



# County of Santa Cruz

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123  
KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR

[www.sccoplanning.com](http://www.sccoplanning.com)

### NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A 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](http://www.sccoplanning.com) under the Planning Department menu. If you have questions or comments about this Notice of Intent, please contact Matt Johnston 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 Romero at (831) 454-3137 (TDD number (831) 454-2123 or (831) 763-8123) to make arrangements.

#### **PROJECT: PASATIEMPO WATER STORAGE TANK**

**APP #: 141215**

**APN(S): 060-011-02**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The proposal includes the following: construction of a 500,000 gallon water tank for storage of tertiary treated non-potable water, on-site well water, and City of Santa Cruz Water Department water for irrigation of the Pasatiempo Golf Course; construction of a 625 square foot pump house; maintenance access road off of Sims Road; and 230 square foot restroom and associated leach field for golf course use; landscape screening; and approximately 2,699 cubic yards of cut and 1,710 cubic yards of fill. The proposal requires an Commercial Development Permit, Preliminary Grading Approval, and Environmental Review.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The project is located on the south side of Sims Road, 300 feet east of Graham Hill Road.

**EXISTING ZONE DISTRICT: PR-O**

**APPLICANT: Steve Sutherland, SSA Architects**

**OWNER: PASATIEMPO INC.**

**PROJECT PLANNER: Sheila McDaniel, (831) 454-2255**

**EMAIL: [Sheila.McDaniel@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Sheila.McDaniel@santacruzcounty.us)**

**ACTION: Negative Declaration**

**REVIEW PERIOD: February 10, 2015 through March 11, 2015**

This project will be considered administratively by the Project Planner at the conclusion of the Review Period.



# COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> 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/>

### NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**Project: Pasatiempo Water Storage**  
**APN(S): 060-011-02**

**Project Description:** The proposal includes the following: construction of a 500,000 gallon water tank for storage of tertiary treated non-potable water, on-site well water, and City of Santa Cruz Water Department water for irrigation of the Pasatiempo Golf Course; construction of a 625 square foot pump house; maintenance access road off of Sims Road; and 230 square foot restroom and associated leach field for golf course use; landscape screening; and approximately 2,699 cubic yards of cut and 1,710 cubic yards of fill. The proposal requires an Commercial Development Permit, Preliminary Grading Approval, and Environmental Review.

**Project Location:** The project is located on the south side of Sims Road, 300 feet east of Graham Hill Road.

**Owner: Pasatiempo Inc.**

**Applicant: Steve Sutherland, SSA Architects**

**Staff Planner: Sheila McDaniel, (831) 454-2255** email: [sheila.mcdaniel@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:sheila.mcdaniel@santacruzcounty.us)

**This project will be considered administratively by the Project Planner at the conclusion of the review period.**

#### California Environmental Quality Act Negative Declaration Findings:

Find, that this 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 Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review period, and; on the basis of the whole record before the decision-making body (including this Negative Declaration) that there is no substantial evidence that the project 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, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Santa Cruz, California.

Review Period Ends: March 11, 2015

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
TODD SEXAUER, Environmental Coordinator  
(831) 454-3511



# County of Santa Cruz

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123  
KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR  
[www.sccoplanning.com](http://www.sccoplanning.com)

## CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW INITIAL STUDY

**Date:** January 5, 2015

**Application Number:** 141215

**Staff Planner:** Sheila McDaniel

### I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

**APPLICANT:** Steve Sutherland, SSA  
Architects

**APN(s):** 060-011-02

**OWNER:** Pasatiempo Inc.

**SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT:** 5

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The project is located on the south side of Sims Road, 300 feet east of Graham Hill Road.

**SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The proposal includes the following: construction of a 500,000 gallon water tank for storage of tertiary treated non-potable water, on-site well water, and City of Santa Cruz Water Department water for irrigation of the Pasatiempo Golf Course; construction of a 625 square foot pump house; maintenance access road off of Sims Road; and 230 square foot restroom and associated leach field for golf course use; landscape screening; and approximately 2,699 cubic yards of cut and 1,710 cubic yards of fill. The proposal requires a Commercial Development Permit, Preliminary Grading Approval, and Environmental Review.

**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"/> Geology/Soils                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Supply/Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality      |
| <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual Resources & Aesthetics        | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing      |

Transportation/Traffic

Mandatory Findings of Significance

**DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL(S) BEING CONSIDERED:**

General Plan Amendment

Coastal Development Permit

Land Division

Grading Permit

Rezoning

Riparian Exception

Development Permit

Other:

**NON-LOCAL APPROVALS**

Other agencies that must issue permits or authorizations:

Regional Water Quality Control Board Permit, State Water Resources Control Board Approval, City of Scotts Valley Will Serve, and City of Santa Cruz Water Department Will Serve

**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

2/6/15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

Parcel Size: 35 acres

Existing Land Use: Golf Course

Vegetation: Turf

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

Nearby Watercourse: Powder Mill Creek

Distance To: Approximately 1900 feet to Powder Mill Creek

### ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Water Supply Watershed: No

Groundwater Recharge: Yes, portion

Timber or Mineral: No

Agricultural Resource: No

Biologically Sensitive Habitat: No

Fire Hazard: No

Floodplain: No

Erosion: No

Landslide: No

Liquefaction: Low

Fault Zone: No

Scenic Corridor: No

Historic: No

Archaeology: Mapped

Noise Constraint: N/A

Electric Power Lines: No

Solar Access: N/A

Solar Orientation: N/A

Hazardous Materials: No

Other:

### SERVICES

Fire Protection: Scotts Valley Fire Protection

School District: SVUSD

Sewage Disposal: Septic

Drainage District: Outside flood zone district

Project Access: Sims Road

Water Supply: City of Santa Cruz Water Department; City of Scotts Valley

### PLANNING POLICIES

Zone District: PR-O

General Plan: O-R

Urban Services Line:  Inside

Coastal Zone:  Inside

Special Designation: None

Outside

Outside

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES:

The subject property contains the Pasatiempo Golf Course. The improvement area is located north of the 13<sup>th</sup> green on the south side of Sims Road between residential properties located to the east and west of the golf course. This portion of the property is currently a maintenance area for storage of course materials including sand and mulch. This area is enclosed by a 6 foot chain link fence that follows the property line along Sims Road and adjacent residential properties. Existing trees and shrubs located inside the fence line provide screening of the fence along Sims Road. A concrete lined v-ditch is located alongside Sims Road and existing property line fence directing runoff to a private culvert located on the southwest edge of the subject property.

## **PROJECT BACKGROUND:**

The Pasatiempo Golf Course is provided potable water from the City of Santa Cruz Water Department for course irrigation and facilities. During drought conditions the City of Santa Cruz significantly cuts back water available to the course, which significantly limits the ability of Pasatiempo to maintain necessary course irrigation.

Pasatiempo has taken measures to reduce water consumption by changing the course to a links style course, including native grasses along course edges and firmer greens, thereby reducing irrigation requirements. However, this is not enough to meet irrigation demand. In an effort to ensure that irrigation water is available during drought years, Pasatiempo Golf Course, in coordination with the City of Scotts Valley, has obtained a preliminary memorandum of agreement (Attachment 11) allowing use of non-potable recycled water from the City's waste water treatment plant. Currently, the City of Scotts Valley does not have enough customers for the available recycled water and is directing excess recycled water to the ocean via an outfall pipeline traveling along Sims Road.

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The proposed 500,000 gallon water tank would provide storage of tertiary treated non-potable water available from the Scotts Valley Wastewater Treatment Facility, on-site well water and City of Santa Cruz Water Department water. The Scotts Valley Wastewater Treatment Facility outfall line extends from Scotts Valley down Graham Hill Road to the ocean. A Utility connection to the existing Scotts Valley Waste Water recycling facility outfall line is proposed to an existing utility stub-out located on Sims Road at the property line. A utility connection stub-out is also located on Deer Path Road for proposed overflow of non-potable water into the existing outfall line from the water tank during severe storm events.

The water is proposed to be treated to the tertiary level by the City of Scotts Valley Treatment Facility prior to delivery to the subject property via the existing Scotts Valley Wastewater Facility outflow line. The outflow line would be first flushed with tertiary water, and then flushed with tertiary water treated with peracetic acid, and then finally the water tank would be filled with tertiary water. Approval of the tertiary treatment at the Scotts Valley Treatment Facility and delivery of tertiary water to the site would be required by the State Water Board and Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to construction.

The project includes a proposed 12-foot wide service driveway to Sims road with a proposed gate located 20 feet back from the roadway as required by Public Works. The driveway extends southwest to two proposed semi enclosed maintenance service bins, approximately 24.5 feet wide, for storage of sand and mulch for course maintenance. The service bins are proposed to be surrounded by a 6 foot tall retaining wall on three sides; a proposed 625 square foot pump house, approximately 22 feet by 28 feet wide and 11 feet six inches in height; and, a 230 square foot restroom building and associated leach field, approximately 14 feet 10 inches by 15.6 feet wide, and approximately 12 feet 10 inches in height, surrounded by a partially below grade water tank, approximately 74 feet wide and 24 feet in height, with approximately 8 feet of the proposed tank on the west side located above grade. The project also includes an

associated water blending value infrastructure pad, approximately 270 square feet in size.

The project requires approximately 2,699 cubic yards of cut and 1,710 cubic yards of fill and requires off-haul of approximately 989 cubic yards. Plans call for removal of one 42 inch oak tree in the vicinity of the proposed water tank. Two other large oak trees, a 42 inch and 48 inch tree, are proposed for retention and would be protected during grading. Existing vegetation along the existing fence line is proposed to be retained. Grading plans provide mounding of soils around the proposed partially below grade tank and mounding on the west side of the access road to minimize off haul. Landscape plans include wildflower ground cover, eight oak trees and three big leaf maple trees interspersed with coffee berry shrubs located around the water tank for addition screening.

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 6 ¼ miles northeast of the Zayante fault, approximately 8 miles off shore to the southwest of the Monterey Bay Tularcitos fault, 9.5 miles to the northeast of the San Andreas fault, 10 miles west of the San Gregorio fault, 16 miles to the northeast of the Monte-Vista Shannon fault, and 26.5 miles east of the Calaveras fault. 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.

A geotechnical investigation for the proposed project was performed by ENGEO INC, dated September 20, 2013 (Attachment 4). The report concluded that seismic hazards include ground shaking from the moderate to major earthquake, liquefaction as well as the occurrence of high ground water within 22 to 25 feet below ground surface, and corrosion of the tank, given below ground installation, were hazards associated with



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

site development. The report recommended that the design meet the California Building Code to reduce potential impacts from ground shaking and corrosion, and provided additional design recommendations to address the potential for liquefaction.

Implementation of the additional requirements included in the review letter prepared by Joe Hanna and Carolyn Burke, dated November 24, 2014 (Attachment 5) 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:** See Item A-1, above.

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

**Discussion:** There are no slopes that exceed 30% on the property.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 erosion control plans are included in the project plans, and standard erosion controls are a required condition of the project. Prior to approval of a grading or building permit, the project must have a final approved Erosion Control Plan, 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.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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. See Item A-1 above.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 | <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
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

sewers are not available?

**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?

**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?

**Discussion:** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Rate Map, 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?

**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?

**Discussion:** A geotechnical investigation for the proposed project was performed by ENGEO INC, dated September 20, 2013 (Attachment 4). The report did not identify these as potential hazards associated with development.

4. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer 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

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

or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes to obtain recycled water (non-potable tertiary treatment) from the City of Scotts Valley Waste Water Reclamation Plant, on-site water, and City of Santa Cruz Water Department water for golf course irrigation and for restroom service. In addition, in the event that an agreement cannot be reached regarding tertiary treatment, the tank would store well water and City water for course irrigation. However, the project is not located in a mapped groundwater recharge area and groundwater recharge would not be impacted by the proposed project.

5. Substantially degrade a public or private water supply? (Including the contribution of urban contaminants, nutrient enrichments, or other agricultural chemicals or seawater intrusion).

**Discussion:** The project would not discharge runoff either directly or indirectly into a public or private water supply. Potential non-potable water tank overflow during storm events is proposed to be directed to the Scotts Valley recycle facility outflow line on Sims Road at Deerpath Drive. However, no commercial or industrial activities are proposed that would generate contaminants. The driveway associated with the project would incrementally contribute urban pollutants to the environment; however, the contribution would be minimal given the size of the driveway area. Potential siltation from the proposed project would be addressed through implementation of erosion control measures during construction.

6. Degrade septic system functioning?

**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?

**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. Final drainage plans are required to be reviewed and approved prior to issuance of the required building permit.

	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 (Attachment 6) has reviewed the project and has 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 within proximity to a levee or dam.

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

**Discussion:** The project does not propose to alter existing drainage patterns on site or result in additional run-off and would not result in degradation of the surface water quality. In addition, overflow of non-potable water would be directed to the outflow line located in Deerpath Drive at Sims Road and not into the public drainage system so as not to degrade water quality.

### 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** Although the site is mapped as potentially containing the white-rayed pentachaeta, marsh microsersis, and zayante band-winged grasshopper, Jessica Duktig, Environmental Planning staff, confirmed the absence of biotic habitat associated with these species and absence of these species. See project comments (Attachment 6).

- |  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/>                           | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion:** Although the site is mapped as potentially containing the white-rayed pentachaeta, marsh microsersis, and zayante band-winged grasshopper, Jessica Duktig, Environmental Planning staff, confirmed the absence of biotic habitat associated with these species and absence of these species. See project comments (Attachment 6).

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The proposed project does not involve any activities that would interfere with the movements or migrations of fish or wildlife, or impede use of a known wildlife nursery site.

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

**Discussion:** The subject property is located in an urbanized area and is surrounded by existing residential development that currently generates nighttime lighting. The project includes an exterior light on the restroom building that 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. However, there are no sensitive animal habitats within or adjacent to the project site.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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, | <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
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

hydrological interruption, or other means?

**Discussion:** The property does not contain wetland habitat. No impact would occur.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** 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:

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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

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

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?

**Discussion:** The project site is zoned Existing Parks and Recreation-Open Space, 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))?

**Discussion:** The project is not adjacent to land designated as Timber Resource.

4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

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?

**Discussion:** The project site and surrounding area do 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. 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

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

project site contains no forest land, and no forest land in proximity to the proposed project site. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

**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 Existing Parks and Recreation-Open Space, 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**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.

Although the subject property is not a designated scenic resource, the only views of the proposed improvements that would be affected by the project are those from private property. County visual resource protection regulations only apply to public viewsheds. Notwithstanding, the plans include landscape screening plants to screen views from private property. Impacts would not be significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 | <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
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

within a state scenic highway?

**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:** This site was previously graded for development of the golf course and the existing visual setting is comprised of two turf mounds located north of the 13<sup>th</sup> green and east of the 14<sup>th</sup> tee. The existing topographical contours would be altered in the areas of the existing mounds for the placement of most of the water tank below grade and there would be an approximately 5 foot increase in the topographical elevation of these mounds. However, the project also includes landscaping that would screen the proposed alterations and minimize impacts of ground surface alterations to less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 includes an exterior light on the building that 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:** There are no historical resources within the project area. No impact would occur.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** Archaeological Resource Evaluation, prepared by Archaeological Application Number: 141215

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

Resource Management, dated October 30, 2014 (Attachment 7) identified the absence of archaeological resources. Archaeological Report Review, prepared by Jessica Duktig, dated November 4, 2014 accepted the report (Attachment 8). However, pursuant to Section 16.40.040 of the Santa Cruz County Code, 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 County Code Chapter 16.40.040.

3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Discussion:** See Item G-2. 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?

**Discussion:** No paleontological resources are mapped in the project area.

#### 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?

**Discussion:** The project does not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazards materials.

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?

**Discussion:** The project would receive tertiary treated water from the City of Scotts

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

Valley for irrigation of the golf course. This would require approval by the State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attachment 6) and is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public. No hazardous chemicals are required to treat water on site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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:** See H-3.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 September 24, 2014 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, 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 subject property is not located within an airport land use plan or located within 2 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 subject property is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

**Discussion:** The proposed improvements are located on private property and would not interfere with emergency evacuation on public streets or affect emergency response.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project design incorporates all applicable fire safety code requirements and includes fire protection devices as required by the local fire agency.

## 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** Existing maintenance vehicles access the site to drop mulch and sand at the subject property for golf course maintenance. The project includes a maintenance driveway to accommodate the existing vehicles. The project is not anticipated to result in additional traffic to the property.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

**Discussion:** The project does not include air traffic.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 includes a curb cut along Sims road. However, the proposed curb cut is located in a straight section of roadway where sight distance would not be impacted. Therefore, no hazards are proposed by this feature.

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

**Discussion:** The project's road access meets minimum County standards and has been approved by the Scotts Valley Fire Protection District.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. | Cause an increase in parking demand which cannot be accommodated by existing parking facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project scope does not involve commercial or residential square footage subject to parking requirements and therefore no new parking demand is anticipated by the project.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 6. | Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The proposed project includes a minimum 12-foot curb cut on Sims Road for ingress and egress of service vehicles and therefore would comply with current road requirements to prevent potential hazards to motorists, bicyclists, and/or pedestrians.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. | Exceed, either individually (the project alone) or cumulatively (the project combined with other development), a level of service standard established by the County General Plan for designated intersections, roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** See response I-1 above.