

CHAPTER 2

SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a brief description of the proposed project, known areas of controversy or concern, project alternatives, all potentially significant impacts identified during the course of this environmental analysis, and issues to be resolved. 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.

2.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addresses the potential environmental effects of adoption and implementation of the City of Santa Cruz Parks Master Plan. The Parks Master Plan is a guidance document that assesses existing conditions and community needs, and guides the short- and long-term planning of parks, recreational facilities, beaches, and open space-greenbelt lands. The Parks Master Plan also will aid implementation of the City's General Plan, and the plan's recommendations are advisory. The Parks Master Plan provides an analysis of the current parks, open spaces, and recreational facilities based on an assessment of the existing assets, quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the community outreach, emerging trends in recreation, and standards for park development.

The Parks Master Plan includes goals, policies and actions for the provision of parks and recreational services. These include general recommendations for new and/or expanded recreational uses. The Master Plan also provides specific recommendations for improvements at the City's individual parks, beaches, open spaces, and recreational facilities. The Parks Master Plan lays out recommendations for the next 15 years but is designed to be updated over time, providing a guiding framework while allowing for adjustments based on both presently anticipated and unforeseen future needs and community desires.

The proposed Parks Master Plan includes the following components; key elements are described in the following sections:

- An inventory of existing conditions, parks, open space and recreational facilities
- An assessment of emerging trends and community needs
- Goals, policies and actions
- Recommendations for specific facilities
- Implementation and funding strategies

2.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY OR CONCERN

The following issues of concern were raised on the Initial Study prepared for the Parks Master Plan (Project), both the 2018 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and the 2019 Recirculated IS/MND.

- Potential impacts associated with expanding off-leash areas for dogs or expanding multi-use trails in Pogonip, Arroyo Seco, and DeLaveaga Park;
- Level of analysis regarding potential biological, erosion and drainage impacts associated with new trails, particularly in Pogonip, DeLaveaga Park, Moore Creek Preserve and Arroyo Seco, and claims that the document defers studies and analyses related to these issues;
- Implementation of and potential changes to the Jessie Street Marsh Management Plan;
- Increased lighting at DeLaveaga Park, Depot Park, Neary Lagoon, Main Beach, San Lorenzo River and new parking lots;
- Impacts of development of a drone course;
- Conflicts with and potential to amend adopted management plans;
- Transportation impacts;
- Support for the Beach Flats community garden; and
- An EIR should be prepared for the Project.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR was circulated for a 30-day comment period on July 26, 2019. Written comments were received in response to the NOP from two public agencies (Caltrans and California Native Heritage Commission) and two individuals (Erica Stanojevic and Grant Weseman). These letters are included in Appendix A and generally addressed:

- Requirements of Caltrans;
- Recommendations for conducting cultural resource assessments and Native American consultations;
- Impacts of lighting (aesthetics and biological resources);
- Request to take park management plans into consideration and anticipated increased usage of parks and open space; and
- Issues regarding enforcement or lack of enforcement of dog regulations, on or off leash.

As indicated in Chapter 1, Introduction, the comments have been taken into consideration in the preparation of this EIR for comments that raise environmental issues.

2.4 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 Section 5.5.

- No Project – Required by CEQA
- Alternative 1 – Reduced Project
- Alternative 2 – Modified Project

Table 5-1 in Section 5.5 of this EIR presents a comparison of project impacts between the proposed project and the alternatives. Excluding the No Project Alternative, Alternative 2, Modified Project, is considered the environmentally superior alternative of the alternatives considered because it would avoid and/or reduce potentially significant impacts, while meeting Project objectives.

2.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

All impacts identified in the subsequent environmental analyses 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 to a less-than-significant level, followed by impacts not found to be significant. The discussions in the Initial Study of impacts that are not being addressed in detail in the text of the Draft EIR are intended to satisfy the requirement of CEQA Guidelines section 15128 that an EIR “shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and therefore were not discussed in detail in the EIR.” The Initial Study is included in Appendix A of this EIR. A summary of less-than-significant and no impacts identified in the Initial study is presented at the end of this section.

2.5.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts were identified as a result of the impact analyses.

2.5.2 Significant Impacts

The following impacts were found to be potentially significant but could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of identified mitigation measures should the City’s decision-makers impose the measures on the project at the time of final action on the project.

