



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

KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR

www.sccoplanning.com

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION NOTICE OF PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT PERIOD

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the following project has been reviewed by the County Environmental Coordinator to determine if it has a potential to create significant impacts to the environment and, if so, how such impacts could be solved. A Negative Declaration is prepared in cases where the project is determined not to have any significant environmental impacts. Either a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is prepared for projects that may result in a significant impact to the environment.

Public review periods are provided for these Environmental Determinations according to the requirements of the County Environmental Review Guidelines. The environmental document is available for review at the County Planning Department located at 701 Ocean Street, in Santa Cruz. You may also view the environmental document on the web at www.sccoplanning.com under the Planning Department menu. If you have questions or comments about this Notice of Intent, please contact Todd Sexauer of the Environmental Review staff at (831) 454-3201

The County of Santa Cruz does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs or activities. If you require special assistance in order to review this information, please contact Bernice Shawver at (831) 454-3137 (TDD number (831) 454-2123 or (831) 763-8123) to make arrangements.

PROJECT: Burgstrom Minor Land Division

APP #: 131316

APN(S): 108-291-09

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This application is a proposal to divide a 13.06 acre parcel into two parcels of 6.49 acres (Parcel A) and 6.57 acres (Parcel B). Requires a Minor Land Division and LAFCO Extraterritorial Water Service approvals.

PROJECT LOCATION: The project site is located on the west side of Blake Avenue in Watsonville (52 Blakeridge Lane).

EXISTING ZONE DISTRICT: RA

APPLICANT: Charlie Eadie

OWNER: Lisa Burgstrom

PROJECT PLANNER: Annette Olson

EMAIL: Annette.Olson@santacruzcounty.us

ACTION: Negative Declaration with Mitigations

REVIEW PERIOD: August 17, 2015 through September 15, 2015

This project will be considered at a public hearing by the Planning Commission at a date to be determined. The time, date and location have not been set. When scheduling does occur, these items will be included in all public hearing notices for the project.



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
KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR
<http://www.sccoplanning.com/>

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project: Burgstrom Minor Land Division

APN(S): 108-291-09

Project Description: This application is a proposal to divide a 13.06 acre parcel into two parcels of 6.49 acres (Parcel A) and 6.57 acres (Parcel B). Requires a Minor Land Division and LAFCO Extraterritorial Water Service approvals.

Project Location: The project site is located on the west side of Blake Avenue in Watsonville (52 Blakeridge Lane).

Owner: Lisa Burgstrom

Applicant: Charlie Eadie

Staff Planner: Annette Olson, (831) 454-3134

Email: Annette.Olson@santacruzcounty.us

This project will be considered at a public hearing by the Planning Commission at a date to be determined. The time, date and location have not been set. When scheduling does occur, these items will be included in all public hearing notices on the project.

California Environmental Quality Act Mitigated Negative Declaration Findings:

Find, that this Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the decision-making body's independent judgment and analysis, and; that the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Mitigated Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review period; and, that revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the project applicant would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; and, on the basis of the whole record before the decision-making body (including this Mitigated Negative Declaration) that there is no substantial evidence that the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment. The expected environmental impacts of the project are documented in the attached Initial Study on file with the County of Santa Cruz Clerk of the Board located at 701 Ocean Street, 5th Floor, Santa Cruz, California.

Review Period Ends: September 15, 2015

Note: This Document is considered Draft until it is Adopted by the Appropriate County of Santa Cruz Decision-Making Body

Date: _____

Todd Sexauer, Environmental Coordinator
(831) 454-3511



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
KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR
www.sccoplanning.com

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW INITIAL STUDY

Date: August 4, 2014

Application Number: 131316

Staff Planner: Annette Olson

I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

APPLICANT: Charlie Eadie

APN: 108-291-09

OWNER: Bergstrom

SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 2

PROJECT LOCATION: Property is located on the west side of Blake Avenue in Watsonville (52 Blakeridge Ln.)

SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Proposal to divide a 13.06 acre parcel into two parcels of 6.49 and 6.57 acres.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Supply/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Resources & Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL(S) BEING CONSIDERED:

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

NON-LOCAL APPROVALS

Other agencies that must issue permits or authorizations: LAFCO

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the lead agency)

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.



