. Odor emissions from the proposed project would be limited to odors associated with vehicle and engine exhaust and idling from cars entering, parking, and exiting the facility. The project does not include any known sources of objectionable odors associated with the long-term operations phase.

During construction activities, only short-term, temporary odors from vehicle exhaust and construction equipment engines would occur. California ultralow sulfur diesel fuel with a

maximum sulfur content of 15 ppm by weight would be used in all diesel-powered equipment, which minimizes emissions of sulfurous gases (sulfur dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, carbon disulfide, and carbonyl sulfide). As the project site is in a coastal area that contains coastal breezes off of the Monterey Bay, construction-related odors would disperse and dissipate and would not cause substantial odors at the closest sensitive receptors. Construction-related odors would be short-term and would cease upon completion. Therefore, no objectionable odors are anticipated from construction activities associated with the project.

The project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people; therefore, the project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to objectionable odors during construction or operation.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is located in an area identified as a potential area of biotic concern based on preliminary analysis. The site is mapped for the following biotic resources on the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB): Dudley’s Lousewort (*Pedicularis dudleyi*), Western Bumble Bee (*Bombus occidentalis*) and Central California Coast Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*)

County environmental staff performed several site visits to the property over the course of several months in 2020 and 2021 to determine the extent to which any of these sensitive species may be present. With regard to Dudley’s lousewort, no plants were identified during the site visits and the last collection of this species occurred in 1884 in the vicinity of Aptos. Since those site visits, the entire development area has been converted to a bicycle shop with storage containers converted to shop space and a bicycle pump track that has been installed in the northern portion of the proposed development area. Within the future building site area all native vegetation has been removed.

No plants that produce suitable nectar for bumble bees currently exist within the development area. However, due to the potential that bumble bees may be present in the wider area, the project

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

will be conditioned to require planting of a variety of flowering plant species that support these bees should they travel through the area.

Valencia Creek is a tributary to Aptos Creek in the Aptos Creek watershed. Valencia Creek is known to support steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*), which are part of the Central California Coast Distinct Population Segment, listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act. The project site sits above lower Valencia Creek, which serves as a migration corridor for adults to reach spawning habitat further upstream and also supports low densities of juvenile steelhead throughout the year.

The proposed project limits disturbance to the southern, mostly flat, portion of the property, which is approximately 100 feet away laterally and 60 feet above the stream channel. The proposed development envelope would not extend any further towards the stream than existing buildings on the adjacent lots located immediately to the east and west of the project site. The only exception to this is the stormwater discharge. Immediately north of the development area the topography is at or above a 50% slope for a lateral distance of approximately 45 feet. The geotechnical report for the project (Attachment 2), identifies release of stormwaters above this slope as a significant hazard and recommends piping stormwater runoff to the toe of the steep slope. This will require installation of two stormwater pipes that will be anchored to the slope, and a perforated dispersal pipe set upon rock energy dissipators that will be installed at the toe of the slope. A site visit with County staff, project civil engineer and the project geotechnical engineer on 2/17/2021 identified the two locations for these outlets, one just above a redwood grove/ring approximately 25 feet across and the other west of that location in an area with a slope less than 5%. The area between the two outlets is densely vegetated with a mix of native redwood, willow, native blackberry and dense English and cape ivy. Plans showing the approved location of the drainage outlets is included at Attachment 4. The two discharge locations are approximately 25 feet above and 55 feet away from the stream channel. The project also includes a pervious paver driveway as well as three rain gardens to aide in filtering stormwater. With the relatively gentle slope below the outlets and the dense vegetation, and the dissipation from the spreaders and the RSP, as well as the treatment of stormwater and controlled release from the rain gardens, there should be no significant impact on steelhead water quality.

Furthermore, the proposed development will not require the removal of any trees or removal of riparian vegetation that would provide shade or organic material supporting the aquatic food web, and habitat for both terrestrial and aquatic insects, which are important food sources for steelhead.

An increase in lighting at the project site has the potential to impact riparian habitat and the common species that utilize it. To reduce those impacts to less than significant, only essential artificial lighting will be permitted. In addition, as a condition of project approval, a final detailed lighting plan shall be required, showing that all light sources will be cast downward, shielded and directed away from Valencia Creek, so that light does not spill over into the riparian habitat to the

north, onto adjacent properties or upwards into the night sky. Lighting shall further be limited to limited to warm light colors with an output temperature of 2,700 kelvin or less

There is the potential to cause some impact associated with construction to water quality. In order to ensure that steelhead habitat is protected, the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

- BIO-1: Prior to any site disturbance, a pre-construction meeting shall be conducted. The purpose of the meeting will be to ensure that the conditions set forth in the proposed project description and Conditions of Approval of the Riparian Exception are communicated to the various parties responsible for constructing the project. The meeting shall involve all relevant parties including the project proponent, construction supervisor and Environmental Planning Staff.
- BIO-2: Prior to construction, high visibility construction fencing shall be installed, to indicate the limits of work and prevent inadvertent grading or other disturbance within the adjacent riparian corridor. No work-related activity including equipment staging, vehicular access, and grading shall be allowed outside the limits of work.
- BIO-3: A revegetation plan using appropriate California native riparian species plants (shrubs and low growing groundcover) with at least three species known as nectar plants for the obscure bumblebee shall be submitted and approved at the building permit review stage and implemented at the rear of the constructed project (five feet from the back of the building and retaining wall to the existing riparian vegetation) in order to restore of the margins of the riparian area, enhance the riparian corridor and for erosion control.
- BIO-4: A permanent three-foot fence shall be erected approximately 5 feet behind the proposed building to demarcate and prevent disturbance to the riparian restoration area. The location of this fence shall be shown on plans submitted in support of the building permit for the project and shall be approved by Environmental Planning staff.
- BIO-5: Prior to issuance of a building permit, a final detailed lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval by Environmental Planning staff, showing that all light sources will be cast downward, shielded and directed away from Valencia Creek, so that light does not spill over into the riparian habitat to the north, onto adjacent properties or upwards into the night sky. Lighting shall further be limited to limited to warm light colors with an output temperature of 2,700 kelvin or less

