

APPENDIX E

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures from City of Capitola and County of Santa Cruz General Plan EIRs

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
AES-1: The proposed Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LTS	N/A	
AES-2: The proposed Plan would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a State scenic highway.	No Impact	N/A	
AES-3: The proposed Plan would not result in substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of Capitola or its surroundings.	LTS	N/A	
AES-4: The proposed Plan would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LTS	N/A	
AES-5: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to aesthetics.	LTS	N/A	
AIR QUALITY			
AIR-1: Citywide construction activities under the proposed Plan would result in a considerable increase of criteria pollutants, and thus, could violate air quality standards.	S	AIR-1a: Prior to issuance of any Grading Permit, the Community Development Director and the Building Official shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans, and specifications stipulate that, in compliance with MBUAPCD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, the City shall limit areas of active disturbance to no more than 2.2 acres per day for initial site preparation activities that involve extensive earth moving activities (grubbing, excavation, rough grading), or 8.1 acres per day for activities that involve minimal earth moving (e.g., finish grading) during all phases of construction activities. If future development projects within the proposed Plan require that grading and excavation exceed those acreages, the City shall implement the following fugitive dust control measures per MBUAPCD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines:	LTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water all active construction areas at least twice daily; ▪ Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard; ▪ Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites; ▪ Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites; ▪ Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets; ▪ Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more); ▪ Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.); ▪ Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph; ▪ Install appropriate best management practices or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; ▪ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible; ▪ Install wheel washers or track-out devices for all exiting trucks and equipment leaving the site; ▪ Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time; ▪ Post a publicly visible sign which specifies the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints (the person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action within 48 hours); ▪ Ensure that the phone number of MBUAPCD is visible to the public for compliance with Rule 402 (Nuisance); and 	

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comply with MBUAPCD Rule 403 (Particulate Matter) regarding concentration, process weight and individual particles requirements. Discharge from any source of particulate matter shall not exceed of 0.15 grain per standard dry cubic foot of exhaust gas. Discharge in any one hour from any source of particulate matter shall not exceed the amount shown in Rule 403 – Particulate Matter Table 1. Additionally, emissions from any heat transfer, incinerator, or metal salvage operation of particles in sufficient number to cause damage to property, which particles are of sufficient size and nature to be visible individually as particles on property other than that under the control of the person responsible for the emission, shall not be permitted. 	
		<p>AIR-1b: Prior to issuance of any Grading Permit, the Director of Public Works and the Building Official shall confirm that the Grading Plan, Building Plans, and specifications stipulate that all off-road construction vehicles/equipment greater than 100 horsepower that will be used on site for more than one week shall <u>comply with the California Air Resources Board's In-Use Offroad Diesel Vehicle Regulation: 1) be manufactured during or after 1996, and 2) shall meet the NO_x emissions standard of 6.9 grams per brake horsepower hour.</u> Alternatively, the project shall implement a combination of the following emission reduction measures on some or all of the above described vehicles and equipment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use alternative fuels (such as biodiesel blends); ▪ Require diesel particulate matter filters on equipment; ▪ Require diesel oxidation catalyst on equipment; ▪ Require General and Industry-Specific Visible Emission limitations for abrasive blasting, drinking water systems, gas turbines, pile drivers and federally regulated industries for compliance with Rule 400 (Visible Emissions); ▪ Install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the 	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>need for independently powered equipment (e.g., compressors);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enforce state required idle restrictions (e.g., post signs). Diesel equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks may keep their engines running continuously as long as they were on-site and staged away from residential areas; ▪ Properly tune and maintain equipment; and ▪ Stage large diesel-powered equipment at least 100 feet from any active land uses (e.g., residences). ▪ <u>Equipment greater than 100 horsepower that will be used on site for more than one week shall meet the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-Certified Tier 3 or newer emissions standards (model year 2006 or newer) model year 2006 or newer).</u> 	
AIR-2: Implementation of the proposed Plan could result in an overall increase in mobile and stationary source emissions within the City, which could exceed Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District air quality standards.	S	AIR-2: There is no mitigation measure available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
AIR-3: Implementation of the proposed Plan could result in an overall increase in odors within the City.	LTS	N/A	
AIR-4: Implementation of the Capitola General Plan could result in an overall increase in localized and carbon monoxide hotspot emissions within the city, which could exceed Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District air quality standards.	LTS	N/A	
AIR-5: The proposed Plan may conflict with or hinder implementation of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Government's regional comprehensive plan guidelines and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District Air Quality Management Plan.	LTS	N/A	

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
AIR-6: Regional air quality emissions resulting from operational buildout of the Capitola General Plan could impact regional air quality levels on a cumulatively considerable basis.	SU	AIR-6: Implementation of the proposed Plan could generate regional air quality emissions resulting from operational buildout of the proposed Plan and could impact regional operational air quality levels on a cumulatively considerable basis; therefore impacts in this regard would be considered significant and unavoidable. There is no mitigation measure available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
BIO-1: The proposed Plan would not result in significant impacts to special-status plant and animal species in the Plan Area.	LTS	N/A	
BIO-2: The proposed Plan would not result in significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.	LTS	N/A	
BIO-3: The proposed Plan would not result in significant impacts to federally protected wetlands.	LTS	N/A	
BIO-4: The proposed Plan would not 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 wildlife nursery sites.	LTS	N/A	
BIO-5: The proposed Plan would not conflict with Capitola's Community Tree and Forest Management Ordinance.	LTS	N/A	
BIO-6: The proposed Plan would not conflict with the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan.	LTS	N/A	
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
CULT-1: The Plan would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5.	LTS	N/A	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
CULT-2: Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.	S	CULT-2: If cultural resources or human remains are accidentally discovered during construction, work shall be halted within 50 meters (150 feet) of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist and/or paleontologist. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated and implemented. Disturbance shall not resume until the significance of the cultural resource is determined and appropriate mitigations to preserve the resource on the site are established. If human remains are encountered during construction or any other phase of development, work in the area of discovery must be halted, the Santa Cruz County coroner notified, and the provisions of Public Resources Code 5097.98-99, Health and Safety Code 7050.5, carried out. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours as required by Public Resources Code 5097.	LTS
CULT-3: Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed Plan could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	S	CULT-3: Refer to Mitigation Measure CULT-2.	LTS
CULT-4: Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	S	CULT-4: Refer to Mitigation Measure CULT-2.	LTS
CULT-5: The Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to cultural resources.	LTS	N/A	
GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY			
GEO-1: The proposed Plan would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including	LTS	N/A	

