

City of Scotts Valley
Bay Village Planned Development Initial Study



Table of Contents

Background & Project Description	1
Environmental Setting	3
Environmental Checklist	3
Aesthetics	3
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	5
Air Quality	7
Biological Resources	11
Cultural Resources	20
Energy	22
Geology and Soils	23
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	26
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	27
Hydrology and Water Quality	30
Land Use and Planning	34
Mineral Resources	34
Noise	35
Population and Housing	38
Public Services	39
Recreation	40
Transportation	41
Tribal Cultural Resources	43
Utilities and Service Systems	45
Wildfire	47
Mandatory Findings of Significance	48
Determination	50

List of Figures

Figure 1: Regional Location

Figure 2: Project Vicinity

Figure 3: Site Plan

Figure 4: Project Rendering

Figure 5: Street View from Erba Lane

Figure 6: Grading Plan

Figure 7: Exterior Lighting Plan

Figure 8: Vegetation Types

Figure 9: Oak Riparian Woodland Habitat

Note: All figures are inserted at the end of the document.

List of Tables

None.

Initial Study

Background & Project Description

Project Title

Bay Village Planned Development

Lead Agency Name and Address

City of Scotts Valley
One Civic Center Drive
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

Contact Person and Phone Number

Paula Bradley, MCP, AICP
Contract Planner
831 345-5482
pbradley@mbakerintl.com

Project Location

As shown in **Figure 1: Regional Location**, and **Figure 2: Project Vicinity**, the project site is on two parcels (APN 22-481-18 and 22) on Erba Lane in the City of Scotts Valley.

Project Applicant/Sponsor

Charlie Eadie
Eadie Consultants

General Plan Designation

Residential High Density (R-H)

Zoning

Residential High Density (R-H)

Project Description

The proposed Bay Village Panned Development project (the project) would construct 10 residential units comprised of six single-family homes on a 45,245 sf parcel. As shown in **Figure 3: Site Plan**, the project site's two existing lots that would be subdivided into ten lots and two common lots. The lots would range in size from 2,750 to 3,691 square feet (sf), with a common area for the riparian setback (Lot B – 10,681 sf) and a new lane (Lot A – 3,557 sf).

The project includes nine 3-bedroom homes, which range in size from 1,766 sf to 2,108 sf, and one 2,236 sf 4-bedroom unit. Each unit would include a two-car garage and a 20-foot deep driveway. A rendering of the subdivision is shown in **Figure 4: Project Rendering**.

To protect an existing oak riparian woodland habitat that extends along the eastern boundary of the project site, a split rail fence would be constructed outside of the riparian boundary. Retaining walls would be constructed along the property lines in the southeast, south, northwest corner and between most of the lots to create level building pads on the sloped lot. The retaining walls would be topped with wood.

Fronting Erba Lane, the project includes a five-foot sidewalk and six-foot landscaped planting strip. The project would construct a new 24 foot-wide private roadway, extending from Erba Lane, providing access to seven of the residential units (Lots 4 through 10). A street view from Erba Lane is shown in **Figure 5: Street View from Erba Lane**.

As shown in **Figure 6: Grading Plan**, grading for the project would require a cut of 1,155 cubic yards of soil (maximum cut of 4.9 feet), and fill of 1,870 cubic yards (maximum fill of 5.2 feet), for a net import of 715 cubic yards. Consistent with current conditions, stormwater would flow generally north to south across the project site.

Storm drainage from constructed impervious surfaces (e.g. roofs, driveways) would be conveyed via a series of collector storm drain pipes to underground (Stormtech) chambers located on Sam Lane where it would be retained and treated. Stormwater from Erba Lane fronting the project site would be collected via drainage inlets and directed to a newly constructed 18-inch storm drain for channel overflow along the southern boundary of the project site. A channel emergency overflow catch basin with riprap apron would be constructed on the southeast corner of the project site to control storm drain flows that would ultimately flow into the adjacent dry creek located in the existing oak riparian woodland corridor.

Water and sewer services would connect to an existing six-inch sanitary sewer and eight-inch water main located on Erba Lane.

Project-Related Approvals, Agreements and Permits

- Planned Development Permit PD19-004
- Minor Land Division MLD19-002
- Design Review DR19-014
- Environmental Assessment EA19-010
- Environmental Review ND20-001
- Cultural Resources Report Permit CR20-001

Other public agencies whose approval is required

None.

Environmental Setting**Background and Intent**

The purpose of the project is to allow for the subdivision of the project site (Lots A and B and Lots 1 through 10) and the construction of 10 residential units as part of a Planned Development.

Project Site and Existing Facilities

The project site is currently vacant with partially paved surface parking. The General Plan designation is Residential High Density (R-H) and the zoning designation is Residential High Density (R-H).

Surrounding the project site is the Scotts Valley Fire Department and single-family residential to the west, Scotts Valley City Hall, and MacDorsa Park to the north and east, and office buildings to the east between the project site and Scotts Valley Drive. The corner of Erba Lane and Scotts Valley Drive is a landscape supply company.

Environmental Checklist

The discussion below analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the project per the criteria as described in Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. For convenience, this analysis uses the Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines as a framework. Different from the standard CEQA checklist included in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines are the impact options included in this analysis.

Aesthetics

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
a) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock				X

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
b) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X
c) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Discussion

Scenic Vista

The project site is currently used as a partially paved parking lot and is surrounded by a combination of commercial, industrial, office, and residential uses. The project site is relatively flat and would not block any scenic vista nor substantially change an important view from a scenic vantage point, and therefore there would be no impact.

Scenic Resources and Visual Character

The project site is not located along a state scenic highway or designated scenic corridor. Although the project would represent a visual change from the existing conditions, it would be consistent with the type of development planned for this area in the General Plan. Additionally, the project is subject to design review, which would provide an opportunity for further evaluation that the project would not adversely impact the visual character of the area. Because there are no scenic resources and the visual character would not be substantially altered, there would be no impact.

Light and Glare

Existing ambient sources of nighttime lighting include neon and fluorescent signs, lighting of building exteriors and architectural accents, illumination through windows, landscape lighting,

street lighting, parking lot lighting, and vehicle headlights. The project would include outdoor lighting on the site typical to a residential development. As shown in **Figure 7: Exterior Lighting Plan**, project plans provide details for exterior lighting for the proposed homes that include: 42-inch tall lighting bollards, wall mounted lights, and recessed 6-inch LED downlights. All fixtures would utilize light-emitting diode (LED) lighting with glare cutoffs and be dark sky-friendly certified by the International Dark-Sky Association.

Site and architectural lighting is subject to the City design review process which would provide an opportunity for further evaluation so that levels of luminance do not adversely affect the adjacent properties. To further minimize lighting effects on the surrounding area, a project-specific conditions would require the project applicant to use no pole lights, and utilize down-directed fixtures on building exteriors with concealed light sources, consistent with City policies and design guidelines for lighting to be at the lowest level and carefully controlled for security, aesthetics, safety, and identification without interfering with nearby land uses. Implementation of these standard conditions of approval would reduce potential off-site light intrusion impacts to a less than significant level.

Findings

The project would not generate affect a scenic vista or scenic resource, would not change the visual character of the project area, and therefore there would be no impact. The project would not result in a substantial change to light and glare and therefore impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

Discussion

The property is not located on land that is classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, and therefore no agricultural impacts would occur as a result of the project.