With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the project is not expected to result in significant impacts and will result in beneficial impacts for the obscure bumblebee.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations (e.g., wetland, native grassland, special forests, intertidal zone, etc.) or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The site of the proposed mixed-use building and associated parking area is located to the south of Valencia Creek, which runs through the northern half of the parcel within a deeply incised arroyo. In accordance with County Code, “Arroyo” means a gully, ravine or canyon created by a perennial, intermittent or ephemeral stream, with characteristic steep slopes frequently covered with vegetation. An arroyo includes the area between the top of the arroyo banks defined by a discernible break in the slope rising from the arroyo bottom. All areas lying within an arroyo constitute the riparian corridor. The riparian corridor along Valencia Creek is therefore defined by the break of slope which runs across the parcel just north of the proposed building site. Because of the potential impacts on the riparian corridor a resource planner was consulted who indicated the following:

Riparian Woodland

Riparian woodland occurs along the banks of the Valencia Creek in the project area. The woodland is dominated by coast live oaks and redwoods along the higher edge of the banks with redwoods on the steeper slopes beyond. Riparian woodland is considered a sensitive natural community by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and is regulated under the California Fish and Game Code section 1600 regarding lake and streambed alteration agreements. The riparian woodland in the project area falls within the CDFW stream zone, which extends laterally to the outer edge of riparian vegetation. In addition, riparian habitat is granted further protections under the County’s Sensitive Habitat Protection and Riparian Corridor and Wetlands Protection ordinances (SCCC 16.30 and 16.32).

Impacts

Development will not require the removal of any trees or removal of riparian vegetation; however, a portion of the proposed parking area and an associated retaining wall be located within the delineated riparian corridor where the land starts to drop off toward Valencia Creek. In addition, a portion of the proposed mixed-use building, the retaining wall and parking area will be located within the required 10-foot construction buffer along the edge of the riparian corridor. In order to conduct work within a County-defined riparian corridor,

or for any construction within the designated construction buffer, the project requires the approval of a Riparian Exception by the County. Therefore, together with the Commercial Development Permit for the proposed mixed-use building, the applicant is required to obtain approval of a Riparian Exception. Prior to the approval of any Riparian Exception, a specific set of findings must be met (SCCC Section 16.30.060). Preliminary analysis has determined that the project complies with these findings and all conditions of approval for the Riparian Exception shall be adhered to.

See additional discussions and all proposed mitigation measures specified under D-1 above, that will reduce potential impacts on the riparian corridor a less than significant level.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no mapped or designated federally protected wetlands on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur from project implementation.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. <i>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project has some potential to interfere with the movement of steelhead or other migratory species; See discussions and mitigation measures specified under D-1 and D-2 above. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the project would not interfere with the movement of steelhead trout of any other migratory fish or wildlife species or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. <i>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (such as the Sensitive Habitat Ordinance, Riparian and Wetland Protection Ordinance, and the Significant Tree Protection Ordinance)?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is located within a County-defined riparian corridor. See discussions and mitigation measures specified under D-1 and D-2 above. The project must be granted a Riparian Exception in order to be consistent with the County of Santa Cruz Riparian

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Corridor and Wetlands Protection Ordinance. In order for a project to qualify for a Riparian Exception (SCCC Section 16.30.060), a specific set of findings must be made. Preliminary analysis has determined that the project complies with these findings.

The project is therefore consistent with the County of Santa Cruz Riparian Corridor and Wetlands Protection Ordinance and impacts from project implementation would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6. <i>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no existing permanent structure(s) on the property. As a result, no impacts to historical resources would occur from project implementation.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The Archaeological Survey Report prepared by Patricia Paramoure Archaeological Consulting, dated November 1, 2021, did not indicate the presence of an archaeological site in the vicinity of the proposed project. However, pursuant to section 16.40.040 of the SCCC, if archeological resources are uncovered during construction, the responsible persons shall immediately cease and desist from all further site excavation and comply with the notification procedures given in SCCC Chapter 16.40.040.

Pursuant to section 16.40.040 of the SCCC, if archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, the responsible persons shall immediately cease and desist from all further site excavation and comply with the notification procedures given in SCCC Chapter 16.40.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Impacts are expected to be less than significant. However, pursuant to section 16.40.040 of the SCCC, and California Health and Safety Code sections 7050.5-7054, if at any time during site preparation, excavation, or other ground disturbance associated with this project, human remains are discovered, the responsible persons shall immediately cease and desist from all further site excavation and notify the Sheriff-Coroner and the Planning Director. If the coroner determines that the remains are not of recent origin, a full archaeological report shall be prepared, and representatives of local Native American Indian groups shall be contacted. If it is determined that the remains are Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission will be notified as required by law. The Commission will designate a Most Likely Descendant who will be authorized to provide recommendations for management of the Native American human remains. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 5097, the descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. Disturbance shall not resume until the significance of the resource is determined and appropriate mitigations to preserve the resource on the site are established.

F. ENERGY

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project, like all development, would be responsible for an incremental increase in the consumption of energy resources during site grading and construction due to onsite construction equipment and potential traffic delays. All project construction equipment would be required to comply with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) emissions requirements for construction equipment, which includes measures to reduce fuel-consumption, such as imposing limits on idling and requiring older engines and equipment to be retired, replaced, or repowered. In addition, the project would comply with General Plan policy 8.2.2, which requires all new development to be sited and designed to minimize site disturbance and grading. As a result, impacts associated with the small temporary increase in consumption of fuel during construction are expected to be less than significant.

The project involves the construction of an approximately 11,000 square foot mixed-use building with a 1,900 square foot basement, 3,000 square feet of office space on the first floor with a covered carport for 5 vehicles, and three residential apartment units on the second floor. No impacts are expected from project implementation. Therefore, the project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

In addition, the County has strategies to help reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. These strategies included in the *County of Santa Cruz Climate Action Strategy* (County of Santa Cruz, 2013) are outlined below.