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
the risk of loss, injury, or death involving surface rupture along a known active fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; and landslides.			
GEO-2: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	LTS	N/A	
GEO-3: Development under the proposed Plan would not result in a significant impact related to development on unstable geologic units and soils or result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	LTS	N/A	
GEO-4: Development under the proposed Plan would not create substantial risks to life or property as a result of its location on expansive soil.	LTS	N/A	
GEO-5: Development under the proposed Plan would not result in impacts associated with the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	LTS	N/A	
GEO-6: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to geology and soils.	LTS	N/A	
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
HAZ-1: The proposed Plan would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	
HAZ-2: The proposed Plan would not 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.	LTS	N/A	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
HAZ-3: The proposed Plan would not result in significant impacts associated with hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼-mile of an existing or proposed school.	LTS	N/A	
HAZ-4: Implementation of the Plan would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as a result of development on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.	LTS	N/A	
HAZ-5: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area due to development within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.	No Impact	N/A	
HAZ-6: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Plan Area due to development in the vicinity of a private airstrip.	No Impact	N/A	
HAZ-7: The proposed Plan would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LTS	N/A	
HAZ-8: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not 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.	LTS	N/A	
HAZ-9: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials.	LTS	N/A	

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
HYDRO-1: The proposed Plan would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.	LTS	N/A	
HYDRO-2: The proposed Plan could 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.	S	HYDRO-2: There is no mitigation measure available to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
HYDRO-3: The proposed Plan would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the Plan Area or vicinity, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site.	LTS	N/A	
HYDRO-4: The proposed Plan would not create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	LTS	N/A	
HYDRO-5: The proposed Plan would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	LTS	N/A	
HYDRO-6: The proposed Plan would not result in a significant impact with respect to the placement of housing or structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows 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.	LTS	N/A	
HYDRO-7: The proposed Plan would not 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.	No Impact	N/A	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
HYDRO-8: The proposed Plan would not result in significant adverse effects related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LTS	N/A	
HYDRO-9: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, could result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality.	S	HYDRO-9: There is no mitigation measure available to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
LAND-1: The proposed Plan would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	N/A	
LAND-2: The proposed Plan would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LTS	N/A	
LAND-3: The proposed Plan would not conflict with the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan.	LTS	N/A	
LAND-4: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development in the surrounding area, would result in less-than-significant-cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning.	LTS	N/A	
NOISE			
NOISE-1: Construction-related activities resulting from implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in the generation of noise levels in excess of established standards.	LTS	N/A	
NOISE-2: Construction-related activities resulting from implementation of the propose Plan could generate or expose persons or structures to excessive ground-borne vibration.	S	NOISE-2a: Project applicants shall ensure by contract specifications that construction staging areas along with the operation of earthmoving equipment within the City would be located as far away from vibration and noise sensitive sites as possible. For projects that involve the displacement of more than 100 cubic yards of soil and is located within	LTS

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>25 feet of an occupied structure, the Community Development Director or the Public Works Director may require at their discretion that a project specific vibration impact analysis be conducted to determine the specific vibration control mechanisms that would be incorporated into the project's construction bid documents, if necessary. Contract specifications shall be included in construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	
		<p>NOISE-2b: The City shall require future developments to implement the following measures to reduce the potential for human annoyance and architectural/structural damage resulting from elevated groundborne noise and vibration levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pile driving within a 50-foot radius of historic structures (as determined by the City) shall utilize alternative installation methods where possible (e.g., pile cushioning, jetting, predrilling, cast-in-place systems, resonance-free vibratory pile drivers). ▪ The pre-existing condition of all designated historic buildings (as determined by the City) within a 50-foot radius of proposed construction activities shall be evaluated during a preconstruction survey, if deemed necessary at the discretion of the Community Development Director or the Public Works Director. The preconstruction survey shall document conditions (photographically and in writing) that exist before construction begins for use in evaluating damage caused by construction activities. All damage shall be repaired back to its preexisting condition. ▪ Vibration monitoring shall be conducted prior to and during pile driving operations occurring within 100 feet of historic structures (as determined by the City). Every attempt shall be made to limit construction-generated vibration levels during pile driving and impact activities in the vicinity of the historic structures. 	
NOISE-3: Future noise levels associated with implementation of the proposed Plan could contribute to an	LTS	N/A	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
exceedance of the City's noise standards resulting in potential noise impacts to sensitive receptors.			
NOISE-4: The Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to noise.	LTS	N/A	
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
POP-1: The Plan would not induce substantial unexpected population growth, or growth for which inadequate planning has occurred, either directly or indirectly.	LTS	N/A	
POP-2: The Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	
POP-3: The proposed Plan would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	LTS	N/A	
POP-4: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to population and housing.	LTS	N/A	
PUBLIC SERVICES			
SVCS-1: The proposed Plan would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered protection facilities, the construction or operation of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	LTS	N/A	
SVCS-2: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to fire protection service.	LTS	N/A	

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
SVCS-3: The proposed Plan would not result in the need for construction or expansion of police facilities.	LTS	N/A	
SVCS-4: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable growth, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to law enforcement services.	LTS	N/A	
SVCS-5: The proposed Plan would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction or operation of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	LTS	N/A	
SVCS-6: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable growth in the SUESD service area, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to schools.	LTS	N/A	
SVCS-7: The proposed Plan would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered library facilities.	LTS	N/A	
SVCS-8: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to libraries.	LTS	N/A	
PARKS AND RECREATION			
PS-1: The proposed Plan would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks and recreational facilities in order to maintain an acceptable ratio of parkland per thousand residents.	LTS	N/A	
PS-2: The proposed Plan would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur, or be accelerated.	LTS	N/A	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
PS-3: The proposed Plan would not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	LTS	N/A	
PS-4: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable growth, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to parks and recreational facilities.	LTS	N/A	
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
TRANS-1: Implementation of the proposed Plan would cause intersection operations to degrade to unacceptable LOS E at the Porter Street and Highway 1 northbound ramps intersection during the AM peak hour in 2035.	S	TRANS-1: To mitigate this impact, an additional westbound right turn lane would be required to be constructed on the Highway 1 northbound off-ramp at Porter Street. With implementation of this improvement, the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS C during the AM and PM peak hour under proposed Plan in conditions in 2035. The improvements necessary to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level would require the approval of Caltrans, and implementation of the improvement may not be feasible. As there are no certain and feasible mitigation measures available to reduce this impact, a <i>significant and unavoidable impact</i> would remain.	SU
TRANS-2: The proposed Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in locations that results in substantial safety risks.	LTS	N/A	
TRANS-3: The proposed Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	LTS	N/A	
TRANS-4: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access.	LTS	N/A	
TRANS-5: Implementation of the proposed Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program regarding	LTS	N/A	

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.			
TRANS-6: Implementation of the proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable project, would result in additional cumulatively considerable impacts.	S	TRANS-6: Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1.	SU
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
Water			
UTIL-1: Buildout of the proposed Plan may result in insufficient water supplies from existing entitlements and resources in 2035.	S	UTIL-1: There is no mitigation measure available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
UTIL-2: The proposed Plan would require the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which may cause significant environmental effects.	S	UTIL-2: There is no mitigation measure available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
UTIL-3: The Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, may result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to water supply.	S	UTIL-3: There is no mitigation measure available to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.	SU
Sanitary Wastewater (Sewer)			
UTIL-4: The proposed Plan would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).	LTS	N/A	
UTIL-5: The proposed Plan would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	
UTIL-6: The proposed Plan would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which	LTS	N/A	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.			
UTIL-7: The Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to wastewater.	LTS	N/A	
Stormwater Drainage			
UTIL-8: The proposed Plan would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	N/A	
UTIL-9: The Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to stormwater facilities.	LTS	N/A	
Solid Waste			
UTIL-10: The proposed Plan would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Plan's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	N/A	
UTIL-11: The proposed Plan would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	
UTIL-12: The Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts with respect to solid waste.	LTS	N/A	