Findings

As described above, there would be no impact on agricultural resources. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Air Quality

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Discussion

Air Quality Plan and Air Quality Standards

The project site is located within the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB), which includes Monterey County, San Benito County, and Santa Cruz County, comprising an area of approximately 5,159 square miles along the central California coast. The Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) is responsible for local control and monitoring of criteria air pollutants throughout the NCCAB.

MBARD has developed the *2012 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region* (2012 AQMP). The 2012 AQMP is a transitional plan shifting focus of MBARD's efforts from achieving the 1-hour component of the State ozone AAQS to achieving the 8-hour ozone requirement. The Plan includes an updated air quality trends analysis, which reflects both the 1- and 8-hour standards, as well as an updated emission inventory, which includes the latest information on stationary, area and mobile emission sources.

In March 2017, MBARD adopted the *2012-2015 Triennial Plan Revision*, which assesses and updates elements of the 2012 AQMP, including the air quality trends analysis, emission inventory, and mobile source programs. The 2017 AQMP Revision only addresses attainment of the State ozone standard. In 2012, EPA designated the NCCAB as in attainment of the current national 8-hour ozone standard of 0.075 ppm¹.

The following MBARD rules would limit emissions of air pollutants from construction and operation of residential development pursuant to the project:

- *Rule 400 (Visible Emissions)* – Discharge of visible air pollutant emissions into the atmosphere from any emission source for a period or periods aggregating more than 3 minutes in any 1 hour, as observed using an appropriate test method, is prohibited.
- *Rule 402 (Nuisances)* - No person shall discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other materials which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public; or which endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public; or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.
- *Rule 425 (Use of Cutback Asphalt)* – The use of cutback asphalt (asphalt cement that has been blended with petroleum solvents) is restricted.
- *Rule 426 (Architectural Coatings)* – This rule limits the emissions of ROGs from the use of architectural coatings.

The MBARD's 2008 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provides criteria for determining cumulative impacts and consistency. The CEQA Air Quality Guidelines note that a project which is inconsistent with an Air Quality Plan would have a significant cumulative impact on regional air quality. Any emissions sources that would be generated as part of the project would be subject to the MBARD rules and regulations. The proposed development (the point source) does not include any processes or activities that would emit air pollutants. Therefore, the proposed use does not have the potential for significant impacts that would conflict with the AQMP. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the AQMP for the Monterey Bay Region. Thus, the project would not make a considerable contribution to this existing, cumulatively significant impact. Impacts would be less than significant.

Construction

MBARD CEQA Guidelines state that construction activities (e.g., excavation, grading, on-site vehicles) that emit 82 pounds per day or more of PM₁₀ would have a significant impact on local

¹ On October 1, 2015, U.S. EPA adopted a new 8-hour ozone standard of 0.070 ppm. However, U.S. EPA has not yet reviewed recent NCCAB emissions to determine attainment with the current 0.070 ppm standard. Therefore, this attainment status is based upon U.S. EPA's prior 0.075 ppm standard.

air quality when they are located nearby and upwind of sensitive receptors. Based on this emissions threshold, construction activity occurring on more than 2.2 acres per day may result in significant PM₁₀ emissions (MBARD, 2015). Because development of the project would not result construction activity occurring on more than 2.2 acres per day, impacts would be less than significant.

However, grading activities during construction could cause dust accumulation in the project area. Implementation of the following standard conditions of approval would be required to ensure potential impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level for all construction activities on the project site.

Furthermore, standard conditions of approval require that development projects reduce dust generation from project grading and construction to minimal levels, the project proponent shall require the grading contractor to implement best management practices (BMPs) for dust control, including watering down exposed earth surfaces each non-rainfall day at intervals that attenuate dust problems. Any dirt tracked on to adjacent roadways shall be removed daily in a manner that does not create substantial airborne dust. The following BMPs shall be included in the construction contract for the project and be implemented during site grading:

- Excavation of the site shall be done in phases by grading only those areas where immediate activity will take place, leaving the remaining areas in their original condition with ground cover.
- A water truck, using recycled water, shall be available on a repeated basis each day throughout the grading phase of the project to spray exposed earth surfaces.
- In addition to regular water spraying, a biodegradable chemical palliative shall be sprayed on any graded areas that will remain exposed without additional grading for three or more days in succession.
- The site entrance shall be base rocked to avoid or minimize tracking mud on roadways by construction vehicles.
- Roadway(s) along the project frontage shall be mechanically swept at the end of each work day when any dirt or mud has been tracked on the street.
- No grading activities shall occur during days of high wind velocity.
- Finished graded areas that are designated as open space and landscape areas of project, shall be covered with an accepted erosion control substance such as straw mulch or hydro mulch with a tackifier.
- Construction staff shall monitor daily all areas that have received a chemical palliative spray or application of mulch to determine if these areas remain in a dust-free condition and take corrective action as needed to maintain a dust-free environment.

Operational

The project would result in new long-term operational emissions from mobile sources (burning of fossil fuels in cars); energy sources (cooling, heating, and cooking); and area sources (landscape equipment and household products). Mobile source emissions constitute most operational emissions from this type of land use development project. However, emissions associated with buildout of this type of project is not expected to exceed any applicable MBARD thresholds. No stationary sources would be constructed that would be long-term permanent sources of emissions. Therefore, the project would not generate a significant level of operational emissions and impacts would be less than significant.

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors in the vicinity include residents and patrons of nearby commercial/office establishments, located approximately 30 feet from the property boundaries of the proposed development.

Construction equipment and associated heavy-duty truck traffic generates diesel exhaust which is a known toxic air contaminant (TAC). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has identified diesel exhaust particulate matter as a toxic air contaminant, and assessment of toxic air contaminant cancer risks is typically based upon a 70-year exposure period. Project grading and construction activities that would utilize diesel-powered equipment would expose receptors to possible diesel exhaust for a very limited number of days (approximately 10 days). Because exposure to diesel exhaust would be well below the 70-year exposure period, and given the limited and short-term duration of activities that would use diesel equipment, construction-related diesel emissions are not considered significant. Furthermore, the State is implementing emission standards for different classes of on- and off-road diesel vehicles and equipment that applies to off-road diesel fleets and includes measures such as retrofits. Additionally, Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations (section 2485(c)(1)) prohibits idling of a diesel engine for more than five minutes in any location.

Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Potential exposure of sensitive receptors to diesel emissions and associated risks is considered a less-than-significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required. However, standard conditions of approval require that prior to issuance of any grading permit, the Director of Public Works and the Building Official shall confirm that the grading permit and specifications stipulate that all off-road construction vehicles/equipment shall comply with the California Air Resources Board's In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation.

Odors

During construction activities, temporary odors from vehicles exhaust and construction equipment engine would occur. However, construction-related odors would be short-term and would cease upon completion. Therefore, no objectionable odors are anticipated from construction activities associated with the project and there would be no impact.

Land uses typically producing objectionable odors include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The project does not include any uses that would be associated with objectionable odors. Odor emissions from the project would be limited to odors associated with vehicle and engine exhaust and idling cars. The project does not include any known sources of objectionable odors associated with the long-term operational use and therefore there would be no impact.