Strategies for the Reduction of Energy Use and GHG Emissions

- Develop a Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) Program, if feasible.²
- Increase energy efficiency in new and existing buildings and facilities.
- Enhance and expand the Green Business Program.
- Increase local renewable energy generation.
- Public education about climate change and impacts of individual actions.
- Continue to improve the Green Building Program by exceeding the minimum standards of the state green building code (Cal Green).
- Form partnerships and cooperative agreements among local governments, educational institutions, nongovernmental organizations, and private businesses as a cost-effective way to facilitate mitigation and adaptation.
- Reduce energy use for water supply through water conservation strategies.

Strategies for the Reduction of Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions from Transportation

- Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through County and regional long-range planning efforts.
- Increase bicycle ridership and walking through incentive programs and investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety programs.
- Provide infrastructure to support zero and low emissions vehicles (plug in, hybrid plug-in vehicles).
- Increase employee use of alternative commute modes: bus transit, walking, bicycling, carpooling, etc.
- Increase the number of electric and alternative fuels vehicles in the County fleet.

² Monterey Bay Community Power (MBCP) was formed in 2017 to provide carbon-free electricity. All Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) customers in unincorporated Santa Cruz County were automatically enrolled in the MBCP in 2018.

Therefore, the project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. <i>Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: AMBAG’s 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) recommends policies that achieve statewide goals established by CARB, the California Transportation Plan 2040, and other transportation-related policies and state senate bills. The SCS element of the MTP targets transportation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in particular, which can also serve to address energy use by coordinating land use and transportation planning decisions to create a more energy efficient transportation system.

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) prepares a County-specific regional transportation plan (RTP) in conformance with the latest AMBAG MTP/SCS. The 2040 RTP establishes targets to implement statewide policies at the local level, such as reducing vehicle miles traveled and improving speed consistency to reduce fuel consumption.

In 2013, Santa Cruz County adopted a Climate Action Strategy (CAS) focused on reducing the emission of greenhouse gases, which is dependent on increasing energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy. The strategy intends to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions by implementing a number of measures such as reducing vehicle miles traveled through County and regional long-range planning efforts, increasing energy efficiency in new and existing buildings and facilities, increasing local renewable energy generation, improving the Green Building Program by exceeding minimum state standards, reducing energy use for water supply through water conservation strategies, and providing infrastructure to support zero and low emission vehicles that reduce gasoline and diesel consumption, such as plug in electric and hybrid plug in vehicles.

In addition, the Santa Cruz County General Plan has historically placed a priority on “smart growth” by focusing growth in the urban areas through the creation and maintenance of an urban services line. Objective 2.1 (Urban/Rural Distinction) directs most residential development to the urban areas, limits growth, supports compact development, and helps reduce sprawl. The Circulation Element of the General Plan further establishes a more

efficient transportation system through goals that promote the wise use of energy resources, reducing vehicle miles traveled, and transit and active transportation options.

Energy efficiency is a major priority throughout the County’s General Plan. Measure C was adopted by the voters of Santa Cruz County in 1990 and explicitly established energy conservation as one of the County’s objectives. The initiative was implemented by Objective 5.17 (Energy Conservation) and includes policies that support energy efficiency, conservation, and encourage the development of renewable energy resources. Goal 6 of the Housing Element also promotes energy efficient building code standards for residential structures constructed in the County.

The project will be consistent with the AMBAG 2040 MTP/SCS and the SCCRTC 2040 RTP. The project would also be required to comply with the Santa Cruz County General Plan and any implemented policies and programs established through the CAS. In addition, the project design would be required to comply with CALGreen, the state of California’s green building code, to meet all mandatory energy efficiency standards. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct any state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

1. *Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

A. <i>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. <i>Strong seismic ground shaking?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. <i>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. <i>Landslides?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (A through D): All of Santa Cruz County is subject to some hazard from earthquakes, and there are several faults within the County. While the San Andreas fault is larger and considered more active, each fault is capable of generating moderate to severe ground shaking from a major earthquake. Consequently, large earthquakes can be expected in the future. The October 17, 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake (magnitude 7.1) was the second largest earthquake in central California history.

The project site is located outside of the limits of the State Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone or any County-mapped fault zone (County of Santa Cruz GIS Mapping, California Division of Mines and Geology, 2001). The project site is located approximately 8.5 miles southwest of the San Andreas fault zone, as the crow flies over mountain ranges so actual distance is much greater than this, and 4.5 miles of the Zayante fault zone, as the crow flies over mountain ranges and is considered much farther than this number. A geotechnical investigation for the project was performed by CMAG Engineering, Inc., dated December 30, 2018 (Attachment 2). This report has been reviewed and has been accepted by the County Civil Engineer as indicated in the letter dated January 9, 2020 (Attachment 3). The report concluded that based on the results of their slope stability analysis, there is a low probability for overall slope instability to occur under static and seismic conditions on the steep slope that descends to the north from the proposed improvements. However, under saturated conditions with slope parallel seepage, the factor of safety of shallow seated erosional failures, on the steep slope adjacent to the proposed improvements, does not meet industry standard factors of safety. To conclude, based on the results of the field investigations, laboratory testing, and engineering analysis, the subject site will be suitable for the proposed development provided the recommendations presented are implemented during grading and construction:

- The proposed north side of the building is to be located approximately 10 to 20 feet from the top of the slope.
- The building is to incorporate a basement, approximately 8 to 10 feet below grade for the portion of the building adjacent to the steep slope.
- The proposed north side of the parking area is to be located approximately 10 to 20 feet from the top of the slope.
- The grade for the parking area adjacent to the steep slope is to be raised by approximately 6 to 8 feet.
- Foundation, retaining wall, and grading recommendations in the subject report shall be adhered to.

- Stormwater shall be piped to the toe of the extreme slope immediately north of the development area and dissipated in a suitable location within the more gently sloped area above the stream channel.

Therefore, impacts associated with geologic hazards will be less than significant.