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
GHG-1: GHG emissions associated with the proposed Plan would exceed MBAUAPCD's proposed GHG significance threshold of 2,000 MTCO _{2e} per year.	S	<p>GHG-1: The City of Capitola shall prepare a Climate Action Plan within 18 months of adopting the proposed Capitola General Plan update. The Climate Action Plan shall include a community inventory of GHG emission sources, and a quantifiable GHG emissions reduction target for 2020 that is consistent with the statewide GHG reduction target under Assembly Bill 32 (2006) and an interim target for the General Plan horizon year 2035 that is consistent with the statewide GHG reduction goal under Executive Order S-03-05, as outlined in CARB's 2013 Scoping Plan Update. The City shall monitor progress toward the GHG emissions reduction goal and prepare reports every 5 years detailing that progress. Measures listed below shall be considered for all new development between the time of adoption of the proposed Capitola General Plan update and adoption of the Climate Action Plan. Local measures considered in the Climate Action Plan may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Require all municipal fleet purchases to be fuel-efficient vehicles for their intended use based on the fuel type, design, size, and cost efficiency. ▪ Work with AMBAG to create a Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy (MTP/SCS) that will reduce GHG emissions generated from transportation in the region. ▪ Revise the Recycling Ordinance to require at least 50 percent diversion of non-hazardous construction waste from disposal, as required by the California Green Building Code. ▪ Amend the Green Building Ordinance to encourage building designs that minimize waste and consumption in construction projects. ▪ Require new development and major renovations to use energy-efficient appliances that meet ENERGY STAR standards and energy-efficient lighting technologies that exceed Title 24 standards by 30 percent. 	SU

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amend the Zoning Code to require new development and major renovations to incorporate measures that reduce energy use through solar orientation by taking advantage of shade, prevailing winds, landscaping, and sunscreens. ▪ Implement incentives for the use of drought-tolerant landscaping and recycled water for landscape irrigation. ▪ Require all new landscaping irrigation systems installed in the city to be automated, high-efficient irrigation systems to reduce water use and require use of bubbler irrigation; low-angle, low-flow spray heads; or moisture sensors. ▪ Conduct periodic energy efficiency audits of existing municipal buildings by checking, repairing, and readjusting heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems; lighting; water heating equipment; insulation; and weatherization. ▪ Continue to implement intelligent transportation systems, roundabouts, signal timing and synchronization, and other efficiency methods that decrease idling time and congestion. ▪ Investigate partnership with programs such as Zipcar to support use of energy efficient or electric vehicles for city residents. ▪ Continue to work with county and regional transportation leaders to explore options for additional funding sources on the regional level to support multi-modal transportation infrastructure. ▪ Develop a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) for City and local employees. A TDM Program would offer incentives to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation by City and local employees (e.g., in the Village, Bay Avenue, and 41st Avenue areas). Free bus passes, reimbursement for not using a parking space, emergency cab services, etc. will help reduce parking demand and reduce GHG emissions through reduced commuter traffic. 	

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to work with school districts and solicit input from elementary, middle, and high school parents to identify opportunities to decrease emissions from school commutes. ▪ Require bicycle parking facilities and on-site showers in major non-residential development and redevelopment projects. Major development projects include buildings that would accommodate more than 50 employees, whether in a single business or multiple tenants; major redevelopment projects include projects that change 50 percent or more of the square footage or wall space. ▪ Provide incentives, such as giving priority in plan review, processing, and field inspection services, for new and existing commercial and residential projects that provide parking spaces reserved for electric vehicles and have a charging connection. ▪ Encourage grey water use and rainwater catchment systems where their use could accomplish water conservation objectives through the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate new California grey water building/plumbing codes into the Green Building Ordinance. ▪ Adopt a residential rainwater collection policy and update the Zoning Code as needed to support permitting and regulation of residential rainwater systems. ▪ Investigate emerging technologies that reuse water within residential and commercial buildings and make that information available to the public via the City's website and/or brochures. ▪ Pursue funding sources to provide rebates and reduce permit fees for cisterns. ▪ Provide outreach support for water-efficient landscaping programs, classes, and businesses. ▪ In partnership with PG&E and local alternative energy companies, develop an Alternative Energy Development Plan that includes 	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance With Mitigation
		<p>citywide measurable goals and identifies the allowable and appropriate alternative energy facility types within the city, such as solar photovoltaics (PV) on urban residential and commercial roofs and wind power facilities. As part of this plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Propose phasing and timing of alternative energy facility and infrastructure development. ▪ Conduct a review of City policies and ordinances and establish a development review process for new alternative energy projects that ensures noise, aesthetic, and other potential land use compatibility conflicts are avoided (e.g., installing tracking solar PV or angling fixed solar PV in a manner that reduces glare to surrounding land uses). ▪ Develop a renewable energy expansion plan for the City. ▪ Consider reducing permitting fees or other incentives for alternative energy development. ▪ Participate in regional efforts to implement Community Choice Aggregation (CCA). 	
<p>GHG-2: The proposed Plan would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>GHS-3: The proposed Plan, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to GHG emissions.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>GHG-3: Implement Mitigation Measure GHG-1.</p>	<p>SU</p>

7.0 REVISED SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Exhibit 2.0-1 of the Draft EIR has been revised to identify changes in impacts and mitigations resulting from revisions made to the Draft EIR in this Response to Comments document (see Chapters 5.0 and 6.0) and from revision of Alternative 2 which is discussed in Chapter 3.0 of this document. All revisions result in reducing the number of impacts for all alternatives. In terms of significant unavoidable adverse impacts (impacts which cannot be fully mitigated to a level of insignificance), the following changes shown below have occurred:

SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF EACH ALTERNATIVE

	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
Number Identified in Draft EIR	14	15	15	19
Number Now Identified	8	8	9	14
Reduction	6	7	6	5

The significant unavoidable impacts that would be generated by Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 are all a result of not being able to provide various public services to meet the demands of an expanding population. The unavoidable impacts of Alternative 4 include all the public service impacts of the other alternatives (although they would be more severe) as well as unavoidable impacts from the conversion of agricultural land, expansion of the Urban Services Line (USL), excessive uncontrolled drainage and visual effects.

A statement of overriding consideration is required for the unavoidable impacts in the approval of any of the alternatives.

The reduction of impacts (both mitigatable and unavoidable) result from the following revisions made to either the Draft EIR or Alternative.

