

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

### IN THIS SECTION:

- 2.1 Project Summary
- 2.2 Areas of Concern
- 2.3 Summary of Alternatives
- 2.4 Summary of Impacts  
& Mitigation Measures

This summary provides a brief description of the proposed project, known areas of concern, project alternatives, and all potentially significant impacts identified during the course of this environmental analysis. This summary is intended as an overview and should be used in conjunction with a thorough reading of the EIR. The text of this report, including figures, tables and appendices, serves as the basis for this summary.

Changes to Draft EIR text that are identified below are shown in underlined type for new text and ~~strikeout~~ type for deleted text.

### 2.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed City of Santa Cruz Draft *General Plan 2030* (dated February 27, 2009), which is an update of the City's existing *General Plan and Local Coastal Plan 1990- 2005*. Pursuant to State law, the proposed General Plan includes the following elements required by state law: Land Use, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space, Safety, and Noise, and also includes optional subjects set forth in the State General Plan Guidelines prepared by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research related to community design and economic development. The City's Housing Element is prepared as a separate volume to the General Plan as it requires updates every seven years in accordance with State law. The City's current Housing Element was updated and adopted in 2010 (with formal state approval and final City adoption in 2011) and covers the years 2007 to 2014. Thus, the Housing Element is not part of the *General Plan 2030* document and not included in the environmental review.

Goals, policies and actions are provided for each element. The General Plan also includes a Land Use Map as required by State law, which identifies land use designations and graphically depicts the arrangement and location of land uses throughout the City. To aid the environmental analysis, a "buildout" projection was developed, which considers the development potential of land permitted under the proposed General Plan that is estimated to occur in Santa Cruz by the year 2030.

## 2.2 AREAS OF CONCERN

The City of Santa Cruz, as the Lead Agency, has identified areas of concern based on comments received on the Notice of Preparation (see Appendix A) and comments received at two scoping meetings held on March 16, 2009. Eleven letters (or emails) of comment were received from agencies, organizations and individuals in response to the Notice of Preparation (see Appendix A in the Draft EIR) – six from agencies and five from members of the community.

Issues or concerns raised by other comment letters include:

- Safety and Hazards
- Consideration of safety requirements for the General Plan;
- Requirements for development in a floodplain;
- Traffic impacts on State highways;
- Air quality impacts;
- Parks planning and park uses;
- Traffic impacts;
- Greenhouse gas emissions;
- Historical preservation;
- UCSC future enrollments;
- Alternatives and Cumulative impacts
- Community benefits

## 2.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe and evaluate alternatives to the project that could eliminate significant adverse project impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level. The following alternatives are evaluated in this EIR in the Chapter 5 - CEQA Considerations.

- ALTERNATIVE 1: No Project.** This alternative would maintain the City's existing 1990-2004 General Plan without new mixed-use land use designations or other land use changes and without new or revised policies and actions. The alternative would result in estimated development of 1,816 residential units and approximately 2,860,000 square feet of commercial, office and industries with an associated population increase of 4,360 residents and 7,710 employees.
- ALTERNATIVE 2: Reduced Growth.** This alternative assumes that growth would occur as forecast by AMBAG under which 2,413 new housing units are projected between 2009 and 2030, which would result in a population increase of 5,790 residents. Under AMBAG forecasts, the City would experience an increase of approximately 8,080 new employees between 2009 ~~1990~~ and 2030. This would result in approximately 2,911,000 square feet of commercial, office and industrial uses.

- **ALTERNATIVE 3: Reduced Land Use Density/Intensity.** This alternative would reduce the projected General Plan buildout by reducing land use densities or intensities in some areas. This alternative assumes a reduction in land use density or intensity in the following areas: a) reduced density along transit corridors and/or elimination of specified segments of mixed use designations to include removal of a mixed use segment along Mission between Bay Street and Walnut Avenue and changing the proposed mixed-use high density designated along Soquel Avenue to a mixed-used medium density designation; b) maintaining the existing General Plan land use designations (and density) at Swenson site and Golf Club Drive area; and elimination of support of large retail commercial in Harvey West area. The alternative would result in estimated development of 2,750 residential units and approximately 3,120,000 square of commercial, office and industries with an associated population increase of 6,600 residents and 8,645 employees.