Findings

A significant air quality impact is defined as any violation of an ambient air quality standard, any substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or any exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As discussed above, the MBARD thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. Therefore, there would be no significant air quality impacts and no mitigation is required in addition to the City's standard conditions of approval for construction dust control at the time of development.

Biological Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological				X
d) 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?		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Discussion

A Biological Assessment was prepared for the project site in May of 2019 (Biotic Resources Group, May 2019), which was based on a previous site plan consisting of six single-family homes and three duplex homes (total of 12 units) (Erba Lane Housing, Site Plan, David Zulim, Inc. dated 8-3-18). An Addendum to the Biological Assessment was prepared in May 2020 based on a revised site plan which represents the proposed project (Biotic Resources Group, May 2020).

Similarly, a Preliminary Tree Inventory & Assessment was prepared for the previous site plan in November 2017 (Kurt Fouts, November 2017). A Preliminary Arborists Report, Preliminary Tree Inventory and Assessment (the Revised Arborists Report) was prepared in March 2020 based on the revised site plan (Kurt Fouts, March 2020).

The analysis below is based on the findings of these assessments, as revised.

Environmental Setting

The project area is located along an unnamed creek. The USGS map (Felton quadrangle) does not identify a stream at this location; however, the field inspection documented a defined bed and bank and evidence of seasonal water flow at the site.

As shown in **Figure 8: Vegetation Types** (which shows the previous site plan), two plant communities occur on the project site. Coast live oak riparian woodland grows along the eastern property line and this woodland extends further eastward along the creek corridor on the City of Scotts Valley property. The woodland is closely associated with the creek, with many trees rooted on the slope and along the top-of-bank. Mature trees of coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) dominant the woodland, with their canopies extending outward from top-of-bank. **Figure 9: Oak Riparian Woodland Habitat** illustrates the extent of the oak riparian woodland in relation to the revised site plan (May 12, 2020).



According to the arborists report (Kurt Fouts, November 2017), 14 oak trees grow on the project site; 26 oak trees are rooted on the adjacent City-owned property. Within the woodland, native and non-native plant species are present, including California blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), velvet grass (*Holcus lanatus*), French broom (*Genista monspessulana*), sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), and young willows. The riparian woodland on the City property also supports willows (*Salix sp.*), which grow along the wetted channel.

In general, oak woodlands provide a high value habitat type for wildlife because acorns are important forage, the natural cavities in the oaks provide nesting opportunities for some birds and mammals, and downed decaying logs and limbs add to structural complexity of a moist microclimate and invertebrate food supply. The value of the oak riparian woodland to wildlife at this site is enhanced by the presence of water in the creek, which provides seasonal water sources for wildlife. Common wildlife expected to occur in this small patch of oak woodland include scrub jay (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*), acorn woodpecker (*Melanerpes formicivorus*), oak titmouse (*Baeolophus inornatus*), chestnut-backed chickadee (*Poecile rufescens*), bushtit

(*Psaltiriparus minimus*), spotted towhee (*Pipilo maculatus*), and western gray squirrel (*Sciurus griseus*).

The second plant community is non-native grasses and forbs dominate the southeast portion of the Erba Lane property, abutting the existing paved area. Evidence of previous fill/base rock materials was observed, suggesting previous disturbances to this area. Plant species are typical of such areas, with wild radish (*Raphanus sativa*), wild oat, Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*), velvet grass, black mustard (*Brassica nigra*.), English plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*), filaree (*Erodium botrys*), and rose clover (*Trifolium repens*) being common. Native plant species in this area are limited to California poppy (*Eshscholzia californica*) and telegraph weed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*).

The use by wildlife of the grassland area is expected to include common species, such as mourning dove (*Zenaidura macroura*), California towhee (*Pipilo crissalis*), white-crowned sparrow (*Zonotrichia leucophrys*), and house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*). Western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), gopher snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), and Botta's pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*) are also likely to occur in the grass habitat.

Applicable Regulations

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CDFW classifies and ranks the State's natural communities to assist in the determining the level of rarity and imperilment. Vegetation types are ranked between S1 and S5. For vegetation types with ranks of S1-S3, all associations within the type are considered to be highly imperiled. If a vegetation alliance is ranked as S4 or S5, these alliances are generally considered common enough to not be of concern; however, it does not mean that certain associations contained within them are not rare (CDFW, 2007 and 2010). The oak-willow riparian woodland (CaCode 71.060.47) is ranked S4, yet some associations are of high priority (CDFW, 2010).

City of Scotts Valley Zoning Code

Streams and Drainage Courses

The City of Scotts Valley Zoning Code contains several references to streams and drainage courses. Section 17 requires structures to be located outside a 25-foot creek setback (measured outward from the top-of-bank). This review found the top of bank to be the break in slope from the flat terrace to the creek. Most of the oak trees are rooted at or just below this top-of-bank location, with the tree canopies extending into, and in some cases beyond, this 25-foot setback.

City Zoning Code 15.06 also addresses drainage facilities, requiring disturbances to natural drainageways be kept to a minimum and existing drainage courses shall not be obstructed or obliterated without mitigating measures installed that have been approved by the building official. Grading equipment is not to disturb or cross flowing streams unless absolutely necessary and only with prior approval from the building official. The code also states no construction materials or construction byproducts shall be discarded in any drainageway or

riparian zone. All streams, floodplains, channels, bodies of standing water, or other riparian areas shall be identified and delineated on the development plans and vegetative removal, land disturbances, or other development activities shall be conducted at a time, and in a manner that will provide and maintain an undisturbed vegetative filter strip. The code also states if it is determined that certain development activities in or near the riparian zones would be detrimental, those activities may be prohibited.

Tree Protection

The City of Scotts Valley Zoning Ordinance Section 17.44.080 regulates the removal of protected trees. Section 17.44.080 includes tree protection regulations. Protected trees are defined as:

- Any tree having a main stem or trunk at least 8 inches or greater diameter at breast height (DBH) (25 inches in circumference), located in a hillside residential zone where the slope within 20 feet of where the tree is located exceeds 20 percent;
- Any single-trunk oak tree with a main stem or trunk at least 8 inches DBH (25-inch circumference), or any multi-trunk oak tree with an individual trunk over 4 inches DBH (12 inch circumference);
- Any street tree (defined as any tree within five feet of a public or private street or right of way), regardless of size;
- Any single-trunk tree with a 13-inch or greater DBH (40-inch circumference);
- Any multi-trunk tree with any trunk greater than or equal to 8-inch DBH (25-inch circumference);
- Any tree, regardless of size, required to be planted or preserved as part of a permit approved by the Planning Department, Planning Commission or City Council, or required as a replacement tree for a removed tree; or
- Any Heritage Tree, defined as a tree identified, because of unique quality and/or size, as among the most significant and noteworthy in the city and formally designated by the City Council.

Per SVMC Section 17.44.080(E)(4), tree removal request shall be included as part of the development application, including an arborist's report, and shall be approved by the planning commission or city council. The development review process shall seek to preserve healthy trees, trees that contribute to the overall aesthetic quality of an area, and to preserve significantly sized trees that are important to the overall landscape of an area.

Sensitive Natural Communities

A biological survey of the project site was conducted in May 2019 to determine the presence of special status plant and animal species. No special status plant species were observed and none are expected. The only special status wildlife species that may occur within or immediately adjacent to the project work area is the San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat.