Implementation of the additional requirements included in the Geotechnical Report Review letter prepared by Environmental Planning staff, dated January 9, 2020, (Attachment 3) will serve to further reduce the potential risk of seismic shaking. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

2. *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Discussion: Some potential for erosion exists during the construction phase of the project, however, this potential is minimal because areas where there will be grading will be replaced with the proposed structure and groundcover will be planted on the slope in the rear to protect Valencia Creek below and prevent erosion on the sloped areas, and standard erosion controls are a required condition of the project. Prior to approval of a grading or building permit, the project must have an approved stormwater pollution control plan (SCCC Section 7.79.100), which would specify detailed erosion and sedimentation control measures. The plan would include provisions for disturbed areas to be planted with ground cover and to be maintained to minimize surface erosion. The locations of the outlets of stormwater on the slope north of the proposed development have been located in the field by the county environmental coordinator and the project geotechnical engineer to ensure discharge does not result in potential erosion. Impacts from soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be considered less than significant.

3. *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?*

Discussion: The geotechnical report cited above (see discussion under G-1) did not identify a significant potential for damage caused by any of these hazards.

4. *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2016), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*

Discussion: The geotechnical report for the project did not identify any elevated direct or indirect risks associated with expansive soils. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. <i>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, leach fields, or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: No septic systems are proposed. The project would connect to the Santa Cruz County Sanitation District, and the applicant would be required to pay standard sewer connection and service fees that fund sanitation improvements within the district as a Condition of Approval for the project.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6. <i>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site of unique geologic feature?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: No unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features are known to occur in the vicinity of the project. A query was conducted of the mapping of identified geologic/paleontological resources maintained by the County of Santa Cruz Planning Department, and there are no records of paleontological or geological resources in the vicinity of the project parcel. No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated.

or unique geologic features do not occur on the project site. No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated.

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <i>Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project, like all development, would be responsible for an incremental increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by usage of fossil fuels during the site grading and construction. In 2013, Santa Cruz County adopted a Climate Action Strategy (CAS) intended to establish specific emission reduction goals and necessary actions to reduce greenhouse gas levels to pre-1990 levels as required under Assembly Bill (AB) 32 legislation. The strategy intends to reduce GHG emissions and energy consumption by implementing measures such as reducing vehicle miles traveled through the County and regional long-range planning efforts and increasing energy efficiency in new and existing buildings and facilities. Implementing the CAS, the MBCP was formed in 2017 to provide carbon-free electricity. All

PG&E customers in unincorporated Santa Cruz County were automatically enrolled in the MBCP in 2018. All project construction equipment would be required to comply with the CARB emissions requirements for construction equipment. Further, all new buildings are required to meet the State’s CalGreen building code. As a result, impacts associated with the temporary increase in GHG emissions are expected to be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. <i>Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See the discussion under H-1 above. No significant impacts are anticipated.

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <i>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No routine transport or disposal of hazardous materials is proposed. However, during construction, fuel would be used at the project site. In addition, fueling may occur within the limits of the staging area proposed to be located at the project site (9041 Soquel Drive). Best management practices would be used to ensure that no impacts would occur. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. <i>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under I-1 above. Project impacts would be considered less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. <i>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Aptos Junior High School located at 1001 Huntington Drive in Aptos, is approximately .75 miles to the edge of the project site. Although fueling of equipment is likely to occur within the staging area, BMPs to contain spills would be implemented. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. <i>Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not included on the Cortese list of hazardous sites in Santa Cruz County compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5. No impacts are anticipated from project implementation.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. <i>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impact is anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6. <i>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not conflict with implementation of the County of Santa Cruz Local Hazard Mitigation Plan 2015-2020 (County of Santa Cruz, 2020). Therefore, no impacts to an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan would occur from project implementation.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. <i>Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under Wildfire Question T-2. The project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No impact would occur.

J. HYDROLOGY, WATER SUPPLY, AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <i>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project is located adjacent to Valencia Creek; however, as conditioned, the project will have no significant impact on water quality and the project would not discharge runoff either directly or indirectly into a public or private water supply. No heavy commercial or industrial activities are proposed that would generate a substantial level of contaminants. However, runoff from this project may contain small amounts of chemicals and other household contaminants, such as pathogens, pesticides, trash, and nutrients. The parking and driveway associated with the project would incrementally contribute urban pollutants to the environment; however, the contribution would be small, given the size of the driveway and parking area. The project incorporates pervious pavers and rain garden catchments to treat stormwater and control release to pre-development levels. The discharge locations direct the pre-treated waters through dense vegetation along a gentle slope over 50-feet from the active channel, further reducing potential impacts. Potential siltation from the project during construction would be addressed through implementation of erosion control BMPs. No water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be violated, and surface or ground water quality would not otherwise be substantially degraded. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. <i>Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project would obtain water from Soquel Creek Water District and would not rely on private well water. Although the project would incrementally increase water demand, Soquel Creek Water District has previously provided information indicating that adequate supplies are available to serve the project and prior to the issuance of a building permit, a valid will-serve letter will be required to be submitted. The project is not located in

a mapped groundwater recharge area or water supply watershed and will not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. <i>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| A. <i>result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. <i>substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. <i>create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or;</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. <i>impede or redirect flood flows?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The project will not alter the course of any stream or river. A drainage plan was prepared for the proposed Project. The County Department of Public Works Stormwater Management Section staff has reviewed and approved the proposed drainage plan. The Project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner that would result in erosion or siltation, or an increase in runoff from the site.

The subject site slopes from the south (Soquel Drive) towards the north (riparian area) and drains to Valencia Creek. The first 35 feet adjacent to Soquel Drive is relatively flat and is steeply sloped beyond that. There are no onsite or near-site drainage facilities. Soquel Drive is crowned and approximately half of the paved road drains toward the subject parcel. The project will result in the construction of approximately 5,000 square feet of impervious area and approximately 3,000 square feet of semi-impervious pavers.