Todd Sexauer
Environmental Coordinator

8/12/15

Date

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

Parcel Size: 13.06 acres

Existing Land Use: Residential

Vegetation: Oak trees and grass

Slope in area affected by project: 0 - 30% 31 - 100%

Nearby Watercourse: Corralitos Creek

Distance To: One-half mile

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Water Supply Watershed: No

Groundwater Recharge: No

Timber or Mineral: No

Agricultural Resource: No

Biologically Sensitive Habitat: No

Fire Hazard: Moderate State Response Area

Floodplain: No

Landslide: No

Liquefaction: Portions of low and moderate

Fault Zone:

Scenic Corridor: No

Historic: No

Archaeology: No

Noise Constraint: No

Electric Power Lines: No

Solar Access: Yes

Solar Orientation: South Facing

Hazardous Materials: None known

Other: N/A

SERVICES

Fire Protection: Pajaro Fire Protection District

School District: Pajaro Valley

Sewage Disposal: On-site septic

Drainage District: Flood Zone 7

Project Access: Blake Ave.

Water Supply: City of Watsonville

PLANNING POLICIES

Zone District: RA

General Plan: RR

Urban Services Line: Inside

Coastal Zone: Inside

Special Designation: N/A

Outside

Outside

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES:

The subject parcel is located next to a suburban residential neighborhood just outside of the small commercial area of Corralitos. The project site is accessed from Blake Avenue. Most of the parcels that front Blake Avenue are zoned R-1-15 (Single-family zone district, with a minimum parcel size of 15,000 square feet). However, the subject parcel and the other parcels located on the hillside on the west side of Blake Avenue are zoned RA (Residential Agriculture). These RA-zoned parcels create a transition to the rural agriculture parcels to the north and west. All of the residential parcels in the immediate vicinity have a General Plan designation of RR (Rural Residential). The subject parcel is located outside of the Urban Services Line.

Although slopes on the subject parcel range from level to 50% slopes, the proposed building site is located on a ridge running east-west with the majority of slopes ranging between 15% to 30%. Oak trees and grasses predominate in the building site area with redwood trees characterizing the north facing slope below the building site.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project description is based on a Tentative Map prepared by Lee Vaage of Mid Coast Engineers dated September 7, 2012 and revised March 26, 2014. The project consists of dividing a 13.06 acre parcel into two parcels of 6.49 acres (Parcel A) and 6.57 acres (Parcel B). With the deduction of rights-of-way and slopes over 50%, the net developable area of each parcel is 5.01 acres (Parcel A) and 5.32 acres (Parcel B).

Parcel B is developed with a single-family residence which was completed in 2002. The current proposal does not include architectural plans for Parcel A as no building is contemplated as a part of the minor land division. A building envelope and a driveway are shown on the project plans. Both were designed to minimize the future development's impact to oak trees. When house plans are developed for Parcel A, the project will be required to comply with County grading regulations.

The proposed land division is subject to the Rural Residential Density Matrix in order to determine the appropriate density of development within the allowed General Plan density range. The subject property is located within the Rural Residential (R-R) General Plan land use designation. The allowed maximum density, per the Rural Residential Density Matrix, is five acres of net developable land area per parcel. The proposed Minor Land Division complies with this requirement, in that each of the parcels to be created will contain a minimum of five acres of net developable land area.

The City of Watsonville provided a will-serve letter contingent upon LAFCO approval of an Extraterritorial Service Proposal Application. This LAFCO approval is required for properties located within the County, i.e. outside of the City of Watsonville, because the City of Watsonville has not obtained a blanket State approval for the service area beyond Watsonville city limits. According to Tom Sharp, Senior Engineering Associate at the City of Watsonville, these Extraterritorial Service Proposal Applications are routinely approved. Piped water, rather than a well, is environmentally preferable as water use can then be metered and intrusions into the aquifer which can introduce contaminants are minimized. The water main to serve the project is located within Blake Ave.