The project was evaluated as to potential direct and indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources. Examples of direct impacts are the removal of oak trees for construction of housing and associated lot development, and pathway construction in the riparian corridor. Examples of indirect impacts include potential disturbance to the oak riparian woodland and wildlife utilization of these areas from increased human uses on the property (e.g., residential uses, landscaping, lighting, pathway uses).

Based on the revised site plan dated May 12, 2020, the revised grading plan preserves most of the oak riparian woodland on the project site. The footprint of the residential buildings are located outside of the dripline of the oak riparian woodland and 25 feet from the “top of bank” of the 100-year storm flood boundary. Two Coast live oaks (T39 and T40), which are located outside of the oak riparian woodland on the southeast corner of Lot 7, would be removed, as discussed below. Additionally, some limited grading would occur within the dripline of oak trees that are to be retained. Some trees would require targeted clearance pruning for grading equipment and hand grading may be required near them to minimize impacts. Two additional protected oaks near lot 6 (T35 and T38) may not be retained.

To reduce construction and post-construction-period impacts to the riparian woodland, the Biological Assessment, as revised, the following mitigation measures would reduce impacts to the oak riparian woodland to a less than significant level.

MM BIO-1: Oak Riparian Woodland -Project Construction

Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City compliance with the following:

- 1.1 The outer edge of the riparian setback area should be demarcated by the placement of six-foot high plastic construction fencing (during the construction period) and a permanent six-foot high fence (after construction). The fence should have an opening to allow access to the existing pathway that crosses the intermittent drainage channel. Fencing should be placed along the outside edge of the dripline of the tree or grove of trees. The construction fencing should be maintained in a functional manner throughout the site construction period and should be inspected periodically by the contractor and City of Scotts Valley personnel for damage and proper functioning. No equipment staging, vehicle parking or other activities shall occur within the protected riparian area.
- 1.2 To minimize sediments entering the intermittent creek, the project should implement best management practices, including:
 - Conduct construction activities within 20 feet of the riparian woodland during the dry season;
 - Incorporate measures to filter and entrap pollutants prior to their discharge into the creek or other downstream drainage features that lead to Carbonera Creek.
 - Stabilize disturbed soils to minimize erosion and sediment input to the creek;

- Implement erosion control measures to prevent sediment from entering the creek channel, including the use of silt fencing or fiber rolls to trap sediments;
 - Conduct erosion control seeding of all disturbed areas as soon as practicable after disturbance following construction;
 - Monitor the effectiveness of the erosion control measures during the first year's rainy season and implement remedial measures (e.g., reseeding, repair of silt fencing) if sedimentation or erosion is noted.
- 1.3 Occurrences of invasive, non-native plant species (i.e., French broom, bull thistle) should be removed from the riparian woodland prior to project completion.

MM BIO-2: Oak Riparian Woodland Post-Construction

Prior to issuance of the building permit, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City compliance with the following:

- 2.1 All lighting features shall be directed away from the oak riparian woodland, such that the woodland is not illuminated. Homeowners/tenants shall not be allowed to install night lighting that illuminates the riparian woodland.
- 2.2 Future landowners/tenants should not utilize invasive, non-native plant species for landscaping. Plant species that should not be used on the property include all plants recognized as exotic pest plants by Cal-IPC (see Exotic Pest Plants of Greatest Ecological Concern in California, www.cal-ipc.org). This list includes: all brooms (i.e., French broom, Spanish broom and Scotch broom), periwinkle (*Vinca sp.*), Cape (or German) ivy, English ivy, Algerian ivy, acacia (all kinds), eucalyptus (all kinds), all pines, cotoneaster, and pyracantha. If evidence of the fungus responsible for Sudden Oak Death (*Phytophthora sp.*) is detected on the property, the homeowners should implement measures to prevent/control the spread of this fungus both on and off-site. The homeowners should be responsible for implementing the most current disease-preventing measures for the use, storage and/or transporting of oak firewood as a means of minimizing the spread of the disease within the City, the County and the State of California. Preventative and treatment measures should also be implemented as recommended. Current information on this disease and recommended treatments is available through the California Oak Mortality Task Force, University of California Cooperative Extension, Sudden Oak Death website (<http://cemarin.ucdavis.edu>).

State and Federal Regulated Waterways and Federal Wetlands

Development of the project would occur adjacent to regulated waterway. The project is located near California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) and Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCD) regulatory jurisdiction, however, proposed residential development is located outside of the oak riparian woodland dripline. As shown in **Figure 9: Oak Riparian Woodland Habitat**, construction would not require the removal of vegetation in the streambank, nor on

the top of the bank of the dry creek, within regulated areas by the CDFW and RWQCD. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with regulated waterways.

Special Status Species, Wildlife Corridors, and Nursery Sites

The only special status wildlife species that may occur within or immediately adjacent to the project site is the San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat. The woodrats may be present in above-ground stick nests. Additionally, nesting birds may occur in or adjacent to the project work area. No other special status wildlife species occur within the project area.

Because most nesting birds are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the project would implement the mitigation measure listed below to avoid potential impacts if any active bird nests are present during vegetation removal. The mitigation measure below would also reduce potential impacts to the woodrats and nesting birds. While none were identified during the May 2019 survey, the project site is suitable habitat for the San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat. Therefore, implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce impacts associated with special status species and nursery sites to a less than significant level.

MM BIO-4: Protection of Sensitive Animal Species

Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the project applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City the following:

1. The landowner shall hire a qualified biologist to search for San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat nests. If any are found and impacts to the nests cannot be avoided, the applicant shall seek written approval from CDFW to implement a trapping and relocation program. Wood rat nests shall not be disturbed without prior written approval from CDFW.
2. If construction is scheduled to begin between March 1 and August 15 of any given year, the landowner shall hire a qualified biologist to conduct a search for active bird nests in the vicinity of the work site (following CDFW survey protocols). If active bird nests are observed, the work shall be postponed until the biologist determines that all chicks have fledged the nest(s).

Conflict with Local Polices, HCP or NCCP, or Other Conservation Plan

As shown in **Figure 6: Grading Plan**, which reflects the revised site plan dated 5/12/2020, the revised Grading Plan preserves most of the oak riparian woodland on the property. The footprint of the buildings are located outside of the dripline of the oak riparian woodland and all but two oak trees (T39 and T40, located on the southeast corner of Lot 7) would be retained.

Some grading would occur within the dripline of oak trees that are to be retained. The Revised Arborists Report analyzed the revised grading plan relative to trees and found that up to six trees may be affected by the project. Some trees would still require targeted clearance pruning for grading equipment (T29 and T30) and hand grading may be required near them. Impacts to

two trees (T35 and T38), adjacent to Lot 6 may be greater, and would likely need to be removed. The Revised Arborists Report also indicated that the future growing conditions for most of the oaks would slightly improve, as more soil would be retained allowing for a larger rooting area.

The Revised Arborists Report recommended tree replacement to compensate for the removal and limbing of the identified trees at a 2:1 tree replacement using 15-gallon or 24-inch box size trees and identifies an open area east of Lot 7 be used for the tree replacement plantings. This recommendation is consistent with City regulations, as described above.

Standard conditions of project approval require the project applicant to implement all measures contained within the Revised Arborists Report for the protection of existing trees to remain, including but not limited to the required procedures and sequence, required tree replacement, tree preservation and protection, and appraised value of preserved trees in the report.

A habitat survey report for the endangered Mount Hermon June Beetle and Zayante Band Wing grasshopper was prepared by Entomological Consulting Services, Ltd., dated July 14, 2005. Due to the absence of indigenous sand parkland vegetation and sunlight, barren Zayante sandy soils, and habitat conditions, the report concluded that the project site was not suitable for the Zayante Band Wing grasshopper. Similarly, due to the absence of Ponderosa pines and Zayante sands, habitat conditions are not suitable for the Mount Hermon June Beetle.

Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or applicable HCP's and there would be no impact.

Findings

The project would comply with the City's standard conditions of approval wherein protected tree removals are compensated at a minimum of 2:1 ratio. Additionally, through implementation of **MM BIO-1** and **MM BIO-2**, impacts associated with vegetation, wildlife, riparian woodland, and other biological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Cultural Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to in § 15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?			X	
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			X	

Discussion

Cultural Resources

The Scotts Valley 1994 General Plan, Figure OS-2 ("Archeological Sensitivity Zones"), indicates that the project site is located within areas of moderate and high archaeological sensitivity.

An Extended Phase I Archeological Assessment (Albion Environmental, Inc., March 2020) was prepared for the project site in 2020 (Albion Environmental, Inc., March 2020). After reviewing the record search results, Albion conducted an intensive pedestrian survey and limited trenching and auguring of the project area. Visual inspection surface and small-scale subsurface excavations revealed no evidence of intact prehistoric or historic-era archaeological deposits. However, due to the proximity of archeological site SCR-177/H, it was recommended that archeological and Native American monitoring occur during all ground-disturbing activities.

Standard conditions of approval for development require that the project applicant and construction contractor ensure that any cultural resource, including archaeological, paleontological, or human remains are not destroyed if discovered during project grading or other subsurface work.

As part of the standard conditions of approval, the project applicant shall submit a copy of a contract with a qualified/registered archaeologist to conduct monitoring of all earth disturbing activities for review and approval by the Community Development Director, before grading

permit issuance. The project applicant shall include this requirement in the contract for all contractors involved with grading and subsurface work. The qualified/registered archaeologist shall monitor all earthwork activity as described below:

1. An archaeologist shall monitor the grading or excavation of soils at the development site in order to determine if important cultural remains are present. Such monitoring shall begin before and occur during subsurface earth moving activities;
2. The duration and period of archaeological monitoring of project development activities shall be at the discretion of the professional archaeologist. At a minimum, however, any activity that initially displaces or removes original soil from its present context shall be monitored by an archaeologist on a continuous basis;
3. Monitoring activities such as replacing soils in trenches, redistributing displaced soil elsewhere on the development site, or removing stockpiled excavated soil may not require monitoring;
4. Monitoring may include the periodic sampling and screening of soils in order to better determine if cultural remains are present; and,
5. If any cultural resources are discovered, the project contractor shall immediately stop all earth disturbing work within a 150-foot radius of the discovery to allow for inspection, evaluation, and potential recovery of resources by the supervising project archaeologist, before resuming any earth-disturbing construction activities. The project applicant shall also contact the Planning Department and Building Official as soon as work has been stopped. It may be necessary to resume grading or excavation activities under the direction of the supervising archaeologist in order to locate or expose cultural remains.

Standard conditions of approval require that the project applicant and construction contractor ensure that paleontological resources are not destroyed during project grading by implementing following measures:

- 1) Provide the project paleontologist with a copy of the final grading plans for review prior to any project grading;
- 2) Provide for daily monitoring during grading activities by the project paleontologist to determine if paleontological resources are encountered in excavated areas;
- 3) Allow for the recovery of any discovered paleontological resources according to a recovery plan/methods specified by the project paleontologist, including the donation of the recovered resources to a suitable repository (museum, school, etc.);
- 4) If recovery occurs, ensure that the project paleontologist prepare a recovery report that details the type of resources recovered and the repository locations where they were taken; and,
- 5) Specify in the construction contract with the project grading contractor(s), that grading personnel are to cooperate with and assist the project paleontologist during monitoring and any recovery activities, including assisting with recovery efforts if necessary.

Human Remains

No known human remains are located on the project site. Pursuant to section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, if human remains are discovered, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the discovery site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the project applicant has complied with the provisions of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

Findings

As discussed above, due to the proximity of archeological site SCR-177/H, archeological and Native American monitoring during all ground-disturbing activities would be required as a standard condition of approval, which would reduce any potential impacts associated with cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Energy

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X

Discussion

Energy consumption associated with construction of the project would be temporary and short-term. Project design and operation would comply with State Building Energy Efficiency Standards, appliance efficiency regulations, and green building standards. Additionally, the project includes other design features including efficient low-energy lighting, and natural ventilation systems.

The project would also be required to be built according to City and State energy efficiency standards. The project would be required to comply with existing regulations, including

applicable measures from the City's General Plan. Vehicle trips and energy consumption would be less carbon intensive as compared to historic levels due to statewide compliance with future low carbon fuel standard amendments and increasingly stringent Renewable Portfolio Standards).

Findings

The project would comply with existing State energy standards and would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. There would be no impact to energy.

Geology and Soils

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Discussion

Earthquake Faults, Landslides, and Seismic Ground Shaking

Project construction would subject the buildings and their inhabitants to periodic seismic shaking associated with the San Andreas Fault and other active faults within the Monterey Bay area. As part of any future Planned Development application submitted to the City of Scotts Valley, the project applicant would be required to submit plans that are in compliance with the latest California Building Code (CBC) standards consistent with Title 15 – Buildings and Construction of the Scotts Valley Municipal Code.

Prior to approval of any entitlements, City staff is required to review project plans and verify that the CBC Seismic requirements are printed on the plans. Building Division staff shall verify

that CBC standards are met prior to issuance of Building Permits. Building inspectors shall conduct site inspections to assure that construction occurs consistent with approved plans.

The Scotts Valley 1994 General Plan, Figure S-3 ("Liquefaction Potential") indicates that the project site is not in an area for liquefaction. Figure S-4 ("Landslide Deposits") indicates that the site is in an area containing landslide deposits. Figure S-5 ("Slopes"), indicate that the project site is not located within any mapped geological hazard areas. Per the earthquake hazard zones defined by the Alquist-Priolo map, the risk of earthquake-induced ground rupture occurring across the project site is moderately low.

A geotechnical investigation was prepared by Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc. (Haro, Kasunich & Associates, November 2005) determined that given the project site is generally level, the potential for seismically induced landslides are low. As a standard condition of approval, an updated geotechnical report would be required for review and approval by the City prior to issuance of a building permit.

Because compliance with Title 15 – Buildings and Construction of the Scotts Valley Municipal Code is required for all future project, potential impacts associated with earthquake-related ground rupture would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Soil Erosion

The project would involve the removal of landscape vegetation and grading activities associated with the construction of buildings, infrastructure, and roads. Grading would largely be limited to the project site, which would limit the amount of exposed soil area that would be subject to erosion. Measures to control erosion would be incorporated into the construction specifications pursuant to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for construction. In addition, to comply with the NPDES requirements for construction, projects involving construction on sites that are one acre or more are required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that specifies how the discharger would protect water quality during construction activities. Compliance with the erosion control ordinances and acquisition of the NPDES General Permit for construction activities would ensure that soil erosion impacts associated with development pursuant to the project would be less than significant.

Sewage Disposal

The project would involve disposal of wastewater through the City's existing sanitary sewer system, and there would be no septic systems constructed as part of the project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Unique Geological Features and Paleontological Resources

There are no known paleontological resources on the project site. However, development of the project could result in the discovery and disturbance of previously unknown or undiscovered paleontological resources. Should evidence of paleontological resources be

encountered during grading and construction, adherence to City, State, and Federal historic preservation laws, regulations, and codes related to archaeological and paleontological resources would ensure the adequate protection of historic and pre-historic resources. With implementation of existing regulations, the impact would be less than significant.

Findings

Compliance with Title 15 – Buildings and Construction of the Scotts Valley Municipal Code and NPDES requirements would reduce any potential impacts associated with geological and soil resources to a less than significant impact. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

Discussion

Construction

Construction of the project would result in direct emissions of CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄ from the operation of construction equipment and the transport of materials. MBARD does not have a threshold for construction GHG emissions, which would be one-time, short-term emissions and therefore would not significantly contribute to long-term cumulative GHG emissions impacts of the project. In the absence of quantitative significance thresholds in CEQA guidance, this analysis turns to other programs. For example, the CARB Mandatory Reporting program requirements are triggered for sources of GHG emissions exceeding 2,500 MTCO₂e) per year. AB 32 requires California agencies to take actions that reduce GHG emissions by 2020 to the levels of 1990, and then substantially further reduce emissions by 2050. Most individual projects do not generate sufficient GHGs to create a project-specific impact to significantly influence climate change; therefore this impact typically involves an analysis to determine if a

project's GHG emissions are cumulatively considerable (significant cumulative impact). Once construction is complete, the generation of construction-related GHG emissions would cease. The project is not expected to exceed the CARB Mandatory Reporting applicability level of 2,500 MTCO₂e per year. As a result, the short-term emission of GHG during construction would be less than significant

Operational

Operational or long-term emissions would occur over the project's life. GHG emissions would result from direct emissions such as project generated vehicular traffic, on-site combustion of natural gas, and operation of any landscaping equipment. Operational GHG emissions would also result from indirect sources, such as off-site generation of electrical power over the life of the project, the energy required to convey water to, and wastewater from the project site, the emissions associated with solid waste generated from the project site, and any fugitive refrigerants from air conditioning or refrigerators. The project would meet CalGreen and CBC standards for energy efficiency standards including passive solar design and natural ventilation and natural lighting.

Additionally, the project includes water-efficient landscape, water-reducing features, and low-impact development practices to reduce water use. The project is an example of "smart growth" strategies based on infill, density, and unit types. Energy use of the completed residential units would be less than similar units constructed in previous years because their construction is required to comply with the energy efficiency standards of the California Building Code. All these factors result in a project that would not significantly contribute to a cumulative GHG impact. Thus, impacts would be considered less than significant.

Findings

While some GHGs would be generated as a result of development of the project, its contribution to GHGs would not be cumulatively considerable and there would not be any significant impacts associated with GHGs. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine			x	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b) 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?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

Discussion

Hazardous Substances

Regarding on-site hazards, the project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No records of the project site were found pertaining to open cases of LUSTs, toxic releases, or site cleanup requirements. The project site is located adjacent to a known hazardous materials site at 7 Erba Lane (southwest of the project site) due to diesel contamination². Given the distance from the project site and the propensity for diesel to migrate downward and not laterally in sandy soils, impacts from the known hazardous site to the subject parcel and the proposed use are unlikely.

It is likely that oils, lubricants, and similar materials may be used to maintain and/or fuel construction vehicles and machinery during the construction phase of the project. Standard conditions of approval require the project applicant to have the construction contractor implement a best management practice/hazardous materials containment plan during the entire time construction activities are occurring. The hazardous materials containment plan shall contain the following elements:

- Stationary equipment such as motors, pumps, welding equipment shall be placed over drip pans or other containment apparatus.
- Construction materials shall not be stockpiled or stored where they could be accidentally discharged downslope or in to Scotts Valley Drive.
- Any petroleum, lubricants or other hazardous materials used during; and, construction shall be stored in a special storage location equipped with double containment and this location shall be shown on the erosion control plan and approved by the agencies that review this plan.

² County of Santa Cruz, Environmental Health Department. Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Service files: Search by Address. Accessed at <https://sccdcs.santacruzcounty.us/ENV/CustomSearch.aspx?SearchName=AllPrograms&repo=EnvironmentalHealth>. Accessed on February 9, 2021.

The project's residential uses may involve use and storage of some materials that are considered hazardous, although these materials are typically limited to everyday use solvents, paints, chemicals used for cleaning and building maintenance, and landscaping supplies. These materials would not be substantially different from household chemicals and solvents already in use throughout the City. Therefore, impacts associated with hazardous substances would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Release of Substances Near Schools

The project is located within one-quarter mile of the Scotts Valley Unified School, approximately 700 feet south of the project site. However, project construction and operation would not involve the emission of hazardous materials, therefore impacts would be considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Emergency Response

General Plan Safety Element Figure S-6 "Evacuation Routes" shows Scotts Valley Drive as a primary evacuation route in the City's Emergency Response Plan. Construction of the project would not change the function of Scotts Valley Drive as a primary evacuation route. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on emergency response.

Public Airport or Private Airstrip

The project site is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Wildland Fire

Refer to the **Wildfire** Section below for further discussion.

Findings

The project site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites, nor would the residential use involve the use of hazardous materials that would require permitting by the Santa County Health Department and therefore impacts would be less than significant. The project would not impact the City's primary evacuation routes, nor is it located within two miles of an airport, and therefore there would be no impacts. No mitigation is required.

Hydrology and Water Quality

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?				X
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:			X	
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?			X	
iii. 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?			X	
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

Discussion

Groundwater Demand

According to the project plans, the project would use approximately 1,485 gallons per day (or two acre-feet of water per year) of water. The Scotts Valley Water District has reviewed the application and has determined that existing water resources would support the proposed development (SVWD Will Serve Letter, dated March 5, 2020). Therefore, there would be no impact.

Groundwater Recharge

The project is located in an area designated on the Scotts Valley General Plan Hydrological Resources Map, Figure OS-5, as a Potential Groundwater Recharge Area. Per the Open Space and Conservation Policy OSA-343 of the Scotts Valley General Plan, all proposed construction in a Potential Groundwater Recharge Area requires a detailed hydrological evaluation to mitigate the loss of recharge.

According to the Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan (Bowman & Williams, September 2018), the existing paved project site contains 32,280 sq. ft. of impervious surface area. Redevelopment would reduce the amount of impervious surface area to 25,924 sq. ft. resulting in a net addition of impervious surface area by 4,345 sq. ft., resulting in an improvement to groundwater recharge as compared to existing conditions. Additionally, the project would incorporate various low impact development design strategies such as the use of permeable pavements, dispersal of runoff of pervious areas, and stormwater control measures that would assist in improving groundwater conditions. Therefore, there would be no impact and no mitigation is required.