- Revised Alternative 2 moves the USL inward so as to retain rather than convert agricultural land in the Buena Vista area. This also solves the previously identified conflict with the Draft Watsonville General Plan. Impact 4.1-1 is eliminated and Impact 4.1-4 becomes fully mitigated. Impact 4.1-1 is also eliminated for Alternatives 1 and 3.
- Impact 4.2-1 is eliminated for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 because the inconsistency of not meeting AMBAG's Fair Share Housing Goal will not generate environmental consequences. Alternative 4 does not create this inconsistency.
- The slight population decrease of Revised Alternative 2 as compared to original Alternative 2 keeps the growth rate at that expected under Measure J. Impact 4.2 is eliminated.
- The retraction of the USL in the Buena Vista area also eliminates the visual impacts which would result from development of this area. Impact 4.9-4 is eliminated for Alternatives 1-3.
- Unavoidable impacts 4.6-2, 4.6-3, 4.6-5, 4.7-1, and 4.7-3 are eliminated for Alternatives 1-4 due to the inclusion of mitigation measures regarding the adequate provision of fire protection and water service.

**REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
CHAPTER 4.1 LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS		
<u>Impact 4.1-1 - Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
<p>Would convert about 262 acres of agricultural land to non-agricultural (primarily residential) development. Of this total, 44 acres are Agricultural Resource lands zoned commercial agricultural (CA) by the County. (S)</p>	<p>Implement Draft General Plan Policies 5.13.1 and 5.14.22, 5.14.15, 5.14.2, and 5.14.3, and designate Area 2 in the Carbonera planning area for Agriculture.</p>	LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3</u>		
<p>Would convert the same amount of agricultural land and affect the same agricultural resources/commercial agricultural and important farmlands as Alternative 2. (S)</p>	<p>Implement Draft General Plan Policies 5.13.1 and 5.14.22, 5.14.15, 5.14.2, and 5.14.3, and designate Area 2 in the Carbonera planning area for Agriculture.</p>	LTS
<u>Alternative 4</u>		
<p>Would convert additional agricultural land in Aptos and Pajaro Valley. Would result in the conversion of about 377 acres of agricultural land of any type, 129 acres of which is Agricultural Resource/Commercial Agriculture Land. (S)</p>	<p>Implement Draft General Plan Policies 5.13.1 and 5.14.22, 5.14.15, 5.14.2, and 5.14.3, and designate Area 2 in the Carbonera planning area for Agriculture. This would partially mitigate the impact.</p>	SU
<u>Impact 4.1-2 - Revised Alternatives 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
<p>Implementation would result in potentially increasing urban-rural land use impacts in the Aptos and Pajaro Valley planning areas. (S)</p>	<p>Implement Draft General Plan Policies 5.13.23, 5.13.31, require agricultural notification statements and setback requirements in Pajaro Valley Area 10, and designate parcel(s) in Pajaro Valley Area 11 as Interim Agriculture.</p>	LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> (S)	Same as <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	LTS
<u>Impact 4.1-3 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Draft General Plan would continue to confine future urban density within existing Urban Services Line. (LTS)	None required	
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3</u>		
Would continue to confine future urban density within existing Urban Services Line. (LTS)	None required	
<u>Alternative 4</u>		
Alternative 4 would involve development outside the existing Urban Services Line in two locations - one in Aptos and one in Pajaro Valley. (PS)	No mitigation available.	<u>SU</u>
<u>Impact 4.1-4 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Generally consistent with General Plans of the cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, and Scotts Valley and Watsonville. Draft General Plan, however, differs from Watsonville General Plan. Buildout according to Alternative 2 would conflict with the Watsonville General Plan by restricting residential development to Urban Low and Very Low densities within the ultimate urban area the City has defined for Watsonville and has planned for Urban High residential densities. Primarily in the northwest and northeast parts of Pajaro Valley. (S)(PS)	Implement Draft General plan policies 2.2.1 and 2.1.7 and Objectives 2.1 and 2.7 to mitigate potential conflicts with the General Plans of Capitola, Santa Cruz, and Scotts Valley, and Watsonville. County's concept of density transition at the urban rural interface differs from the planning concept articulated by the Watsonville General Plan. No mitigation available.	LTS <u>SU</u>

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
CHAPTER 4.2 POPULATION, JOBS, AND HOUSING		
<u>Impact 4.2.1 – Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Would not achieve AMBAG's Fair Share Housing Goal of providing new affordable dwelling units. (S)	Implementation of County of Santa Cruz Housing Element would partially mitigate this impact.	SU
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project) and Alternative 3</u>		
Would not achieve AMBAG's Fair Share Housing Goal of providing new affordable dwelling units. (S)	Implementation of County of Santa Cruz Housing Element would partially mitigate this impact.	SU
<u>Alternative 4</u>		
Would add 6,179 affordable dwelling units, meeting AMBAG's Fair Share Goal. (LTS)	None required.	
<u>Impact 4.2.2 – Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Implementation and buildout according to Alternative 2 would exceed the growth rate assumed under the Growth Management System of Measure J. (S)	Extend the buildout period of the Draft General Plan.	LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Implementation and buildout according to Alternative 2 would exceed the growth rate assumed under the Growth Management System of Measure J. (S)	Extend the buildout period of the Draft General Plan.	LTS

S = Significant
 PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
 LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Impact 4.2-4 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Number of jobs would be slightly more than under the 1980 General Plan as a result of redesignation of some land to commercial uses. This is a beneficial impact. (LTS)	None required.	
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
With Alternative 1 approximately 3,850 new jobs expected over existing conditions. With Alternative 3 number of jobs would increase by approximately 992 over the 1980 General Plan. This is a beneficial impact. With Alternative 4 the number of jobs would decrease by approximately 1,281 over the 1980 General Plan. (LTS)	None required.	
<u>CHAPTER 4.3 TRANSPORTATION</u>		
<u>Impact 4.3-1 - Alternative 1 (No Project)</u>		
With implementation of Alternative 1 eight of the 41 study intersections would operate over capacity (LOS F) and five intersections would operate at capacity (LOS E). (S)	Specific recommendations regarding the configuration of each intersection which would violate the General Plan's LOS standard are proposed in Chapter 4.3. Most of these are included in the Draft Circulation Element.	LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