As discussed in the “Alternatives” subsection of the CEQA CONSIDERATIONS (Chapter 5.0) section of this EIR, none of the alternatives, including the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would eliminate significant unavoidable project and cumulative impacts related to traffic and water supply, although all alternatives would result in a reduced level of traffic and water demand. The No Project Alternative would, however, reduce the other four identified significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. Alternative 2 – Reduced Growth would also reduce the identified significant impact related to consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan to a less-than-significant level, although under the Alternative 3—Reduced Density/Land Use Intensity, this would remain significant, but could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level as with the project. Potentially significant impacts on schools and cultural resources would remain significant under Alternatives 2 and 3, but could be mitigated. Table 5-5 provides a comparison of impact significant between the proposed *General Plan 2030* and the alternatives evaluated in this section. Alternatives 2 and 3 could attain some of the objectives (#1 and #3) and partially attain others (#2 and #4).

Excluding the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1), Alternative 2 – Reduced Growth, is considered the environmentally superior alternative of the alternatives considered. Although it would not eliminate significant unavoidable impacts, it could result in the greatest reduction of traffic and water demand impacts and reduce some of the other identified significant impacts. However, it would not fully meet project objectives.

## 2.4 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

All impacts identified in the subsequent environmental analysis are summarized in this section. This summary groups impacts of similar ranking together, beginning with significant unavoidable impacts, followed by significant impacts that can be mitigated, followed by impacts not found to be significant.

## SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The following impacts have been identified as being significant, and although mitigation measures help reduce the level of significance, the impacts cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

### 4.4 - Transportation and Traffic

**Impact 4.4-1: Traffic Impacts on Intersections Levels of Service (LOS).** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development that would result in increased vehicle trips and traffic, resulting in changes in intersection levels of service to unacceptable levels or further deterioration of intersections currently operating at unacceptable levels of service. With implementation of proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions, including road improvements identified in an updated Traffic Impact Fee program, intersection operations would be improved and traffic levels would be reduced, except at eight intersections.

#### Mitigation Measures

With implementation of the proposed *Plan 2030* policies and actions to reduce vehicular traffic, increase vehicle occupancy and support/encourage use of alternative transportation measures, the impact could be reduced to a less-than-significant level at all but four intersections along state highways and the four local intersections. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. With uncertainty regarding funding and implementation of transportation projects for the other intersections, the impact remains significant and unavoidable. However, revision of the following *General Plan 2030* action is recommended.

#### Recommended Revisions to the Draft General Plan 2030

Revise or add policies/actions as indicated below. Deleted text is shown in ~~strikeout~~ typeface, and new text is shown in underlined typeface.

- M3.1.4            Accept a lower level of service and higher congestion at major regional intersections if necessary improvements would be ~~too~~ prohibitively costly or result in significant, unacceptable environmental impacts.

**Impact 4.4-2: Traffic Impacts on State Highway Levels of Service (LOS).** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development that would result in increased vehicle trips and traffic on state highways in the regions (Routes 1, 17, and 9), which would further exacerbate existing unacceptable levels of service.

#### Mitigation Measures

None are known beyond those being considered for Highway 1 by Caltrans as discussed in the EIR text.

### **4.5 - Water Supply**

**Impact 4.5-1 Water Supply.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in increased development and population growth that would result in an increased demand for water supply in a system that currently has inadequate supplies during dry years and may have inadequate supplies in normal years in the future.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions to reduce water demand, promote water conservation, and support development of reliable supplemental water supplies will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level due to uncertainties regarding funding and implementation of desalination or another adequate alternative water supply, which may be needed to serve future growth. Therefore, the conservative conclusion is that the project impact on City water supplies during both normal and during dry year conditions is significant and unavoidable, even with implementation of proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions.

#### **Cumulative Impacts**

The following were determined significant cumulative impacts to which the proposed project's incremental contribution was found to be cumulatively considerable, thus resulting in a significant unavoidable impact.