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

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

A. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| A. 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (A through D): The project site is located outside of the limits of the State Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone (County of Santa Cruz GIS Mapping, California Division of Mines and Geology, 2001). However, the project site is located approximately three and a half miles southwest of the San Andreas fault zone. In addition to the San Andreas fault, other nearby fault systems capable of producing intense seismic shaking on this property include the San Gregorio, Zayante, Sargent, Hayward, Butano, Calaveras faults, and the Monterey and Corralitos fault complexes. 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.

All of Santa Cruz County is subject to some hazard from earthquakes. However, the project site is not located within a county or state mapped fault zone. A geotechnical investigation for the proposed project was performed by William E. St. Clair of Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., dated September 2013 (Attachment 3). The report concluded that the potential is low for liquefaction/lateral spreading and slope instability

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

to affect development constructed within the building envelope.

Implementation of the additional requirements included in the review letter prepared by Environmental Planning staff (Attachment 4), including a requirement that construction comply with the recommendations of the report and requiring that the engineer submit a plan review letter prior to issuance of the building permit, will serve to further reduce the potential risk of seismic shaking.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The report cited above concluded that there is a low potential risk from liquefaction/lateral spreading and/or slope instability. The recommendations contained in the geotechnical report, including criteria for grading (page 17), recommendations for the foundation (conventional spread footings or concrete slab on grade), and retaining wall and drainage recommendations, will be made conditions of project approval to reduce this potential hazard to a less than significant level.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. | Develop land with a slope exceeding 30%? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are slopes that exceed 30% on the property. However, no improvements are proposed on slopes in excess of 30%.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. | Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Some potential for erosion exists during the construction phase of the project, however, this potential is minimal because prior to approval of a grading or building permit, the project must have an approved Erosion Control Plan, which will specify detailed erosion and sedimentation control measures. The plan will include provisions for disturbed areas to be planted with ground cover and to be maintained to minimize surface erosion.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. | Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The geotechnical report for the project did not identify any elevated risk associated with expansive soils. Page 11 of the report states, "Therefore the potential for liquefaction and lateral spread to affect the proposed development is low."

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6. Place sewage disposal systems in areas dependent upon soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, leach fields, or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed project would use an onsite sewage disposal system, and County Environmental Health Services has determined that site conditions are appropriate to support such a system.

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. Result in coastal cliff erosion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a coastal cliff or bluff, and therefore, would not contribute to coastal cliff erosion.

B. HYDROLOGY, WATER SUPPLY, AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Place development within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <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 May 16, 2012, no portion of the project site lies within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <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 May 16, 2012, no portion of the project site lies within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Be inundated by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The subject property is not located within an area subject to a seiche as there are no nearby lakes or enclosed water bodies. It is also not subject to a tsunami or mudflow as shown on the Tsunami map, dated January 2009.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Discussion: The project would obtain water from City of Watsonville and would not rely on private well water. Although the project would incrementally increase water demand, the City of Watsonville has indicated that adequate supplies are available to serve the project (Attachment 8). The project is not located in a mapped groundwater recharge area.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. Substantially degrade a public or private water supply? (Including the contribution of urban contaminants, nutrient enrichments, or other agricultural chemicals or seawater intrusion). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not discharge runoff directly into a public or private water supply. However, runoff from this project may contain small amounts of chemicals and other household contaminants. No commercial or industrial activities are proposed that would contribute contaminants. Potential siltation from the proposed project will be addressed through implementation of erosion control best management practices.

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6. Degrade septic system functioning? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no indication that existing septic systems in the vicinity would be affected by the project.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 7. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding, on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project is not located near any watercourses, and would not alter the existing overall drainage pattern of the site. Department of Public Works Drainage Section staff has reviewed and approved the proposed drainage plan.

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 8. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: Department of Public Works Drainage staff has reviewed the project and have determined that existing storm water facilities are adequate to handle the increase in drainage associated with the project. Refer to response B-5 for discussion of urban contaminants and/or other polluting runoff.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located near any watercourses and the proposed building site is located well-above the base flood level of Corralitos Creek which is located over one-half mile away to the east.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 10. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: A required condition of approval from the Department of Public Works, Stormwater Management is to require that future development on the property would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize the generation, transport and discharge of pollutants. BMPs for residential projects typically include discharging runoff into landscaped areas to allow for infiltration.

C. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 Game, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: According to the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB), maintained by the California Department of Fish and Game, *Monolopia gracilens* (woodland woollythreads) has the potential to occur on-site. County staff and the County's consulting biologist conducted a site assessment and determined that the development envelope did not support any listed plant species (Attachment 11).

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

During the site assessment, several nesting bird species were present, as were dusky-footed woodrats nests. Several large dead tree snags that could host bat species were also noted. Nesting migratory birds are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; dusky-footed woodrats are a state listed species of special concern, and several bats species are listed on the Western Bat Working Groups list recognized by the Department of Fish and Wildlife. To ensure no significant impacts occur to these special status species, the following mitigations shall apply to any future development proposed on the subject parcel:

BIO-1 In order to avoid impacts to special status bats, tree removal activities shall be limited to between September 15 and November 1, if feasible.

- a. If trees must be removed outside of the timeframe above, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for special status bats 3-4 weeks prior to site disturbance. If active roosts are present in trees to be retained, roosting bats shall be excluded from trees to be removed prior to any disturbance. In trees to be retained, no disturbance zones, set by the biologist based on the particular species present, shall be fenced off around the subject tree to ensure other construction activities do not harm sensitive species.
- b. The maternity roosting season for bats is March 1 – July 3. Tree removal should be scheduled outside of the maternal roosting period if special status bats are present. Before any trees are removed during the maternal roosting season, a qualified biologist shall perform surveys. If maternal roosts are present, disturbance shall be avoided until roosts are unoccupied. The biologist shall be responsible for ensuring bat roosts are vacated.

BIO-2 In order to avoid impacts to raptors and migratory songbirds, tree removal activities shall be limited to the months between September 1 and February 1, if feasible.

If trees must be removed outside of the timeframe above, a qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for raptor or migratory songbird nests 3-4 weeks prior to site disturbance.

- a. If active raptor or migratory bird nests are found in trees to be retained, the biologist shall be required to be on site during any initial vegetation or ground disturbance activities (e.g. vegetation clearing, grading, excavation, tree pruning/removal) that could potentially impact listed species. The biologist shall be responsible for setting and maintaining the disturbance buffers from active nests during construction activities, and buffers and exclusionary measures shall be implemented only after consultation with CDFW.
- b. If no active nests are present on the subject parcel, tree removal can proceed provided the mitigations in 1. above have been implemented.

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

BIO-3 In order to mitigate any potential impacts to San Francisco dusky footed woodrats, all nests must be avoided if feasible. If a nest must be moved, the following measures shall be implemented;

- a. Prior to nest disturbance, the biologist shall obtain from CDFW a scientific collection permit for the trapping of the dusky-footed woodrats.
- b. Nests shall be disturbed/dismantled only during the non-breeding season, between October 1 and December 31.
- c. At least two weeks prior to site disturbance, the qualified biologist shall survey the project disturbance area to identify all active woodrat nest locations that may be affected by the proposed development.
- d. Prior to nest disturbance, woodrats shall be trapped at dusk of the night set for relocation of the nest(s).
- e. Any existing nest that may be disturbed by construction activities shall be mostly dismantled and the material spread in the vicinity of identified nest relocation site(s).
- f. In order to avoid the potential health effects associated with handling rodents and their milieu, all workers involved in the handling of the woodrats or the nest materials should wear protective gear to prevent inhalation of contaminant particulates, contact with conjunctiva (eyes), and protection against flea bites; a respirator, eye protection and skin protection should all be used.
- g. Dismantling shall be done by hand, allowing any animals not trapped to escape either along existing woodrat trails or toward other available habitat.
- h. If a litter of young is found or suspected, nest material shall be replaced, and the nest left alone for 2-3 weeks before a recheck to verify that young are capable of independent survival before proceeding with nest dismantling.
- i. Woody debris shall be collected from the area and relocated nests shall be partially constructed in an area determined by the qualified biologist to be both suitable for the woodrats and far enough away from the construction activities that they will not be impacted.
- j. Woodrats that were collected at dusk shall be released 2 hours before dawn near the newly constructed nests to allow time for woodrats to find refuge.
- k. Once construction of the house is complete, the biologist shall survey the nest area to note whether the new nests are in use, the woodrats have built new nests, or the nest area has been completely abandoned. This information shall be submitted in a letter report to the Environmental

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

Planning Section of the Planning Department, and the local CDFW biologist.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. | 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The subject parcel supports two types of oak woodland: prime oak woodland and degraded oak woodland. The prime oak woodland supports a dense woodland of coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), with a predominantly native plant understory. Understory plants include California blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), coffee berry (*Frangula californica*), poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), and hairy honeysuckle (*Lonicera hispidula*). There are scattered occurrences of cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster sp.*), an invasive, non-native plant species. The degraded oak woodland is a mosaic of native oaks and two non-native tree species: acacia (*Acacia sp.*) and Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*). The understory is dense with cotoneaster. Cover by invasive, non-native species ranges from 20% to over 75%. Areas mapped as oak woodland and degraded oak woodland meet the definition of sensitive habitat under County Code. In the area proposed for development, 13,000 s.f. of prime oak woodland and 1,680 s.f. of degraded oak woodland may be impacted by future development.

BIO-4 In order to mitigate impacts to oak woodland, the project proponent has created an oak woodland restoration plan (Attachment 10). To ensure future property owners or prospective buyers are aware of this requirement, the restoration plan shall be attached to the final recorded map and shall be a condition of approval of any development proposal on the subject parcel. When the landowner submits a building plan to the County for a Building Permit and Grading permit, the County will review the plan as to the proposed location of the development envelope, the septic leach line, and the access road. The County Sensitive Habitat Ordinance and the restoration plan require landowners avoid impacts to sensitive habitat wherever feasible. A site suitability analysis depicts almost all of the residential development within oak woodland. There may be slight variations in this assessment pending more detailed site surveying of the limits of the oak woodland and the final building envelope and attendant features; however, where such features occur within mapped prime or degraded oak woodland, mitigation actions will be required. Habitat compensation for permanent impacts to prime and degraded oak woodland will require:

3:1 enhancement ratio for permanent impacts to prime oak woodland (39,000

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

s.f. : 13,000 s.f.)

1:1 enhancement ratio for permanent impacts to degraded oak woodland (1,680 s.f. : 1,680 s.f.)

2:1 oak tree replacement ratio for oak trees removed; oak tree plantings to occur within designated oak woodland mitigation area(s)

Mitigation shall occur within areas mapped as degraded oak woodland, acacia/pine grove, or pine grove. Mitigation will include removal of invasive, non-native plant species, replanting of oak trees, and implementing long-term maintenance and monitoring of the designated mitigation area(s), and implementation of best management practices (BMPs) prior to and during construction within oak woodland. The implementation of the oak woodland restoration plan reduces the impacts to oak woodland to less than significant.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. | Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native or migratory wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project does not involve any activities that would interfere with the movements or migrations of fish or wildlife. The site is used by migratory birds for nesting. Implementation of the mitigations in C.1. above will ensure no significant impacts to nesting birds. The area around the proposed building envelope is heavily wooded and the loss of some tree structure within this dense forest is less than significant.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. | Produce nighttime lighting that would substantially illuminate wildlife habitats? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The subject property is located in rural setting within an oak woodland.

BIO-5 In order to mitigate the impacts of additional nighttime lighting on existing animal habitats, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan with the final project plan set which shall show all proposed site, building, security, and landscape lighting directed downwards and away from adjacent animal habitats and undisturbed areas. The lighting plan shall be reviewed and approved by County Planning Staff prior to building permit issuance. With a lighting plan that directs all outdoor lighting downward and away from adjacent animal habitats and undisturbed areas, the impact of lighting from the project will be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The subject parcel is on an elevated knoll and no wetland features are present.

6. 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: With the implementation of the oak woodland restoration plan cited above, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances.

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

Discussion: The proposed 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.

D. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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:

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

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 Residential Agriculture, 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The closest Timberland Production land is located over a mile away. Given this, no impact to timberland will result from this project.

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

Discussion: No forest land occurs on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. No impact is anticipated.

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

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. | 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? | <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. The nearest forest land is located one mile away. No impact would occur from project implementation.

E. 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 Residential Agriculture, 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.

F. VISUAL RESOURCES AND AESTHETICS

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | Have an adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Discussion: The project would not directly impact any public scenic resources, as designated in the County's General Plan (1994), or obstruct any public views of these visual resources.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. | Substantially damage scenic resources, within a designated scenic corridor or public view shed area including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not located along a County designated scenic road, public viewshed area, scenic corridor, within a designated scenic resource area, or within a state scenic highway. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. | Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The property can be characterized as a rural site located in an area that is designated for residential development. This project would create one additional residential lot where a home could be constructed in the future. The construction of one new home and related improvements would not significantly alter the character of the residential area in that the surrounding parcels are developed with single-family dwellings. In addition, no improvements are proposed that would significantly alter the existing topography or ground surface relief features. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. | Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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 residential uses.

G. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

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

Discussion: The existing structure(s) on the property is/are not designated as a

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

historic resource on any federal, state or local inventory.

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

Discussion: No archeological resources have been identified in the project area. Pursuant to County Code Section 16.40.040, if at any time in the preparation for or process of excavating or otherwise disturbing the ground, any human remains of any age, or any artifact or other evidence of a Native American cultural site which reasonably appears to exceed 100 years of age are discovered, the responsible persons shall immediately cease and desist from all further site excavation and comply with the notification procedures given in County Code Chapter 16.40.040.

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

Discussion: No human remains are expected to occur in the project area. Pursuant to Section 16.40.040 of the Santa Cruz County Code, 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 archeological report shall be prepared and representatives of the local Native California Indian group shall be contacted. Disturbance shall not resume until the significance of the archeological resource is determined and appropriate mitigations to preserve the resource on the site are established.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. | Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: No paleontological resource or unique geologic feature is known to be found on the subject parcel, therefore no impact is anticipated to these resources when a dwelling and related improvements are constructed in the future. There is no grading proposed with this application.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

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

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

Discussion: No hazardous materials are proposed to be transported, used, or disposed of as a routine part of any future construction project on the new residential lot.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not propose activities involving the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment with exception of potential hazards associated with construction equipment staging and refueling. However, impacts associated with construction are not anticipated to result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

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

Discussion: The project does not propose activities involving the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment with exception of potential hazards associated with construction equipment staging and refueling. However, impacts associated with construction are not anticipated to result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment. In addition, the project is not located within one-quarter mile of any school.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not included on the June 4, 2015 list of hazardous sites in Santa Cruz County compiled pursuant to the specified code.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. | 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, | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Discussion: The project is not located within the Watsonville Airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6. | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impact to the safety of future residents of the new residential lot is anticipated.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not proposing to obstruct emergency response routes or emergency evacuation as no improvements that would obstruct an emergency response are proposed to be located within a private or public right-of-way.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 8. | Expose people to electro-magnetic fields associated with electrical transmission lines? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not propose electrical transmission lines.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 9. | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not propose a residence at this time. However, any future design would incorporate all applicable fire safety code requirements and includes fire protection devices as required by the local fire agency.

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

I. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Although no dwelling is proposed as a part of this application, when a dwelling is constructed, the project would create a small incremental increase in traffic on nearby roads and intersections. However, given the small number of new trips created by the project (one peak trip would be created with the construction of the new dwelling unit), this increase is less than significant. Further, the increase would not cause the Level of Service at any nearby intersection to drop below Level of Service D.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. | Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not include changes in air traffic. In addition, any future construction would have no impact to air traffic air patterns as residential structures are limited by County Code to 28 feet in height. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. | Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not propose changes to any existing design features. The new driveway would be required to meet all of the County's Design Criteria standards for driveways. These standards will insure that the new driveway does not create a hazard. This proposal is to add one residential lot to a residential neighborhood; therefore, no incompatible uses are proposed.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. | Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|