The project’s civil engineer has prepared Preliminary Civil Improvement Plans and drainage calculations that have been reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works (DPW) Stormwater Management for feasibility to comply with the County Design Criteria. The plans and report detail how the project has been designed to mitigate for the proposed increase in impervious area coverage. The proposal includes routing impervious area runoff to biofiltration areas and through permeable paver and underground rock sections that will provide both filtering for water quality treatment as well as flood control storage. The flood control storage is sized to detain the post development runoff from the 25-year storm while controlling the release so that predevelopment 5-year runoff rates are maintained. The controlled release will be routed to the north in two 8-inch storm drains that discharge on separate rip rap outfalls. The project has been conditioned to provide detailed grading information to ensure that existing runoff from Soquel Drive will continue with existing drainage patterns and routed so as not to impact adjacent private properties. The project is also conditioned to ensure that the civil engineer’s final design and siting of the outfall structures are acceptable to the project geotechnical engineer. A recorded maintenance agreement regarding the ongoing maintenance of all proposed stormwater mitigations is also required prior to final acceptance of the project. Impacts would therefore be considered less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. <i>In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Rate Map, dated September 29, 2017, no portion of the project site lies within a flood hazard zone, and there would be no impact.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. <i>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: All County water agencies are experiencing a lack of sustainable water supply due to groundwater overdraft and diminished availability of streamflow. Because of this, coordinated water resource management has been of primary concern to the County and to the various water agencies. Projects seeking approval must be consistent with numerous water management plans as described below.

As required by state law, each of the County’s water agencies serving more than 3,000 connections must update their Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) every five years, with the most recent updates completed in 2021. This project falls within the City of Santa Cruz Water Department service area. The City of Santa Cruz Water Department is

anticipating that water use through 2040 will slightly increase, and they are planning accordingly through the development of several diverse water supply projects.

County staff are working with the water agencies on various integrated regional water management programs to provide for sustainable water supply and protection of the environment. Effective water conservation programs have reduced overall water demand in the past 20 years, despite continuing growth. In August 2014, the Board of Supervisors and other agencies adopted the Santa Cruz Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Plan Update 2014, which identifies various strategies and projects to address the current water resource challenges of the region. In 2020, an updated climate change chapter was added to the IRWMP. A Countywide Storm Water Resources Plan was created through a related effort in 2016 to ensure the coordinated use of storm water as a resource.

The County is working closely with water agencies to implement the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) of 2014. There are three groundwater basins in the County that are subject to SGMA, the Santa Margarita Basin, the Santa Cruz Mid-County Basin, and the Pajaro Valley Basin. The project is located in the Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Basin.

In 2016, Soquel Creek Water District (SqCWD), Central Water District (CWD), County, and City of Santa Cruz adopted a Joint Powers Agreement to form the Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency for management of the Mid-County Basin under SGMA. The Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) written by the Groundwater Agency was approved by the Department of Water Resources in June 2021. The GSP outlines an approach to reach sustainability by 2040 which relies on projects including a purified recycled water and an aquifer storage and recovery project to provide additional supply to the Basin. Projects and Management Actions included in the Plan originated through the SqCWD Community Water Plan and the City of Santa Cruz Water Supply Augmentation Strategy.

In addition to the Groundwater Sustainability Plan, Urban Water Management Plans, and the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, the project will comply with SCCC Chapters 13.13 (Water Conservation – Water Efficient Landscaping), 7.69 (Water Conservation) and 7.70 (Water Wells), as well as Chapter 7.71 (Water Systems) section 7.71.130 (Water use measurement and reporting). The proposed project is consistent with the community Water Plan and so no significant impacts are anticipated.

K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Physically divide an established community?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not include any element that would physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. General Plan policy 5.2.3 (Activities Within Riparian Corridors and Wetlands) states: “Development activities, land alterations and vegetation disturbance within riparian corridors and wetlands and required buffers shall be prohibited unless an exception is granted per the Riparian Corridor and Wetlands Protection ordinance”. Please see complete discussion under Question D-5. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

L. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site does not contain any known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Therefore, no impact is anticipated from project implementation.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is zoned PA, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (M-3) nor does it have a land use designation with a Quarry Designation Overlay (Q) (County of Santa Cruz 1994). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

M. NOISE

Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <i>Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

County of Santa Cruz General Plan

The County of Santa Cruz has not adopted noise thresholds for construction noise. The following applicable noise related policy is found in the Public Safety and Noise Element of the Santa Cruz County General Plan (Santa Cruz County 1994).

- Policy 6.9.7 Construction Noise. Require mitigation of construction noise as a condition of future project approvals.

The General Plan also contains the following table, which specifies the maximum allowable noise exposure for stationary noise sources (operational or permanent noise sources) (Table 2).

	Daytime ⁵ (7:00 am to 10:00 pm)	Nighttime ^{2, 5} (10:00 pm to 7:00 am)
Hourly Leq average hourly noise level, dB ³	50	45
Maximum Level, dB ³	70	65
Maximum Level, dB – Impulsive Noise ⁴	65	60

Notes:
 1 As determined at the property line of the receiving land use. When determining the effectiveness of noise mitigation measures, the standards may be applied to the receptor side of noise barriers or other property line noise mitigation measures.
 2 Applies only where the receiving land use operates or is occupied during nighttime hours
 3 Sound level measurements shall be made with “slow” meter response.
 4 Sound level measurements shall be made with “fast” meter response
 5 Allowable levels shall be raised to the ambient noise levels where the ambient levels exceed the allowable levels. Allowable levels shall be reduced to 5 dB if the ambient hourly Leq is at least 10 dB lower than the allowable level.
 Source: County of Santa Cruz 1994

County of Santa Cruz Code

There are no County of Santa Cruz ordinances that specifically regulate construction or operational noise levels. However, Section 8.30.010 (Curfew—Offensive noise) of the SCCC contains the following language regarding noise impacts:

(A) No person shall make, cause, suffer, or permit to be made any offensive noise.

(B) “Offensive noise” means any noise which is loud, boisterous, irritating, penetrating, or unusual, or that is unreasonably distracting in any other manner such that it is likely to disturb people of ordinary sensitivities in the vicinity of such noise, and includes, but is not limited to, noise made by an individual alone or by a group of people engaged in any business, activity, meeting, gathering, game, dance, or amusement, or by any appliance, contrivance, device, tool, structure, construction, vehicle, ride, machine, implement, or instrument.

I The following factors shall be considered when determining whether a violation of the provisions of this section exists:

(1) Loudness (Intensity) of the Sound.