- 201 -

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Impact 4.3-2 Alternative 1 (No Project)</u>		
A total of seven State highway segments were studied. Of the seven segments, increased traffic on one segment (Highway 1 between Freedom Boulevard and Larkin Valley Road) would result in a deterioration of LOS from D to F. Five other state highway segments operating at LOS E or F would increase their traffic volumes by more than one percent of capacity. (S)	Specific recommendations included in the EIR include the extension of high occupancy vehicle lanes and construction of additional through traffic lanes. Some of the mitigations may themselves, however, have significant impacts.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.3-3 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
With implementation of Revised Alternative 2 operation of the signalized intersection of 7th Avenue and Capitola Road would deteriorate from LOS C to LOS E. (S)	Addition of a southbound right turn lane would mitigate to acceptable LOS.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.3-4 Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Of the seven State highway segments studied one segment (Highway 1 between Morrissey Boulevard and Rio Del Mar Boulevard) would have increased traffic resulting in a deterioration of LOS from D to F. Three other state highway segments already operating at LOS F would increase their traffic volumes by at least six percent of capacity. (S)	Specific recommendations included in the EIR include the extension of high occupancy vehicle lanes and construction of additional through traffic lanes. Some of the mitigations may themselves, however, have significant impacts.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.3-5 Alternative 3</u>		
Six of the 41 study intersections would operate at capacity (LOS E) with implementation of Alternative 3. (S)	Specific physical improvements for each of the six impacted intersections are recommended in Chapter 4.3. These measures are beyond what is proposed in the Draft Circulation Element.	LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Impact 4.3-6 Alternative 3</u>		
Of the seven State highway segments studied one segment (Highway 1 between Freedom Boulevard and Larkin Valley Road) would have increased traffic resulting in a deterioration of LOS from D to F. Three other state highway segments already operating at LOS F would increase their traffic volumes by at least ten percent of capacity. (S)	Specific recommendations included in the EIR include the extension of high occupancy vehicle lanes and construction of additional through traffic lanes. Some of the mitigations may themselves, however, have significant impacts.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.3-7 Alternative 4</u>		
Four of the 41 studied intersections would operate over capacity (LOS F) and an additional five intersections would decrease their LOS to E with implementation of Alternative 4. (S)	Specific physical improvements for each of the nine impacted intersections are recommended in Chapter 4.3. These measures are beyond what is proposed in the Draft Circulation Element.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.3-8 Alternative 4</u>		
Of the seven State highway segments studied one segment (Highway 1 between Freedom Boulevard and Larkin Valley Road) would have increased traffic resulting in a deterioration of LOS from D to F. Three other state highway segments already operating at LOS F would increase their traffic volumes by at least nine percent of capacity. (S)	Specific recommendations included in the EIR include the extension of high occupancy vehicle lanes and construction of additional through traffic lanes. Some of the mitigation may themselves, however, have significant impacts.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.3-9 Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project), Alternative 1, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4</u>		
Implementation of any of the General Plan alternatives would increase transit demand thereby requiring a ten to 30 percent increase in the Metro bus fleet. Demand for more bicycle and pedestrian facilities would also increase. (LTS)	General recommendations include expansion of bus fleet, construction of park and ride lots, all of which would rely on various funding sources.	

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
CHAPTER 4.4 NOISE		
<u>Impact 4.4-1 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Vehicular traffic resulting from <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> would not cause a substantial increases in the ambient noise levels along the major roadways in the County. (LTS)	Implement Draft General Plan policy 6.8.2 is recommended but not required.	
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> . (LTS)	Same as <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	
<u>Impact 4.4-2 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Extension of 41st Avenue north form Soquel Drive to Soquel-San Jose Road would substantially increase ambient noise levels of adjoining areas and could potentially expose existing or proposed land uses to unacceptable noise levels. (S)	Implement Draft General Plan Policies 6.8.1 and 6.8.2.	LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	Same as <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	LTS
<u>Impact 4.4-3 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Future residential development within the Urban Services Line would be exposed to traffic noise exceeding an L_{dn} of 60 DBA the maximum level considered acceptable according to the 1980 General Plan. (S)	Implement Draft General Plan Policies 6.7.1, 6.7.2, 6.7.3, 6.7.4, 6.9.1, 6.9.2, and 6.9.3. <u>In addition, implement Policy 6.7.5 which requires future residential development adjacent to railways to meet outdoor and indoor noise standards of 65 L_{dn} and 45 L_{dn} respectively; and Policy 6.7.6 requiring vibration studies within 200 feet of railways.</u>	LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	Same as <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	LTS
<u>Impact 4.4-4 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Development of new residential and other projects would result in a substantial short-term increase in noise sensitive areas during construction of the projects. (S)	Mitigation measures include limiting the hours of construction activity, locating stationary construction equipment away from existing residential development and constructing temporary construction barriers.	LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> . (S)	Same as <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	LTS
<u>CHAPTER 4.5 AIR QUALITY</u>		
<u>Impact 4.5-1 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
At the 15 intersections projected to operate at LOS D or worst no violations of the State or Federal one-hour or eight-hour carbon monoxide standard are predicted to occur. (LTS)	None required.	
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> . (LTS)	None required.	

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	---

Impact 4.5-2 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Future development within unincorporated Santa Cruz County would result in a net decrease in regional pollutant emissions (reactive organic gases, oxides of nitrogen, PM-10, and sulfur oxides) relative to Alternative 1. (LTS)

None required.

Alternative 1 (No Project)

Incremental increase in emissions associated with future development in the unincorporated areas would be unchanged by Alternative 1. (LTS)

None required.

Alternative 3, Alternative 4

Alternatives 3 and 4 would result in a net increase in regional pollutant emissions relative to Alternative 1. (S)

Limit population growth to the five-year increments assumed in the 1991 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region.

LTS

Impact 4.5-3 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Land use projections would result in population projections consistent with the projections assumed for the 1981 Air Quality Management Plan. (LTS)

None required.

Alternative 1 (No Project)

Similar to Revised Alternative 2. (LTS)

None required.

S = Significant
 PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
 LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Alternatives 3 and 4 would result in population projections which exceed those assumed for the 1991 Air Quality Management Plan. (S)	Limit population growth to the five-year increments assumed in the 1991 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region.	LTS
<u>CHAPTER 4.6 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES</u>		
<u>Impact 4.6-1 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
General Plan buildout would increase the demand for police service. To maintain existing level of police service seven additional patrol deputies would be needed to serve the urban area by buildout (nine additional County-wide). (S)	Include additional policies in the General Plan to ensure adequate level of police service. However, implementation of such policies is contingent on securing new public funds, which may not be possible. <u>Add a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.</u>	SU
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Would increase the demand for police service. To maintain existing level of police service 11 patrol deputies would be needed by buildout of Alternative 1, 12 patrol deputies would be needed for Alternative 3 and 18 patrol deputies would be needed for Alternative 4. (S)	Same as <u>Revised Alternative 2.</u>	SU

S = Significant
 PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
 LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Impact 4.6-2 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Would increase demands on the Aptos/La Selva Fire Protection District. Would require additional firefighters. (S)	Include additional policies in the Parks, Recreation and Public Facilities Element to ensure the highest level of fire protection. Implementation is dependent upon additional funding which is not foreseen at this time. <u>In addition, add a policy requiring commitment of availability of adequate level of service and a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.</u>	S <u>U</u> LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Would increase demands on the Aptos/La Selva Fire Protection District. Would require additional firefighters. (S)	Same as <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2.	S <u>U</u> LTS
<u>Impact 4.6-3 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Would increase demand on Central Fire Protection District. Would require additional firefighters and equipment. (S)	Include additional policies in the Parks, Recreation and Public Facilities Element to ensure the highest level of fire protection. However, implementation of such policies is contingent on securing new public funds, which may not be possible. <u>In addition, add a policy requiring commitment of availability of adequate level of service and a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.</u>	S <u>U</u> LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2. (S)	Same as <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2.	S <u>U</u> LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

208

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Impact 4.6-4 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Would increase demands on the Freedom Fire Protection District. Would require additional firefighters would be required, but funding mechanism in place to serve increased population levels. (LTS) However, would decrease level of service to Buena Vista Area now served by CDF. (S).	Include policy to ensure annexation of Pajaro Planning Areas 10 and 11 to the fire district with which could provide the best level of service. Add a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.	LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised Alternative 2.</u>	Same as <u>Revised Alternative 2.</u>	
<u>Impact 4.6-5 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Would increase demands on the Scotts Valley Fire Protection District. Would require additional personnel and/or equipment. (S)	Future development outside of the Scotts Valley Fire Protection District boundaries but inside its Sphere of Influence should be required to annex into the District. Include additional policies in the Parks, Recreation and Public Facilities Element to ensure the highest level of fire protection. <u>In addition, add a policy requiring commitment of availability of adequate level of service and a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.</u>	S LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Each alternative would increase demands on the Scotts Valley Fire Protection District. (S)	Same as <u>Revised Alternative 2.</u>	S LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Impact 4.6-6 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Would increase demands on already over-capacity sewer mains in parts of Live Oak and Aptos. (S)

Implement Draft General Plan policies. Add a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.