- **Population Growth.** Cumulative growth (City and UCSC) could result in an average annual growth rate of 1.3% if the North Campus area is annexed to the City in the next 20 years. This projected level of growth exceeds historical growth rates between 1990 and 2009 (0.901.9%), as well as the AMBAG population growth rate of 0.65% between 2009 and 2030.
- **Traffic.** Cumulative development and growth would generate traffic that would result in unacceptable levels of service at 26 intersections, all of which could be improved to acceptable levels or improved operations, except at 11 intersections, including five along state routes. Cumulative traffic along state highways would contribute to existing and future unacceptable levels of service. Therefore, the cumulative traffic would result in significant cumulative impacts at seven intersections and along Highways 1 and 17. Funding availability for facility improvements and expansion of transit service will likely remain constrained into the foreseeable future. Thus, implementation of recommended improvements and alternative transportation facilities cannot be assured, and the impact under the cumulative conditions remains significant, at City intersections and along state highways this is a significant cumulative impact, and the project's incremental increase would be cumulatively considerable.
- **Water Supply.** Cumulative development and growth in the City's water service area would result in a significant cumulative water impact, as it results in additional demand in a system that does not currently have adequate water supplies to meet existing or future demands during drought conditions or potentially during normal years at some time after the year 2015 ~~2020~~. The City's supplies are sufficient to

meet cumulative water demands in a normal year through to the year 2030 if overall water use remains at 2007-2008 levels. However, if water demand is consistent with historic water use between 1999 and 2004, the City's total demand will be approximately ~~377~~ ~~223~~ MGY greater than the available normal year supply of ~~4,160~~ ~~4,314~~ MGY in 2030. Thus, cumulative development and growth would result in a significant cumulative impact during dry years and potentially during normal years. The project's incremental contribution is therefore considered "cumulatively considerable" and thus significant in and of itself. The City has identified a desalination plant as its best, potentially feasible option to alleviate shortages in drought conditions and as a potential additional normal-year water supply to serve new growth, and therefore has committed to pursuing this option with the intent of obtaining all necessary regulatory approvals. However, the City acknowledges the inherent uncertainty about its ability to obtain all necessary approvals for the planned desalination facility. Furthermore, surface water supplies may be reduced due to implementation of wildlife protection strategies under a future HCP, which may require that the City seek additional supplies and/or expansion of a desalination facility beyond that capacity that is currently planned for drought supply. Thus, the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

- **Noise.** Cumulative development and growth would result in noise increases associated with the traffic increases, but the increases would not exceed significance criteria (more than a 3 dBA increase), except for three road segments (Swift Street north of Delaware and Mission Street between Bay and Walnut) that would be considered significant for some existing residences along these segments.

## SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The following impacts have been identified as being significant which can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

### 4.6 – Public Services & Utilities

**Impact 4.6-4 Schools.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in increased development and population growth that would generate elementary school student enrollments that could exceed capacity of existing schools.

#### Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required beyond payment of school impact fees that will be collected at the time of issuance of a building permit.

### 4.9 – Cultural Resources

**Impact 4.9-1: Archaeological Resources and Human Remains.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development that could directly or indirectly disturb or alter archaeological resources, historical archaeological, and/or

human remains. Even with implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and actions for cultural resource protection, this is considered a potentially significant impact.

### **Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.9-1 below, in conjunction with implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and actions and compliance with local regulations, will mitigate potential impacts of future development on archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

**MITIGATION 4.9-1** Add Action HA1.2.2 that establishes a procedure for preparing archaeological investigations as follows:

HA1.2.2 Require preparation of archaeological investigations on sites proposed for development within areas identified as “Highly Sensitive” or “Sensitive” on the “Areas of Archaeological Sensitivity” and “Historical Archaeology Sensitivity” maps, except for exempt uses within “Sensitive” areas as described below, prior to approval of development permits. The investigation shall include archival research, site surveys and necessary supplemental testing as may be required, conducted by a qualified archaeologist. The significance of identified resources shall be ascertained in accordance with CEQA definitions, and impacts and mitigation measures outlined if significant impacts are identified, including, but not limited to recovery options and onsite monitoring by an archaeologist during excavation activities. A written report describing the archeological findings of the research or survey shall be provided to the City.

Allow minor projects with little excavation to be exempt from this requirement for preparation of an archaeological assessment within designated “Sensitive” areas, but not within the “High Sensitivity” areas. Minor projects generally involve spot excavation to a depth of 12 inches or less below existing grade, or uses that have virtually no potential of resulting in significant impacts to archaeological deposits. Exempt projects may include: building additions, outdoor decks, or excavation in soil that can be documented as previously disturbed.

**Impact 4.9-3: Paleontological Resources.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could directly or indirectly disturb or alter paleontological resources. Even with implementation of the proposed policies and actions for cultural resource protection, this is considered a potentially significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and actions outlined above, and Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 identified below will mitigate potential impacts of future development to a less-than-significant level.

**MITIGATION 4.9-2** Add Action HA1.2.3 that establishes a procedure for preparing archaeological investigations as follows:

HA1.2.3 The City shall notify applicants within paleontologically sensitive areas of the potential for encountering such resources during construction and condition approvals that work will be halted and resources examined in the event of encountering paleontological resources during construction. If the find is significant, the City should require the treatment of the find in accordance with the recommendations of the evaluating paleontologist. Treatment may include, but is not limited to, specimen recovery and curation or thorough documentation.

**Air Quality**

**Impact 4.11-1 Consistency with AQMP.** Adoption and implementation of the General Plan 2030 could indirectly result in increased population associated with potential development that would be accommodated by the Plan. The increased population would exceed population estimates in the Air Quality Management Plan in 2030, and thus the project would be inconsistent and conflict with the AQMP.

**Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of the following mitigation measure will reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**MITIGATION 4.11-1** The City shall work with the MBUAPCD and AMBAG and request that AMBAG's next population and housing forecast for the city of Santa Cruz and MBUAPCD's next *Air Quality Management Plan* be updated to reflect potential growth that could be accommodated by the General Plan 2030.

## LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The following impacts were found to be less-than-significant. Mitigation measures are not required.

### 4.1 - Land Use

**Impact 4.1-2: Introduce Incompatible Land Uses.** The proposed *General Plan 2030* does not introduce new land uses that would be incompatible with existing land uses or land use designations, although residential densities may increase in limited areas. However, with implementation of proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions, compatibility between new higher density residential uses with adjacent lower density residential neighborhoods would be ensured.

### 4.2 - Population & Housing

**Impact 4.2-1 Population Growth Inducement.** Adoption and implementation of the *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in increased population associated with potential development that could be accommodated by the Plan. However, the estimated amount and rate of growth are consistent with historic population growth patterns and trends, and would not be considered substantial.

**Impact 4.2-3 Removal of Housing and/or Displacement of People.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result removal of existing housing and/or displacement of residents due to redevelopment of underutilized parcels. As most mixed-use and redevelopment areas include predominantly non-residential structures, and with adherence to City regulations and *Housing Element* policies, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

### 4.3 - Aesthetics

**Impact 4.3-1: Scenic Public Views.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development that could adversely affect scenic public views. However, such development would be limited to infill sites and with implementation of the proposed policies and actions for protection of scenic public views, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.3-2: Scenic Resources.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development that could adversely impact scenic resources. However, with implementation of the proposed policies and actions for protection of scenic resources, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.3-3: Degradation of Visual Quality of Surrounding Areas.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development that would result in intensified structural development in some areas that could result in substantial degradation of the visual quality of surrounding neighborhoods. However, with implementation of the proposed policies and actions for siting of development to be sensitive to existing uses in concert with street landscaping, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.3-4: Introduction of Light and Glare.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could introduce new sources of light or glare. However, given the infill nature of future development, it is not expected that new sources of substantial light or glare would be introduced. Implementation of the proposed policies and actions for minimizing lighting impacts would further reduce potential effects.

#### **4.4 - Transportation and Traffic**

**Impact 4.4-3: Traffic Hazards.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would not result in new roads that could potentially create hazards, and with implementation of proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions to ensure road safety, the project would not result in direct or indirect impacts related to increased hazards. Therefore, there is *no impact* related to road safety/hazards.

**Impact 4.4-4: Conflicts with Adopted Plans.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would not result in conflicts with adopted plans, policies or programs that support alternative transportation, as the proposed goals, policies and actions directly support implementation and use of alternative transportation modes.