(a) Day and Evening Hours. For purposes of this factor, a noise shall be automatically considered offensive if it occurs between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and it is:

(i) Clearly discernible at a distance of 150 feet from the property line of the property from which it is broadcast; or

(ii) In excess of 75 decibels at the edge of the property line of the property from which the sound is broadcast, as registered on a sound measuring instrument meeting the American National Standard Institute’s Standard S1.4-1971 (or more recent revision thereof) for Type 1 or Type 2 sound level meters, or an instrument which provides equivalent data.

A noise not reaching this intensity of volume may still be found to be offensive depending on consideration of the other factors outlined below.

(b) Night Hours. For purposes of this factor, a noise shall be automatically considered offensive if it occurs between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. and it is:

(i) Clearly discernible at a distance of 100 feet from the property line of the property from which it is broadcast; or

(ii) In excess of 60 decibels at the edge of the property line of the property from which the sound is broadcast, as registered on a sound measuring instrument meeting the American National Standard Institute’s Standard S1.4-1971 (or more recent revision thereof) for Type 1 or Type 2 sound level meters, or an instrument which provides equivalent data.

A noise not reaching this intensity of volume may still be found to be offensive depending on consideration of the other factors outlined below.

(2) Pitch (frequency) of the sound, e.g., very low bass or high screech;

- (3) Duration of the sound;
- (4) Time of day or night;
- (5) Necessity of the noise, e.g., garbage collecting, street repair, permitted construction activities;
- (6) The level of customary background noise, e.g., residential neighborhood, commercial zoning district, etc.; and
- (7) The proximity to any building regularly used for sleeping purposes. [Ord. 5205 § 1, 2015; Ord. 4001 § 1, 1989]

Table 3: Typical Noise Levels for Common Construction Equipment (at 50 feet)	
Equipment	L _{max} (dBA)
Air Compressor	80
Backhoe	80
Chain Saw	85
Compactor	82
Concrete Mixer	85
Concrete Pump	82
Concrete Saw	90
Crane	83
Dozer	85
Dump Truck	84
Excavator	85
Flat Bed Truck	84
Fork Lift	75
Generator	82
Grader	85
Hoe-ram	90
Jack Hammer	88
Loader	80
Paver	85
Pick-up Truck	55
Pneumatic Tool	85
Roller	85
Tree Chipper	87
Truck	84

Source: Federal Transit Authority, 2006, 2018.

Sensitive Receptors

Some land uses are generally regarded as being more sensitive to noise than others due to the type of population groups or activities involved. Sensitive population groups generally include children and the elderly. Noise sensitive land uses typically include all residential uses (single- and multi-family, mobile homes, dormitories, and similar uses), hospitals, nursing homes, schools, and parks.

The nearest sensitive receptors are residential units across the creek and riparian area that goes down and up to a residential neighborhood, located approximately 500 feet to the north of the project area.

Impacts

Potential Temporary Construction Noise Impacts

Noise generated during project construction would increase the ambient noise levels in adjacent areas. Construction would be temporary, and construction hours would be limited as a condition of approval. Given the limited duration of construction and the limited hours of construction activity, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

Potential Permanent Impacts

The project would not result in a permanent increase in the ambient noise level. The main source of ambient noise in the project area is traffic noise along Soquel Drive. However, no substantial increase in traffic trips is anticipated as a result of the project. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. <i>Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The use of construction and grading equipment would potentially generate periodic vibration in the project area. This impact would be temporary and periodic and is not expected to cause damage; therefore, impacts are not expected to be significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. <i>For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip or within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area. No impact is anticipated.

N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area. The project proposes only to construct an approximately 11,000 square foot mixed-use building with a 1,900 square foot basement, 3,000 square feet of commercial space and 3 apartment units and would not induce population growth. No impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. <i>Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not displace any existing housing since the project site is currently considered vacant. No impact would occur.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:

1. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

a. <i>Fire protection?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. <i>Police protection?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. <i>Schools?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. <i>Parks?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. <i>Other public facilities; including the maintenance of roads?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a through e): The project site is served by the Aptos/La Selva Fire Protection District and County Sheriff. The site is located within the Pajaro Valley Unified School District which has available space for new children should any be added as a result of this project. Nearby schools include Rio Del Mar and Valencia Elementary Schools (which serve students from kindergarten through 6th grade), Aptos Junior High School (which serves students for 7th and 8th grade) and Aptos High School (serving students from 9th grade to graduation). The nearest parks to serve this parcel are the Aptos Village County Park which is located approximately .75 miles to the west of the project site and the Polo Grounds County Park which is located approximately .75 miles to the east of the project site. While the project represents an incremental contribution to the need for services, the increase would be minimal. Moreover, the project meets all of the standards and requirements identified by the local fire agency or California Department of Forestry, as applicable, and school, park, and transportation fees to be paid by the applicant would be used to offset the incremental increase in demand for school and recreational facilities and public roads. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

P. RECREATION

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. <i>Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not substantially increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not propose the expansion or require the construction of additional recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

Q. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Senate Bill (SB) 743, signed by Governor Jerry Brown in 2013, changed the way transportation impacts are identified under CEQA. Specifically, the legislation directed the State of California’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to look at different metrics for identifying transportation impacts. OPR issued its “Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA” (December 2018) to assist practitioners in implementing the CEQA Guidelines revisions to use vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle related impacts. The CEQA Guidelines were also updated in December 2018, such that vehicle level of service (LOS) will no longer be used as a determinant of significant environmental impacts, and an analysis of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) will be required as of July 2020. A discussion of consistency with the Santa Cruz County General Plan LOS policy is provide below for informational purposes only.

The project would create a small incremental increase in traffic on nearby roads and intersections. The proposed project would generate an estimated 69 daily trips with 7 trips during the AM peak hour and 10 trips during the PM peak hour. The increase would not cause the LOS at any nearby intersection to drop below LOS D, consistent with General Plan Policy 3.12.1.

The project design would comply with current road requirements, including the regulations under section 13.11.074 of the County Code, “Access, circulation and parking” to prevent

potential hazards to motorists, bicyclists, and/or pedestrians, as well as the County of Santa Cruz Department of Public Works design criteria. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

2. *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1) (Vehicle Miles Traveled)?*
-

Discussion: In response to the passage of Senate Bill 743 in 2013 and other climate change strategies, OPR amended the CEQA Guidelines to replace LOS with VMT as the measurement for transportation impacts. The “Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA,” prepared by OPR (2018) provides recommended thresholds and methodologies for assessing impacts of new developments on VMT. There are also a number of screening criteria recommended by OPR that can be used to determine whether a project will have a less-than-significant impact. The screening criteria include projects that generate less than 110 net new trips, map-based screening, projects within a ½ mile of high-quality transit, affordable housing projects, and local serving retail. Since Santa Cruz County has a Regional Transportation Planning Authority and generally conducts transportation planning activities countywide, the county inclusive of the cities is considered a region.

In June of 2020, the County of Santa Cruz adopted a threshold of 15% below the existing countywide average per capita VMT levels for residential projects, 15% below the existing countywide average per employee VMT for office and other employee-based projects, no net increase in the countywide average VMT for retail projects, and no net increase in VMT for other projects. Based on the countywide travel demand model the current countywide average per capita VMT for residential uses is 10.2 miles. The current countywide per employee average VMT for the service sector (including office land uses) is 8.9 miles, for the agricultural sector is 15.4, for the industrial sector is 13.9, and for the public sector is 8.2. Therefore, the current VMT thresholds for land use projects are 8.7 miles per capita for residential projects. For employee-based land uses the current thresholds are: 7.6 miles per employee for office and services projects, 13.1 miles per employee for agricultural projects, 11.8 miles per employee for industrial projects, and 7 miles per employee for public sector land use projects. The threshold for retail projects and all other land uses is no net increase in VMT. For mixed-use projects, each land use is evaluated separately unless they are determined to be insignificant to the total VMT.

A traffic impact analysis for the proposed mixed-use development was submitted by traffic engineer Keith Higgins (dated February 6, 2020) which summarizes traffic impacts in two ways. One method was to summarize the project trip generation. County Code states if a

proposed project generates 20 or more AM or PM peak hour vehicle trips, a formal traffic impact analysis is required. Exhibit 7 of the he submitted traffic study summarizes the project trip generation, which was estimated using trip rates from *Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers in 2017. The proposed project would generate an estimated 69 daily trips with 7 trips during the AM peak hour and 10 trips during the PM peak hour. A formal traffic impact analysis, therefore, is not required since this is below the threshold number of 20 additional trips. Furthermore, the small number of added trips generated by the project would be distributed throughout the surrounding street network, including Soquel Drive and Highway One, which will minimize the number of trips added to any one of these roadways. Therefore, the project as proposed would not adversely impact existing roads or intersections in the surrounding area.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is defined as the total miles traveled by all vehicles traveling to and from a specific area over an average day. Santa Cruz County standards state that projects that generate less than 110 net new daily vehicle trips are considered to have a less than significant impact on VMT. Exhibit 7 of the Traffic Report indicates that the project would only generate 69 daily trips, therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on VMT.

3. *Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

Discussion: The project consists of a proposal to construct a 10,981 square foot mixed-use building that includes an approximately 1,900 square foot basement storage area, approximately 3,000 square feet of office space on the first floor with a covered carport for 5 vehicles, and three residential apartment units at the second floor, located in the PA (Professional-Administrative Office) district. No increase in hazards would occur from project design or from incompatible uses. No impact would occur from project implementation.

4. *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

Discussion: The project’s road access meets County standards and has been approved by the local fire agency or California Department of Forestry, as appropriate.

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

1. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>A. <i>Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources Code section 5020.1(k), or</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>B. <i>A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The project proposes to establish an approximately 11,000 square foot mixed-use building with a 1,900 square foot basement, 3,000 square feet of office space on the first floor with a covered carport for 5 vehicles, and three residential apartment units on the second floor, located in the PA (Professional-Administrative Office) district. Section 21080.3.1(b) of the California Public Resources Code (AB 52) requires a lead agency formally notify a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated within the geographic area of the discretionary project when formally requested. As of this writing, no California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Santa Cruz County region have formally requested a consultation with the County of Santa Cruz (as Lead Agency under CEQA) regarding Tribal Cultural Resources. However, no Tribal Cultural Resources are known to occur in or near the project area. Therefore, no impact to the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource is anticipated from project implementation.

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>1. <i>Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Discussion:

Water

The project would connect to an existing municipal water supply. Soquel Creek Water District has previously determined that adequate supplies are available to serve the project and that no new facilities are required to serve the project. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, an updated will-serve letter is required confirming this initial determination. No impact would occur from project implementation.

Wastewater

Municipal wastewater treatment facilities are available and have capacity to serve the project. No new wastewater facilities are required to serve the project. No impact would occur from project implementation.

Stormwater

The drainage analysis for the project 9041 Soquel Drive, prepared by Ramsey Civil Engineering, Inc., dated April 1, 2020. The project's civil engineer has prepared Preliminary Civil Improvement Plans and drainage calculations that have been reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works (DPW) Stormwater Management for feasibility to comply with the County Design Criteria. The plans and report detail how the project has been designed to mitigate for the proposed increase in impervious area coverage. The proposal includes routing impervious area runoff to biofiltration areas and through permeable paver and underground rock sections that will provide both filtering for water quality treatment as well as flood control storage. The flood control storage is sized to detain the post development runoff from the 25-year storm while controlling the release so that predevelopment 5-year runoff rates are maintained. The controlled release will be routed to the north in two 8-inch storm drains that discharge on separate rip rap outfalls. The project has been conditioned to provide detailed grading information to ensure that existing runoff from Soquel Drive will continue with existing drainage patterns and routed so as not to impact adjacent private properties. The project is also conditioned to ensure that the civil engineer's final design and siting of the outfall structures are acceptable to the project geotechnical engineer. A recorded maintenance agreement regarding ongoing maintenance of the proposed stormwater mitigations is required prior to final acceptance of the project. No impacts are expected to occur from the project.

Electric Power

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides power to existing and new developments in the Santa Cruz County area. As of 2018, residents and businesses in the County were automatically enrolled in MBCP’s community choice energy program, which provides locally controlled, carbon-free electricity delivered on PGE’s existing lines.

The proposed site is previously undeveloped and is not currently served by electric power (the unpermitted bike shop uses a solar inverter system). Electric power service will be required to serve the site; however, no substantial environmental impacts will result from the additional improvements; impacts will be less than significant.

Natural Gas

PG&E serves the urbanized portions of Santa Cruz County with natural gas.

The proposed site is considered undeveloped and not currently served by natural gas. Extension of gas lines are proposed to serve the site. However, no environmental impacts will result from the additional improvements; impacts will be less than significant.

Telecommunications

Telecommunications, including telephone, wireless telephone, internet, and cable, are provided by a variety of organizations. AT&T is the major telephone provider, and its subsidiary, DirectTV provides television and internet services. Cable television services in Santa Cruz County are provided by Charter Communications in Watsonville and Comcast in other areas of the county. Wireless services are also provided by AT&T, as well as other service providers, such as Verizon.

No improvements related to telecommunications are required, and there will be no impact.

2. *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

Discussion: All the main aquifers in this County, the primary sources of the County’s potable water, are in some degree of overdraft. Overdraft is manifested in several ways including 1) declining groundwater levels, 2) degradation of water quality, 3) diminished stream base flow, and/or 4) seawater intrusion. Surface water supplies, which are the primary source of supply for the northern third of the County, are inadequate during drought periods and will be further diminished as a result of the need to increase stream baseflows to restore habitat for endangered salmonid populations. In addition to overdraft, the use of water resources is further constrained by various water quality issues.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Soquel Creek Water District has previously indicated that adequate water supplies are available to serve the project subject to the payment of fees and charges in effect at the time of service. Prior to issuance of a building permit an updated will-serve letter will be required to be submitted, confirming this initial determination. The development would also be subject to the water conservation requirements in Chapter 7.69 (Water Conservation) and 13.13 (Water Conservation—Water Efficient Landscaping) of the County Code and the policies of section 7.18c (Water Conservation) of the General Plan. Therefore, existing water supplies would be sufficient to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. <i>Result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The Santa Cruz County Sanitation District has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that that the project meets all feasibility requirements and that adequate capacity in the sewer collection system is available to serve the project. Therefore, existing wastewater collection/treatment capacity would be sufficient to serve the project. No impact would occur from project implementation.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. <i>Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Due to the small incremental increase in solid waste generation by the project during construction and operations, the impact would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. <i>Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste disposal. No impact would occur.

T. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located in a State Responsibility Area, a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or a County-mapped Critical Fire Hazard Area and will not conflict with emergency response or evacuation plans. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. <i>Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located in a State Responsibility Area, a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or a County-mapped Critical Fire Hazard Area. In addition, the project design incorporates all applicable fire safety code requirements and includes fire protection devices as required by the local fire agency and is unlikely to exacerbate wildfire risks. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. <i>Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located in a State Responsibility Areas, a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or a County-mapped Critical Fire Hazard Area. Improvements associated with the project are unlikely to exacerbate wildfire risks. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. <i>Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located within a State Responsibility Areas, a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or a County-mapped Critical Fire Hazard Area. Downslope and downstream impacts associated with wildfires are unlikely to result from the project.

Regardless, the project design incorporates all applicable fire safety code requirements and includes fire protection devices as required by the local fire agency. Impacts would be less than significant. See section D.1. for further discussion of slope stability related to stormwater release.

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>1. <i>Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal community or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in Section III (A through T) of this Initial Study. As a result of this evaluation, with the proposed mitigations, there is no substantial evidence that significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>2. <i>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project’s potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be no potentially significant cumulative effects

associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

3. *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to specific questions in Section III (A through T). As a result of this evaluation, no potentially adverse effects to human beings associated with this project were identified. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

IV. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

California Department of Conservation, 1980

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Soil Candidate Listing for Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance Santa Cruz County U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, soil surveys for Santa Cruz County, California, August 1980.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2019

California Natural Diversity Database SOQUEL USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle; queried November 29, 2021

CalFIRE, 2010

Santa Cruz County-San Mateo County Community Wildfire Protection Plan. May 2010.

Caltrans, 2018

California Public Road Data 2017: Statistical Information Derived from the Highway Performance Monitoring System. Released by the State of California Department of Transportation November 2018.

County of Santa Cruz, 1994

1994 General Plan and Local Coastal Program for the County of Santa Cruz, California. Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on May 24, 1994, and certified by the California Coastal Commission on December 15, 1994.

County of Santa Cruz, 2013

County of Santa Cruz Climate Action Strategy. Approved by the Board of Supervisors on February 26, 2013.

County of Santa Cruz, 2015

County of Santa Cruz Local Hazard Mitigation Plan 2015-2020. Prepared by the County of Santa Cruz Office of Emergency Services.

DOF, 2018

E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State—January 1, 2011-2018. Released by the State of California Department of Finance May 2018.

Federal Transit Administration, 2006

Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual.

Federal Transit Administration, 2018

Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. September 2018.

FEMA,

Flood Insurance Rate Map Flood Insurance Rate Map 0351 Federal Emergency Management Agency. Effective on May 16, 2012.

MBUAPCD, 2008

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Prepared by the MBUAPCD, Adopted October 1995, Revised: February 1997, August 1998, December 1999, September 2000, September 2002, June 2004 and February 2008.

MBUAPCD, 2013a

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, NCCAB (NCCAB) Area Designations and Attainment Status – January 2013. Available online at http://www.mbuapcd.org/mbuapcd/pdf/Planning/Attainment_Status_January_2013_2.pdf

MBUAPCD, 2013b

Triennial Plan Revision 2009-2011. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. Adopted April 17, 2013.

OPR, 2018

“Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA.” Available online at http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------



This page intentionally left blank.

Attachment 1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Attachment 2

Geotechnical Report by CMAG Engineering, Inc.

Dated December 30, 2018

Attachment 3

Geotechnical Report Acceptance Letter
Dated January 9, 2020

Attachment 3

Geotechnical Report Acceptance Letter
Dated January 9, 2020

Attachment 4

Approved Locations of Drainage Outlets



This page intentionally left blank.