LTS

Alternative 4

Sanitary sewer service would be extended outside the USL and sphere of influence of the SCCSD. (S)

Amend USL and SCCSD's sphere of influence and annex area to SCCSD.

LTS

Impact 4.6-7 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Increase in wastewater could be accommodated by the Freedom County Sanitation District, however, there would not be sufficient capacity in the Sydney Avenue Bypass to accommodate buildout of alternative. Would extend sewer system outside of FCSD's service area and sphere of influence. (S)

Expand the capacity of the Sydney Avenue Sewer Bypass to accommodate wastewater flows, amend SCCSD's sphere of influence and annex areas into SCCSD. Add a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.

LTS

Alternative 1 (No Project)

Similar to Revised Alternative 2.

Same as Revised Alternative 2.

LTS

Alternative 3

Same as Revised Alternative 2. In addition, would exceed allocation rights at Watsonville Wastewater Treatment Plan (S). Would require expansion of Wastewater Plant (S).

Same as Revised Alternative 2. In addition, would need to increase FCSD's capacity rights, and expand Watsonville Wastewater Treatment Plant. Expansion of treatment plant is dependent upon securing additional funding which is not foreseen at this time.

SU

S = Significant
 PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
 LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Alternative 4

Same as Alternative 3. In addition, would extend sewers outside the USL. (S)

Same as Alternative 3. In addition, would need to amend USL.

SU

Impact 4.6-8 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

In Carbonera future development under this alternative would use individual septic systems. (LTS)

None required.

Alternative 1 (No Project)

In Carbonera future development under this alternative would use individual septic systems. (LTS)

None required.

Alternative 3, Alternative 4

This alternative would result in residential densities that could not be accommodated by individual septic tank systems. A community-wide sewage disposal system would be needed. A package plant could be built, or residents could request connection to the City of Santa Cruz to provide sanitary service. (PS)

If a connection to the City is desired, the area of Carbonera requesting service would need be annexed to City of Santa Cruz, and expansion of the City of Santa Cruz collection system would be required.

SU

The additional funds to finance this improvement are not foreseen at this time.

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Impact 4.6-9 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Would need additional neighborhood parkland in Aptos, Pajaro Valley, and Soquel. Would need additional community parkland in Aptos, Live Oak and Pajaro Valley. (S)

Adoption of proposed General Plan Objective 7.1b and Policies 7.1.1, 7.1.2 and 7.1.6, County to examine current Park Dedication Ordinance would partially mitigate this impact. Additional funds would be required to purchase and develop park land but are not foreseen at this time. Add a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.

SU

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4

Similar to Revised Alternative 2. (S)

Same as for Revised Alternative 2.

SU

Impact 4.6-10 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Construction of the library facilities identified in the County library system's long range plan would be sufficient to accommodate Revised Alternative 2 at buildout. (LTS)

None Required.

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3

Construction of the library facilities identified in the County library system's long range plan would be sufficient to accommodate Alternative 1 at buildout. (LTS)

None Required.

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Alternative 4

Construction of the library facilities identified in the County library system's long range plan would not be sufficient to accommodate Alternative 4 at buildout. (S)

Add a policy to the General Plan which would require a geographical distribution of libraries in accordance with the Plan for the Decade of the 90's. However, implementation of this policy is contingent on securing new funding sources for additional library facilities. Such funding is not foreseen at this time. Add a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.

SU

Impact 4.6-11 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Existing and planned Live Oak Elementary School District facilities would not be sufficient to accommodate student populations generated by General Plan buildout. Revised Alternative 2 would generate about 715 students. (S)

~~Complete new middle school, implement Draft General Plan objectives, policies and programs associated with schools, add a policy requiring written commitments stating there is adequate capacity within District's schools and secure additional funding for new schools. However, there is little likelihood of securing such funding. State law prohibits measures to mitigate school impacts beyond changing school impact fees and (in some cases) providing temporary modular classrooms.~~
 Implement Draft General Plan objectives, policies and programs associated with schools, add a policy requiring written commitments stating there is adequate capacity within District's schools and secure additional funding for new schools. However, there is little likelihood of securing such funding. State law prohibits measures to mitigate school impacts beyond changing school impact fees and (in some cases) providing temporary modular classrooms.

SU

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4

Existing and planned Live Oak Elementary School District facilities would not be sufficient to accommodate student populations generated by these alternatives. (S)

Same as Revised Alternative 2.

SU

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
 PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Impact 4.6-12 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Would generate 2,482 additional students who would attend Pajaro Valley Unified School District. This would contribute to existing overcapacity problems at the PVUSD. (S)

Implement Draft General Plan objectives, policies and programs associated with schools, ~~add a policy requiring written commitments stating there is adequate capacity within District's schools and~~ secure additional funding for new schools. However, there is little likelihood of securing such funding. State law prohibits measures to mitigate school impacts beyond changing school impact fees and (in some cases) providing temporary modular classrooms.

SU

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, and Alternative 4

Alternative 1 would generate 2,809 additional students, Alternative 3 3,702 students, and Alternative 4 6,367 students who would attend Pajaro Valley Unified School District. This would contribute to existing overcapacity problems at the PVUSD. (S)

Same as Revised Alternative 2.

SU

Impact 4.6-13 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Enrollment at the Santa Cruz City School District high schools is near capacity. High school students generated from buildout of the Live Oak, Soquel and Carbonera planning areas under Revised Alternative 2 would exceed the capacity of the District's high schools. New school facilities would be needed. (S)

Same as Mitigation 4.6-12.

SU

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
 PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4

Enrollment at the Santa Cruz City School District high schools is near capacity. High school students generated from buildout of the Live Oak, Soquel and Carbonera planning areas under Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 would exceed the capacity of the District's high schools. New school facilities would be needed. (S)

Same as Revised Alternative 2.

SU

Impact 4.6-14 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Implementation of Revised Alternative 2 would contribute to the Soquel Unified Elementary School District's existing overcapacity problem. Buildout would result in 520 additional students and would exceed growth levels projected by the SUESD. (S)

Same as Mitigation 4.6-12.

SU

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4

Implementation of alternatives would contribute to the Soquel Unified Elementary School District's existing overcapacity problem. Buildout of Alternative 1 would result in 540 additional students, Alternative 3 570 students and Alternative 4 653 students and would exceed growth levels projected by the SUESD. (S)

Same as Revised Alternative 2.