#### **4.5 - Water Supply**

**Impact 4.5-2 Groundwater.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in increased development and population growth that would result in an increased demand for water supply. However, the draft *General Plan 2030* plan does not propose expansion of groundwater supplies, and with implementation of proposed policies and actions, groundwater supplies would not be depleted, nor would development accommodated by the plan interfere with groundwater recharge.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required as a significant impact has not been identified. However, revision of the following *General Plan 2030* action is recommended.

#### **Recommended Revisions to the Draft General Plan 2030**

Revise or add policies/actions as indicated below. Deleted text is shown in ~~strikeout~~ typeface, and new text is shown in underlined typeface.

CC3.3.8      Provide adequate pumping, treatment, and distribution facilities for the reliable production of groundwater, consistent with pumping rates/volumes identified in the City's Urban Water Management Plan. ~~of 1 mgd all -in normal years and 2 mgd during droughts.~~

#### **4.6 – Public Services & Utilities**

**Impact 4.6-1 Fire Protection.** Adoption and implementation of the General Plan 2030 could indirectly result in increased population associated with potential development that could be accommodated by the Plan that would result in increased fire protection and emergency service demands. However, future development and growth would not result in the need to construct new or expanded fire stations.

**Impact 4.6-2 Police Protection.** Adoption and implementation of the General Plan 2030 could indirectly result in increased population associated with potential development that could be accommodated by the Plan that would result in increased police protection service demands. However, future development and growth would not result in the need to construct new or expanded police stations.

**Impact 4.3 Parks and Recreation.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 could indirectly result in increased development and population growth that would result in an indirect demand for parks and recreational facilities. However, the estimated growth would not increase use of parks or recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration would occur. With implementation of proposed policies and actions, in combined with existing regulations, the impact to parks and recreational facilities is considered less-than-significant.

**Impact 4.6-5 Wastewater Collection & Disposal.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 could indirectly result in increased development and population growth that would result in indirect generation of wastewater that could be accommodated by the existing wastewater treatment plant and collection system improvements, as needed and supported in the General Plan.

**Impact 4.6-6 Solid Waste Disposal.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 could indirectly result in increased development and population growth that would result in indirect generation of solid waste that could be accommodated within the remaining landfill capacity.

**Impact 4.6-7 Energy Use.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in increased development that would result in indirect energy demands, which would not be wasteful or an inefficient use with implementation of state and local regulations and proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions.

#### **4.7 – Hydrology, Drainage & Water Quality**

**Impact 4.7-1: Alteration of Drainage Patterns and Stormwater Runoff.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development that could result in increased stormwater runoff. With implementation of the proposed policies and actions for stormwater management and adherence to other City's plans and regulations, there would be no alteration of drainage patterns and increases in runoff would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.7-2: Water Quality.** Adoption and Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could result in increased stormwater runoff and potential urban pollutants that contribute to water quality degradation. With implementation of the proposed policies and actions for water quality protection and adherence to other City's plans and regulations related to drainage and water quality controls, this would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.7-3: Flood Hazards.** Adoption and Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could result in exposure to flood hazards, including watercourse flooding, dam failure and/or tsunami. With implementation of the proposed policies and actions related to flood control and adherence to other City's plans and regulations, the project would not result in location of habitable structures within a floodplain or substantial risk of exposure of structures or people to flood hazards. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.

#### **4.8 – Biological Resources**

**Impact 4.8-1: Riparian and Wetland Habitats.** Adoption and Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could directly or indirectly impact riparian and/or wetland habitat areas within and adjacent to the City. With implementation of the proposed policies and actions for resource protection and adherence to other City's plans and regulations protecting these habitat areas, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.8-2: Other Sensitive Habitat Areas.** Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would result in future development that could directly or indirectly impact sensitive habitat areas within and adjacent to the City (other than riparian and wetland habitats). Within implementation of the proposed policies and actions for resource protection, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.8-3: Special Status Species.** Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would result in future development that could directly or indirectly impact special status species. With implementation of the proposed policies and actions for resource protection, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.8-4: Wildlife Movement & Breeding.** Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would result in future development that could directly or indirectly interfere with wildlife movement and/or breeding. With implementation of the proposed policies and actions for resource protection, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Impact 4.8-6: Tree Protection.** Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would result in future development that could directly or indirectly adversely affect heritage trees in conflict with local tree protection regulations. With implementation of the proposed policies and actions for resource protection, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

#### **4.9 – Cultural Resources**

**Impact 4.9-2: Historical Resources.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could directly or indirectly disturb or alter historical resources. With implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and actions for historic resource protection, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

#### **4.10 – Geology and Soils**

**Impact 4.10-1: Seismic Hazards.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could result in exposure of people and property to seismic hazards, including ground shaking, liquefaction, and ground settlement. With adherence to City regulations, the project would not result in increased risk of exposure to seismic hazards.