Stormwater Runoff

The project applicant prepared a Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan (PSCP) (Bowman & Williams, 9/10/2018) to address potential impacts from stormwater runoff. The PSCP described

project site-specific best management practices (BMPs) to control erosion and sedimentation and maintain water quality in accordance with the current edition of the City of Scotts Valley Stormwater Technical Guide. The BMPs address the construction and maintenance of storm drain inlets, irrigation and use of pesticides, maintenance of hardscapes, and maintenance of underground stormwater facilities.

Furthermore, standard conditions of approval require the developer and construction contractor to implement best management practices to prevent sedimentation and discharge of contaminants off-site during project construction, including hazardous materials containment plan during the entire time construction activities are occurring. The hazardous materials containment plan shall contain the following elements:

- Stationary equipment such as motors, pumps, welding equipment shall be placed over drip pans or other containment apparatus.
- Construction materials shall not be stockpiled or stored where they could be accidentally discharged downslope or in to Scotts Valley Drive.
- Any petroleum, lubricants or other hazardous materials used during; and, construction shall be stored in a special storage location equipped with double containment and this location shall be shown on the erosion control plan and approved by the agencies that review this plan.

Implementation of recommendations as described in the PSCP and preparation of a SWPPP for review and approval prior to construction activities would ensure that impacts from stormwater runoff would be less than significant.

Floodplains, Seiche, Tsunami and Mudflow Related Hazards

The property is not located within a floodplain. There is no possibility of a seiche or tsunami occurring that could affect the project. The project is not located on or near a lake or ocean coastline. Therefore, the project would have no impacts.

Findings

Implementation of recommendations as described in the PSCP and preparation of a SWPPP would reduce impacts on hydrology and water resources to a level of less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Land Use and Planning

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

Discussion

Surrounding the project site is the Scotts Valley Fire Department and single-family residential to the west, Scotts Valley City Hall, and MacDorsa Park to the north and east, and office buildings to the east between the project site and Scotts Valley Drive. The corner of Erba Lane and Scotts Valley Drive is a landscape supply company.

The project site is currently zoned Residential High Density (R-H). Additionally, the project site is designated under the City of Scotts Valley General Plan as Residential High Density (R-H), which allows for 9 to 15 residential units. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the existing zoning and General Plan land use designations.

Findings

The proposed future residential use of the site would be in keeping with surrounding land uses and the development pattern of the neighborhood. The project would have no impact and therefore no mitigation is required.

Mineral Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Discussion

The Scotts Valley 1994 General Plan, Figure OS 4, indicates that there are no significant mineral deposits on the project site. The project is not located in an area known to contain regionally significant mineral resources and would not result in the loss of the availability of a known mineral resource of regional value. Additionally, the project site is not located in an area that has been identified by the City of Scotts Valley as a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

Findings

The project would have no impact and therefore no mitigation is required.

Noise

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the			X	

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Discussion

Short Term Noise Levels

Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and varies depending on the nature or phase of construction (e.g. land clearing, grading, excavation, paving). Noise generated by construction equipment, including earth movers, material handlers, and portable generators, can reach high levels. During construction, exterior noise levels could affect the residential neighborhoods surrounding the construction site. Project construction would occur adjacent to existing single-family residences on Erba Lane. However, construction activities would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated at a single point near sensitive receptors.

Project construction would comply with the City's Municipal Code Section 17.46.160, which states that all construction activity shall be limited to the hours between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 9 a.m. through 5 p.m. on Saturday. No construction activity is allowed on Sunday. These permitted hours of construction are included in the code in recognition that construction activities undertaken during daytime hours are a typical part of living in an urban environment and do not cause a significant disruption. Construction would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated or confined in the area directly adjacent to sensory receptors. Therefore, construction noise would be acoustically dispersed throughout the project site and impacts would be less than significant.

Long Term Noise Levels

The Noise Contour Map for the City indicates that the project site is in an area of less than 60dBA. The Noise Element of the Scotts Valley General Plan specifies that "exterior noise levels measured at the property line of proposed new residential developments shall be limited to or below an average annual day-night level of 60 dBA" (NA-454).

Implementation of the project would create new sources of noise in the project vicinity from residential sources, mechanical equipment, and landscape maintenance. These noise sources would be similar to those generated in other residential neighborhoods throughout the City. Such noise would primarily occur during the "daytime" activity hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Furthermore, the residences would be required to comply with the noise standards set forth in the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. Per General Plan Policies LP-38, NA-457, NO-441, and NA-444 land uses which include residential uses should not be allowed in areas with excessive noise. Therefore, there would be no impact from long-term noise levels.

Exposure to Groundborne Vibrations

Because the project would not require the use of heavy construction equipment, the residences located approximately 30 feet from the project's construction area would not be exposed to vibrations levels exceeding the FTA's 0.20 in/sec PPV significance threshold vibrations. Therefore, there would be no vibration impacts.

Future project residents may experience occasional groundborne vibrations from nearby traffic on Scotts Valley Drive when large trucks use the roadway. But this vibration is not expected to be frequent nor at high levels. This impact is less than significant.

Airport or Private Airstrip Noise

The project site is not located within any airport noise impact contours and not located within the vicinity of any private air strip, and therefore there would be no impact.

Findings

The project would not expose future residential uses to short-term construction nor long-term operational noise levels in excess of City standards. Noise generated during the construction phase is temporary and would be limited to Monday-Saturday daytime hours per compliance with the City's Municipal Code Section 17.46.160. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Population and Housing

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion

The project would result in a relatively small increase in population (27 persons³) that is well within the land use buildout capacity projections identified within the City of Scotts Valley General Plan (1994) as well as the Association of Monterey Bay Area Government's 2018 Regional Growth Forecast for the City of Scotts Valley population of 12,418 by 2040. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Findings

There is no potential for a significant impact due to substantial growth either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the project would have a no impact and no mitigation is required.

³ . The average household size for Scotts Valley is 2.67 persons which estimates 27 persons for a project with 10 units

Public Services

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?				X
ii) Police protection?				X
iii) Schools?				X
iv) Parks?				X
v) Other public facilities?				X

Discussion

Fire Services

The project is located in an existing urban area that is currently served by the Scotts Valley Fire Protection District. The closest fire station is located across the street from the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Police Services

The project would add new residents to the City who would occasionally need police services. This type of additional service would not generate a demand beyond what the police department can accommodate. The Scotts Valley Police department is located west and adjacent to the project site at City Hall. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Schools

The project would add approximately 27 new residents to the City, some of whom would be students attending schools within the Scotts Valley Unified School District. These additional students would not generate a significant demand on the area school system and therefore there would be no impact.

Parks

The project would add approximately 27 new residents to the City who would occasionally utilize City parks and recreational programs; however, this additional use would not generate a demand beyond what the City Parks Department can accommodate and no new additional park facilities would be required. Additionally, as a standard condition of the approval, the project would be required to pay a parks and recreation in-lieu fee as part of their building permit. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Other Public Facilities

The project does not have the potential to affect other public facilities, in excess of that previously considered by the General Plan. Therefore, there would be no impact

Findings

The project would have no impact on public services and therefore no mitigation is required.

Recreation

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Would the project 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?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Discussion

Scotts Valley has a total of seven parks, ranging in size from a half-acre to 7.5 acres. Recreational facilities are also available at local schools, the Scotts Valley Senior Center, and Scotts Valley Community Center. The proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities and therefore there would be no impact. Additionally, standard conditions require the developer pay an in-lieu park fee.