SU

Impact 4.6-15 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Implementation of Revised Alternative 2 would increase student enrollment within the Scotts Valley Union School District by 98 students. Existing and planned school facilities would not be sufficient this increase. (S)

Same as Mitigation 4.6-12.

SU

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4

Implementation of Alternative 1 would increase student enrollment within the Scotts Valley Union School District by 110 students, Alternative 3 153 students and Alternative 4 532 students. Existing and planned school facilities would not be sufficient this increase. (S)

Same as Revised Alternative 2.

SU

CHAPTER 4.7 WATER SUPPLY CONSIDERATIONS

Impact 4.7-1 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Water demand in the Live Oak and Carbonera planning areas would increase by 680 acre feet per year. During drought periods, this increased water demand may exceed the "Firm Yield" (the assured minimum annual capacity) of the City of Santa Cruz Water Department. This could result in an increase in water demand which would exceed available water supply. (S)

Implement Draft General Plan polices 5.6.3, 7.16.2, and 7.18.5 to partially mitigate this impact.

SU LTS

Develop an additional water supply for the City of Santa Cruz Water Department, with sufficient capacity to provide the anticipated increase in water demand the selected alternative. However, the construction of this improvement is dependent upon securing additional public funds. At present there appears little likelihood of obtaining such future funding. In addition, add a policy requiring commitment of availability of adequate level of service and a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.

S = Significant
 PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
 LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Water demand in the Live Oak and Carbonera planning areas would increase by 811 acre feet per year with Alternative 1, 802 acre feet with Alternative 3 and 1,076 acre feet with Alternative 4. During drought periods, this increased water demand may exceed the "Firm Yield" (the assured minimum annual capacity) of the City of Santa Cruz Water Department. This could result in an increase in water demand which would exceed available water supply. (S)	Same as <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2.	<u>SU</u>LTS
<u>Impacts 4.7-2, 4.7-4, and 4.7-6 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Project implementation and buildout would increase the impermeable surface area from roofs, driveways and parking lots in Live Oak, Carbonera, and Pajaro Valley, which would reduce groundwater recharge and thus affect future water supply. (PS)	Implement Draft General Plan policies 5.5.12, 5.8.2, <u>5.15.2</u> , <u>5.15.4</u> and 7.22.2.	LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Project implementation and buildout would increase the impermeable surface area from roofs, driveways and parking lots in Live Oak and Carbonera), which would reduce groundwater recharge and thus affect future water supply. (PS)	Same as <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2.	LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Impact 4.7-3 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Water demand in the Soquel and Aptos planning areas would increase by 1,028 acre feet per year. Because the water supply in this basin is obtained by groundwater extraction, increased demand would require increased pumping, and/or development of new sources of supply. Increased water demand as a result of implementation of Revised Alternative 2, along with additional growth in this basin from growth beyond the Urban Services Line, would be considered to be a significant cumulative impact. (S)

Implement Draft General Plan policies 5.6.3, 5.8.5, 7.18.2, 7.18.5 and Objective 5.8 programs A and B would partially mitigate this impact.

Development of additional water supply for the Soquel Creek Water District, with sufficient capacity to provide the anticipated increase in water demand from the selected alternative, without creating groundwater overdraft. However, implementation of this mitigation is contingent upon securing additional public funds for this improvement which are not foreseen at this time. In addition, add a policy requiring commitment of availability of adequate level of service and a policy requiring annual review of the rate of development compared to provision of services.

SØLTS

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4

Water demand in the Soquel and Aptos planning areas would increase by 1,059 acre feet per year with Alternative 1, 1,138 acre feet with Alternative 3 and 1,322 acre feet with Alternative 4. Because the water supply in this basin is obtained by groundwater extraction, increased demand would require increased pumping, and/or development of new sources of supply. Increased water demand as a result of implementation of Revised Alternative 2, along with additional growth in this basin from growth beyond the Urban Services Line, would be considered to be a significant cumulative impact. (S)

Same as Revised Alternative 2.

SØLTS

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Impact 4.7-5 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Water demand in the Pajaro Valley planning area would increase by 801 acre feet per year. The Pajaro Valley aquifer is currently in overdraft, and seawater intrusion has impacted coastal areas due to overpumping. Additional water demand could increase the existing imbalance between groundwater pumping and groundwater recharge. (S)

Implement Draft General Plan policies including 5.6.3, 7.18.2, 7.18.5, Objective 5.8 Programs A through M.

SU

Development of additional water supply, additional recharge, or offsetting amounts of water conservation for the Pajaro Valley basin, with sufficient capacity to provide the anticipated increase in water demand from the selected alternative.

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4

Water demand in the Pajaro Valley planning area would increase by 971 acre feet per year with Alternative 1, 1,013 acre feet with Alternative 3, and 1,835 acre feet with Alternative 4. The Pajaro Valley aquifer is currently in overdraft, and seawater intrusion has impacted coastal areas due to overpumping. Additional water demand could increase the existing imbalance between groundwater pumping and groundwater recharge. (S)

Same as Revised Alternative 2.

SU

CHAPTER 4.8 STORM DRAINAGE AND SURFACE HYDROLOGY CONSIDERATIONS

Impacts 4.8-1, 4.8-2, 4.8-3, 4.8-5, 4.8-6, 4.8-7, 4.8-12, 4.8-16, 4.8-18, 4.8-19 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Proposed residential development would cause minor increases in runoff flows and peak flow rates in some streams; will have a minor effect on storm drain capacity and will also result in a minor decrease in rainfall infiltration and groundwater recharge. In addition, there would be a minor impact on channel stability on five streams within the Soquel planning area. (LTS)

None required.