**Impact 4.10-2: Other Geologic Hazards.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could result in exposure to people and property to potential hazards associated with landslides, slope stability, and/or coastal bluff retreat. With adherence to City regulations and proposed General Plan 2030 goals, policies and actions, the future development would not be located on unstable area related to landslides, slope instability or coastal bluff retreat.

**Impact 4.10-3: Soil Constraints.** Adoption and Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could result in exposure to soil constraints, such as expansive soils, that could lead to structural damages. With adherence to City regulations, the project would not result in increased risk of exposure to soils constraints.

**Impact 4.10-4: Erosion.** Adoption and Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that could result in erosion and inadvertent sedimentation into storm drains or watercourses, if not properly controlled. With adherence to City regulations, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion.

#### **4.11 – Air Quality**

**Impact 4.11-2 Increased Emissions of Criteria Pollutants.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in emissions of criteria pollutants due to new development that would be accommodated by the Plan within an air basin that currently exceeds state standards for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. However, emissions of criteria pollutants are expected to decrease in the future, and new emissions would not contribute to potential air quality violations. Additionally, with implementation of proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions and adherence to regional guidelines for future project-level reviews, indirect emissions resulting from buildout under the Plan would not be expected to substantially increase ozone precursors and particulate matter or result in air quality violations.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required as a significant impact has not been identified. However, revision of the following *General Plan 2030* actions are recommended to strengthen support for MBUAPCD air pollution control strategies.

#### **Recommended Revisions to the Draft General Plan 2030**

Revise or add policies/actions as indicated below. Deleted text is shown in ~~strikeout~~ typeface, and new text is shown in underlined typeface.

- HZ2.2.1      ~~Incorporate~~ Require future development projects to implement applicable Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District control measures and/or air quality mitigations in the design of new projects as set forth in the District's "CEQA Guidelines".
- HZ2.2.2      Permit major indirect sources of air pollution only if they provide transportation measures to reduce their impacts to ~~an in a less-than-significant level,~~ consistent with applicable MBUAPCD recommended mitigation and control measures as set forth in the District's "CEQA Guidelines".
- HZ2.2.6      Support MBUAPCD air pollution control strategies, air quality monitoring and enforcement activities.

**Impact 4.11-3 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Pollutants.** The increased population or development accommodated by the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in exposure of existing or new sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations which would not be considered substantial with implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions and the regulation of stationary sources by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

### **4.12 – Global Climate Change**

**Impact 4.12-1 Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in increased greenhouse gas emissions from development accommodated by the proposed plan. However, the emissions level would not be considered substantial compared to long-term forecasts and state and regional targets, and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions, as well as planned implementation statewide actions, would further reduce emissions.

### **4.13 – Noise**

**Impact 4.13-1: Exposure to Noise.** Implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development that could be exposed to noise levels that exceed state

standards for compatible noise levels for residential uses. With implementation of the proposed General Plan policies and actions for noise, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required, but revisions to the following General Plan 2030 actions are recommended to specifically reference land-use noise compatibility standards.

### **Recommended Revisions to the Draft General Plan 2030**

Revise or add policies/actions as indicated below. Deleted text is shown in ~~strikeout~~ typeface, and new text is shown in underlined typeface.

- HZ3.2.1 Apply noise and land use compatibility table and standards to all new residential, commercial, and mixed-use proposals, including condominium conversions in accordance with the standards set forth in the "Land Use – Noise Compatibility Standards" table.

**Impact 4.13-2: Increase in Permanent Ambient Noise Levels.** Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that would generate traffic and contribute to increased noise levels along City streets and highways, but would not exceed criteria of significance or substantially increase ambient noise levels.