Finding

No significant impacts to recreation and open space resources are expected. Thus, the thresholds of significance have not been exceeded. Payment of Park Impact fees would mitigate the incremental increase created by the project.

Transportation

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				X
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?				X
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

Discussion

Conflict with City Policies or Programs, Increase Hazards, Impair Emergency Access

The project would involve the construction of a new 24 foot-wide private roadway that would provide access to six of the residential units. The design of the roadway would be consistent with City standards and subject to design review to ensure there is adequate emergency vehicle access. The frontage along Erba Lane would be improved with a sidewalk, curb and gutter landscaped buffer, and on-street parking; consistent with City standards. Therefore, there would be no impact

Increase Vehicle Miles Travelled

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is a measure of total vehicular travel that accounts for the number of vehicle trips and the length of those trips. Because the City of Scotts Valley has not formally adopted VMT significance criteria, this CEQA analysis uses guidance per the City of Scotts Valley's VMT Implementation Guidelines (Kimley-Horn and Associates, July 2020).

The VMT Implementation include screening criteria to avoid unnecessary analysis and findings for non-significant transportation impacts. Small projects that generate less than 110 trips per day are exempt from VMT analysis.

Project trip generation was estimated by applying the proposed type of development to the appropriate trip generation rates published in the *Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition (2012)*. The ITE estimated rate for single-family housing is 10.67 average daily trips per household (ITE Code 210). This would result in 106.7 trips per day for the project, which is less than the City's VMT Implementation Guidelines and as such, the project is exempt from further VMT analysis.

Furthermore, because the project would not generate more than 50 peak hour trips, it is exempt from preparing a traffic impact analysis per the City's Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (2003).

Findings

The project would not conflict with City policies or programs regarding the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The project would not cause a hazard nor impair emergency access. The project is considered a "small project" per the City VMT Implementation Guidelines and is exempt to further analysis. Therefore there would be no impacts to transportation and no mitigation is required.

Tribal Cultural Resources

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				X
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?				X
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural				X

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California				

Discussion

Section 21080.3.1(b) of the California Public Resources Code (AB 52) requires a lead agency formally notify a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated within the geographic area of the discretionary project when formally requested.

As of this writing, no California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Santa Cruz County region have formally requested a consultation with the City of Scotts Valley (as Lead Agency under CEQA) regarding Tribal Cultural Resources. As a result, no Tribal Cultural Resources are known to occur in or near the project area.

Findings

No California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Santa Cruz County region have formally requested a consultation with the City of Scotts Valley. Therefore, no impact to the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource is anticipated and no mitigation is required.

Utilities and Service Systems

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Discussion

Water Treatment Facilities

The 10 proposed residential units would result in a daily water demand of 1,485 gallons per day or approximately two-acre feet per year (AFY).⁴ Therefore, the proposed residential use would cause only a minimal increase on the demand for water and wastewater service. The Scotts Valley Water District has reviewed the application and has determined that existing water resources would support the proposed development. Thus, impacts are be considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities

The Wastewater Department has reviewed the proposed development and has determined that the existing wastewater treatment facilities would support the proposed development. The project would not generate solid waste in excess of that typically generated by 10 residential units. Thus, impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Electric Power, Natural Gas, or Telecommunications

The project would require new connections to PG&E for electricity and natural gas. In addition, the project would require new telecommunication connections with the respective service providers. The project site is surrounded by commercial development to the south, and east and single-family residential to the west, which are serviced by various dry utility providers. Because these utilities would be readily extended from existing infrastructure adjacent to the project site, impacts from the project would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Solid Waste

The project would generate approximately 122 pounds of daily solid waste.⁵ The 122 pounds of daily solid waste generated by the project would represent less than one percent of the daily permit capacities of Buena Vista and Monterey Peninsula landfills⁶, respectively. Therefore, both landfills have adequate capacity. Thus, impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

4 Daily Water Use Factor for High Density Residential is 55 (gallons per capita/day). (27 residents x 55 gallons/day) = 1,485 (gallons/day)

5 Daily Solid Waste Generation Rate for Residential Use is 12.23 pounds per day/unit (CalRecycle, 2019). (10 residential units x 12.23 pounds/day) = 122.3 pounds/day

6 The Buena Vista Sanitary Landfill is permitted to receive 838 tons of solid waste per day (CalRecycle, 2019). The Monterey Peninsula Landfill is permitted to receive 3,500 tons of solid waste per day.

Findings

Existing utilities and service systems are available to serve the project and no new facilities would be required to be constructed. Therefore, the project would have less than significant or no impacts associated to utilities and service systems, and no mitigation is required.

Wildfire

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

Discussion

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) has mapped the relative wildfire risk in areas of large population by intersecting residential housing density with proximate fire threat according to three risk levels, namely Moderate, High, and Very High. Wildfires are large-scale brush and grass fires in undeveloped areas. The project is within an urbanized area and not within a Very-High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as mapped by CALFIRE. Additionally, the project would incorporate all applicable fire safety code requirements, including fire protection devices in all residential units and appropriate fire-resistant landscaping on the project site, as required by the Scotts Valley Fire District, and therefore there would be no impact.

Findings

The project would not affect emergency response/evacuation plans, would not expose residents or structures to a wildfire risk, and would not exacerbate fire risk. Therefore, the project would have no impact to wildfires, and no mitigation is required.

Mandatory Findings of Significance

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Does the project:				
a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS Issues	Potentially Significant Issues	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion

As discussed in the individual sections, the project would not degrade the quality of the environment with the implementation of identified Standard Conditions of Approval and mitigation measures. As discussed in **Biological Resources**, mitigation measures **MM BIO-1: Oak Riparian Woodland -Project Construction** and **MM BIO-2: Oak Riparian Woodland -Post Construction** would reduce impacts to less than significant.

As described in the environmental resource sections of this Initial Study, the project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The project would result in temporary air quality and noise impacts during construction. With the implementation of the identified Standard Conditions of Approval, and consistency with adopted City policies, construction impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level. As described above, these impacts would be temporary and the project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts on air quality and noise impacts in the project area.

The project would have a less than significant impact or no impact on the remaining environmental resources and would not contribute to cumulative impacts to these resources. Therefore, the project would not cause a cumulatively considerable impact and no mitigation is required.


Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	X
I find that the project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the project MAY have a potentially significant or a potentially significant unless mitigated impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.	

Paula Bradley, MCP, AICP
Contract Planner

Date



Source: Google Earth, 2021

Figure 1: Regional Location

Bay Village Planned Development Project



Not to scale

Kimley»Horn
Expect More. Experience Better.



Source: Nearmaps, 2021

Figure 2: Project Vicinity
Bay Village Planned Development Project



Not to scale

Kimley»Horn
Expect More. Experience Better.




Source: Bowman & Williams, 2020

Figure 4: Proposed Project Rendering
Bay Village Planned Development Project



Not to scale

Kimley»Horn
Expect More. Experience Better.



Source: Bowman & Williams, 2020

Figure 7: Grading Plan


Bay Village Planned Development Project




Not to scale

Kimley-Horn

Expect More. Experience Better.





Source: David B. Zulim Inc., 2019

Figure 9: Oak Riparian Woodland Habitat

Bay Village Planned Development Project



Not to scale

Kimley»Horn

Expect More. Experience Better.