Impact BIO-4: Wildlife Breeding – Nesting Birds. Implementation of the Parks Master Plan and future implementation of recommended improvements could result in

indirect impacts to nesting birds if any are occurring within or near future construction areas.

Mitigation Measures

MITIGATION BIO-4A: Require that a pre-construction nesting survey be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist if future park facility construction or tree removal occurs near mature trees and wooded areas, and is scheduled to begin between March and late July to determine if nesting birds are in the vicinity of the construction sites. If nesting raptors or other nesting species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act are found, construction may need to be delayed until late-August or after the wildlife biologist has determined the nest is no longer in use or unless a suitable construction buffer zone can be identified by the biologist. This measure also is a requirement of the *City-wide Creeks and Wetlands Management Plan* (Standard 12).

MITIGATION BIO-4B: Include an Action in the Parks Master Plan to prohibit recreational use of drones and/or establishment of a recreational drone course within sensitive habitat areas or near wildlife nesting areas that could cause disturbance or harm to breeding or nesting wildlife.

Impact GEO-2: Soils and Erosion. The proposed Project would not directly result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil, but may result in indirect erosion impacts related to future trail development supported by the Parks Master Plan.

Mitigation Measures

MITIGATION GEO-2A: Implement site design and erosion control measures for new trails and other facilities in areas subject to high erosion hazards or adjacent to streams and wetland areas, including but not limited to, installation of temporary fencing on the outer edges of steep slopes and creek crossings to prevent inadvertent erosion and sedimentation from entering adjacent drainages and streams during construction; conducting grading prior to the rainy season and protecting disturbed areas during the rainy season; and revegetating disturbed cut/fill areas.

MITIGATION GEO-2B: Limit trail use and/or implement seasonal trail closures as needed during the rainy season to prevent erosion due to trail use.

Impact HYD-1: Water Quality. Future development accommodated by the proposed *Parks Master Plan 2030* could result in minor increases in stormwater runoff, but would not result in violations of any water quality standards or waste discharge

requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality, except for potential erosion due to construction.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the Project policies and actions that would avoid or minimize runoff and water quality impacts, as well as City stormwater management requirements, provisions of adopted park plans and accompanying EIR requirements, and Mitigation Measures GEO-2A and GEO-2B would reduce potential erosion impacts from future trails and other development to a *less-than-significant* impact.

2.5.3 Less-Than-Significant Impacts

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

- Impact AES-3: Visual Character.** The proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.
- Impact AES-4: Light and Glare.** The proposed Project would not result in new sources of substantial light or glare.
- Impact AIR-2: Project Emissions.** The proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment.
- Impact AIR-3: Sensitive Receptors.** The proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Impact GHG-1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** The proposed Project would not generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- Impact BIO-1: Sensitive Habitats.** Implementation of the Parks Master Plan could result in indirect impacts to sensitive habitats as a result of future implementation of recommended improvements identified in the Master Plan, which would be avoided or minimized with implementation of policies and actions in the Parks Master Plan and the *General Plan 2030*, as well as with mitigation or other measures included in previously adopted park/open space management plans and their accompanying CEQA documents.

- Impact BIO-2: Wetland Habitats.** Implementation of the Parks Master Plan could result in indirect impacts to sensitive wetland habitats as a result of future implementation of recommended improvements identified in the Master Plan, which would be avoided or minimized with implementation of policies and actions in the Parks Master Plan and the *General Plan 2030*, as well as with mitigation or other measures included in previously adopted park/open space management plans and their accompanying CEQA documents.
- Impact BIO-3: Special Status Species.** Implementation of the Parks Master Plan could result in indirect impacts to special status species or their habitat areas as a result of future implementation of recommended improvements identified in the Master Plan, which would be avoided or minimized with implementation of policies and actions in the Parks Master Plan and the *General Plan 2030*, as well as with mitigation or other measures included in previously adopted park/open space management plans and their accompanying CEQA documents.
- Impact CUL-1: Historical Resources.** The proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource due to future renovations of structures listed in the City’s Historic Building Survey
- Impact CUL-2: Archaeological Resources.** The proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.
- Impact CUL-3: Human Remains.** The proposed Project would not disturb human remains.
- Impact CUL-4: Tribal Cultural Resources.** The proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.
- Impact GEO-1: Exposure to Seismic Hazards.** The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death resulting from rupture of a known earthquake fault, seismic ground shaking, landslides, or seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction, which cannot be mitigated through the use of standard engineering design techniques.
- Impact GEO-3: Unstable Geologic Units or Soils.** The proposed Project would not be located on an unstable geologic unit or soil.
- Impact GEO-4: Expansive Soils.** Future parks improvements would not result in substantial new structural development that would be subject to expansive soils.