S = Significant	SU = Significant Unavoidable
PS = Potentially Significant	LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Impacts 4.8-4, 4.8-11, 4.8-20 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Implementation and buildout according to <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2 would result in an increase in the discharge of urban stormwater contaminants. This is considered a cumulative impact. (S)	Implement Draft General Plan Policies 5.7.1, 5.7.2, 5.7.3, 5.7.4, 5.7.5, 5.7.6, and 5.7.7. Implementation of Objective 5.7, Program C. County participation in regional stormwater management plan being prepared by AMBAG. Foster the technical development of staff with respect to the design methods and maintenance of stormwater contaminant removal systems. <u>County should seek funds to implement stormwater management plan when required by federal law.</u>	LTS
<u>Impact 4.8-8 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Residential development would cause increases in runoff volumes and peak flow rates for the Schwan Lake and Corcoran Lagoon/Rodeo Gulch Watersheds. (S)	Require on-site stormwater detention for developments greater than one acre in area.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.8-9, 4.8-13, 4.8-17 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Development could subject stormwater drainage improvements to increased watershed peak flows. (S)	Require applicant to conduct engineered drainage plan, including downstream impact assessment.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.8-10 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Alternative)</u>		
Implementation would result in slight decrease in rainfall infiltration and groundwater recharge within watersheds of Schwan Lake, Corcoran Lagoon/Rodeo Gulch and Moran Lake. (S)	Same as Mitigation 4.8-8	LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Impacts 4.8-15 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Implementation and buildout according to <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> would result in an increase in the discharge of urban stormwater contaminants. This is considered a cumulative impact. (S)	Implement Draft General Plan Policies 5.7.1, 5.7.2, 5.7.3, 5.7.4, 5.7.5, 5.7.6, and 5.7.7. Implementation of Objective 5.7, Program C. County participation in regional stormwater management plan being prepared by AMBAG. Foster the technical development of staff with respect to the design methods and maintenance of stormwater contaminant removal systems. The County should contribute an additional \$6,000 toward the AMBAG Clean Water Act 205(J) grant.	LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (Impact 4.8-21)</u>		
The 1980 General Plan allows for only minor increases in development area an minor to significant increases in residential development density relative to <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> In the Live Oak area, this alternative results in a seven percent increase in developed area and corresponding increase in residential density from 7.4 du/ac versus 11.3 du/ac. This would result in impacts to stormwater drainage facilities, flooding, groundwater recharge, and water quality. (S)	Same as for impacts identified for <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	LTS
<u>Alternative 3 (Impact 4.8-22)</u>		
Significant increases in development density translate to similarly significant increases in the percent of watershed lands covered with impervious surfaces, which, in turn, results in increases in runoff volumes and peak flows. The most significant impacts would be in Live Oak and Pajaro Valley. (S)	Same as for impacts identified for <u>Revised Alternative 2</u> .	LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Alternative 4 (Impact 4.8-23)

Similar to Alternative 3, this alternative would result in increases in runoff volumes and peak flows. Combined impact of the increased developed area and residential densities would be considered to be a significant impact for stormwater drainage, flooding, groundwater recharge and water quality in Pajaro Valley. (S)

Same as for impacts identified for Revised Alternative 2. In addition, development as proposed in Alternative 4 would need to be considered in the Corps of Engineers current flood reconnaissance study on the lower reach of Corralitos Creek.

SU

CHAPTER 4.9 VISUAL RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS

Impact 4.9-1 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Future development in Aptos would alter the character of the Highway 1 scenic corridor and existing residential neighborhoods. Implementation of the Draft General Plan policies to protect visual resources within scenic corridors and the coastal area as well as policies which require design review would ensure that future development according to Revised Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts. (LTS)

None Required.

Alternative 1 (No Project)

Impact is similar to Revised Alternative 2.

None required.

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Changes in the landscape from higher density of development proposed by Alternative 3 would not be as easy to mitigate as less dense development. Future development in Aptos according to Alternative could result in substantial, demonstrable negative visual effects on the environment particularly to the County's scenic corridors. (PS)	In addition to Draft General Plan policies recommended residential densities should be reviewed and reduced in order to ensure that future building mass and scale is proportionate to neighboring development.	LTS
<u>Impact 4.9-2 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
Implementation of the Draft General Plan would affect the existing visual quality in the Carbonera planning area, and would result in the loss of the agricultural vista provided by Area 2. (S)(PS)	In addition to implement Draft General Plan policies, redesignate Area 2 as Agricultural Resource/Commercial Agriculture.	LTS
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2.	Same as <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2.	LTS
<u>Alternative 4</u>		
Residential densities proposed by Alternative 4 would be greater than residential densities of surrounding land use. Alternative 4 could result in significant visual impacts. (S)	In addition Mitigations under <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2, recommended residential densities should be reviewed and reduced in order to ensure that future building mass and scale is proportionate to neighboring development.	LTS

S = Significant
PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Impact 4.9-3 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

General Plan buildout would change the visual character of certain neighborhoods within the Live Oak planning area. The development densities proposed by Revised Alternative 2 would be similar to existing development densities thus, the mass and scale of new construction is expected to be similar to existing development. Implementation of the Draft General Plan objectives, policies and programs which pertain to scenic resources and community design would provide further assurance that new development would not result in negative aesthetic affects. (LTS)

None required.

Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4

There are a few areas within Live Oak where proposed development densities would be significantly different than existing residential densities. Construction of high density residential development within an area characterized by low density residential development could result in significant visual impacts. (S)

In addition to Draft General Plan policies recommended residential densities should be reviewed and reduced in order to ensure that future building mass and scale is proportionate to neighboring development.

LTS

Impact 4.9-4 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)

Future development in the Pajaro Valley planning area would not occur within any County designated scenic corridors or within the coastal zone, ~~but would alter the visual and aesthetic quality of existing neighborhoods.~~ (S) This alternative is not expected to result in significant visual effects because development densities would complement existing densities and because of General Plan policies which require design review. (LTS)

~~In addition to Draft General Plan policies recommended residential densities should be reviewed and reduced in order to ensure that future building mass and scale is proportionate to neighboring development. This mitigation, however, would not fully mitigate visual impacts resulting from the development of Areas 2, 4, 10, and 11.~~ None required.

SU

S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable
PS = Potentially Significant LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project), Alternative 3, Alternative 4</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2. (S)	Same as <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2.	SU
<u>Alternative 4</u>		
<u>Future development within the Pajaro Valley planning area would not occur within any County designated scenic corridor or within the coastal zone, but would alter the visual and aesthetic quality of neighborhoods. (S)</u>	<u>In addition to Draft General Plan policies recommended, residential densities should be reviewed and reduced in order to ensure that future building mass and scale is proportionate to neighborhood development. This mitigation, however, would not full mitigate visual impacts resulting from the development of areas 10 and 11.</u>	SU
<u>Impact 4.9-5 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project)</u>		
General Plan buildout within the Soquel planning area would occur outside of the coastal zone and within existing urban areas. <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2 is not expected to result in significant negative effects on the environment because development densities would complement existing densities and because of General Plan policies which require design review. (LTS)	None required.	
<u>Alternative 1 (No Project)</u>		
Similar to <u>Revised</u> Alternative 2.	None required.	

S = Significant
 PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
 LTS = Less Than Significant

REVISED EXHIBIT 2.0-1 (CONTINUED)
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
---------	---------------------	--

Alternative 3, Alternative 4

These alternatives proposes urban high density residential use within certain areas. Construction of high density residential uses in an area of low density uses could result in visual dissimilarities in building mass. (S)

In addition to Draft General Plan policies recommended residential densities should be reviewed and reduced in order to ensure that future building mass and scale is proportionate to neighboring development.

LTS

CHAPTER 4.10 ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELD CONSIDERATIONS

Impact 4.11-1 - Revised Alternative 2 (Proposed Project), Alternative 1, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4.

Numerous studies have suggested a potential for adverse health effects due to long term exposure to electromagnetic fields, such as found near powerlines. The siting of housing, or other habitable structures, such as schools, near powerlines will increase the electromagnetic field exposure to future residents over the background levels and may thus increase the risk of disease. (PS)

Implement Draft General Plan Objectives 6.6a and 6.6b and Policies 6.6.1, 6.6.2, 6.6.3, and 6.6.4.

LTS

S = Significant
 PS = Potentially Significant

SU = Significant Unavoidable
 LTS = Less Than Significant