**Impact 4.13-3: Increase in Temporary Noise Levels Due to Construction.** Implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would accommodate future development that would generate temporary increases in ambient noise levels due to construction activities, although substantial generation of vibration would not be expected. Due to the temporary and short-term duration of construction with intermittent noise levels, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.

## **4.14 – Hazardous Materials**

**Impact 4.14-1 Creation of Hazard with Transport, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in creation of a hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. With implementation of proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions and adherence to federal, state and local regulations, a significant hazard would not be expected to result.

**Impact 4.14-2 Exposure to Hazardous Materials.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* could indirectly result in exposure to contaminated sites accidental release of hazardous materials. With adherence to federal, state and local regulations, a significant hazard would not be expected to be created.

#### **4.15 – Agricultural, Forest & Mineral Resources**

**Impact 4.15-1: Conflicts with Agricultural Uses.** Adoption and Implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would accommodate future development which would not result in conflicts with agricultural uses of that could lead to conversion of farmlands to non-agricultural uses with implementation of proposed policies and actions.

### **No IMPACTS**

The State CEQA Guidelines section 15128 require that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. The EIR identified the following topics/issues as not being an impact for the reasons provided.

#### **4.1 – Land Use**

**Impact 4.1-1: Divide an Established Community.** Adoption and implementation of the *General Plan 2030* would not result in development or expansion of municipal boundaries that would result in a physical division of an established community.

**Impact 4.1-3: Conflict with Applicable Land Use or Other Plans.** Goals, policies and actions of the draft *General Plan 2030* would not conflict with other adopted plans. The plan consistency analysis has not found any plan inconsistencies with the Draft General Plan that would result in adverse physical impacts.

#### **4.4 - Transportation and Traffic**

**Impact 4.4-3: Traffic Hazards.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would not result in new roads that could potentially create hazards, and with implementation of proposed *General Plan 2030* policies and actions to ensure road safety, the project would not result in direct or indirect impacts related to increased hazards.

**Impact 4.4-4: Conflicts with Adopted Plans.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would not result in conflicts with adopted plans, policies or programs that support alternative transportation, as the proposed goals, policies and actions directly support implementation and use of alternative transportation modes.

#### **4.8 – Biological Resources**

**Impact 4.8-5: Habitat Reduction.** Implementation of the proposed *General Plan 2030* would result in future development that would be considered urban infill development and would not result in significant reduction of wildlife habitat or cause a wildlife or plant population to drop below self-sustaining levels or become eliminated. Therefore, there is no impact related to substantial habitat reduction.

**Impact 4.8-7: Conflicts with Local Plans and Policies.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan 2030 would not result in conflicts or inconsistencies with policies adopted to protect biological resources. Thus, there is no impact related to this issue.

#### **4.11 – Air Quality**

**Impact 4.11-4 Odors.** Adoption and implementation of the *General Plan 2030* would not directly or indirectly result in new uses that would result in introduction of substantial odors with implementation of proposed policies and actions and adherence to City regulations.

#### **4.12 – Global Climate Change**

**Impact 4.12-2: Conflicts with Applicable Plans.** Potential development that could be accommodated in the draft *General Plan 2030* would result in increased greenhouse gas emissions, but the proposed project would not conflict with adopted plans.

#### **4.15 – Agricultural, Forest & Mineral Resources**

**Agricultural Resources.** There are no designated agricultural lands within City limits or the City's existing Sphere of Influence, and future development accommodated by the plan would not result in conversion of agricultural lands or conflict with existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts.

**Forest Resources.** There are no areas of protected timberland land within the City or its existing Sphere of Influence, and there are no protected timberlands within the General Plan 2030 planning area. Thus, there would be no conflicts with zoning of forest lands (15d) or the conversion of timberland (15e-f). Furthermore, the proposed plan includes goals, policies and actions that seek maintenance and expansion of the City's urban forest as summarized in Table 4.15-1.

**Mineral Resources.** There are no designated mineral resources within the City, its existing Sphere of Influence or the *General Plan 2030* planning area, and therefore, the proposed General Plan would have no impact to mineral resources (15g). An existing quarry is located west of the City within the General Plan planning area. The site is located within the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County and subject to County regulations.