- Impact GEO-6: Paleontological Resources.** The proposed Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.
- Impact HAZ-2: Exposure to Wildland Fire Hazard.** The proposed Project would not expose people or structures to wildland fires.
- Impact HYD-3: Alteration of Drainage Patterns and Stormwater Runoff.** Future development accommodated by the proposed *Parks Master Plan 2030* could result in minor increases in stormwater runoff, but would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area or increase impervious surfaces in a manner that would result in substantial off-site erosion, a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff that would result in flooding, runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.
- Impact NOISE-1: Increase in Ambient Noise Levels.** The proposed Project would not generate a substantial increase in temporary or permanent ambient noise levels.
- Impact PUB-1: New or Expanded Public Service Facilities.** The proposed Project would not require new or physically altered governmental facilities.
- Impact PUB-2: Increased Use of Parks.** The proposed Project would not cause a substantial increase in use of parks and recreational facilities.
- Impact PUB-3: New Recreational Facilities.** The proposed Project would not include recreational facilities or require expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment.
- Impact TRANS-1: Conflicts with Plans Addressing the Circulation System.** The proposed Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
- Impact UTIL-2: Water Supply.** The proposed Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years.
- Impact UTIL-3: Wastewater Treatment.** Adoption and implementation of the proposed Parks Master Plan could indirectly result in increased generation of wastewater that could be accommodated by the existing wastewater treatment plant.
- Impact UTIL-4: Solid Waste Disposal.** The proposed Project would not exceed existing landfill capacity.

Impact UTIL-6: Energy. The proposed Project would not result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy.

Impact LAND-2: Conflicts with Plans. The proposed project will not conflict with policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

2.5.4 No Impacts

The following were found to have no impacts. No mitigation measures are required.

- AES-1: Scenic Vistas-Views
- AES-2: Scenic Resources
- AIR-1 Conflicts with Air Quality Management Plan.
- AIR 4: Odors
- GHG-2 Conflicts with Climate Action Plan
- BIO-4 Wildlife Corridors
- BIO5 Conflicts with Local Ordinances
- BIO-6 Conflicts with HCP or NCCP
- BIO-7 Substantially Reduce Fish or Wildlife Species Habitat.
- BIO-8 Cause a Fish or Wildlife Population Decline
- BIO-9 Threaten to Eliminate a Plant or Animal Community.
- GEO-5 Use of Septic Systems
- HAZ-1 Emergency Response
- HAZ-3 Wildland Fire Hazard
- HYD-2 Groundwater Impacts
- HYD-4 Flood Hazards / Tsunamis
- HYD-5 Conflict with Water Quality or Groundwater Plans
- HAZ-1 Emergency Response
- HAZ-3 Wildland Fire Hazard
- NOISE-2 Vibration
- NOISE-3 Location near Airport
- TRANS-2 Conflict with State CEQA Guidelines-Vehicle Miles Traveled
- TRANS-3 Geometric Design Hazards
- TRANS-4 Emergency Access
- UTIL-1 *New or Expanded Utilities*
- UTIL-5 *Conflict with Solid Waste Regulations*

- UTIL-7 *Conflict with Energy Plan.*
- LAND-1 *Division of an Established Community*

2.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

CEQA Guidelines section 15123 requires the Summary to identify “issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.” This EIR has presented mitigation measures and project alternatives, and the City Council will consider the Final EIR when considering the proposed project. In considering whether to approve the project, the City Council will take into consideration the environmental consequences of the project with mitigation measures and project alternatives, as well as other factors related to feasibility. “Feasible” means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15364). Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or already owns the alternative site). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives. The concept of feasibility also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. Moreover, feasibility under CEQA encompasses “desirability” to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK