DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR THE

COPPERLEAF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

SAN JUAN BAUTISTA, SAN BENITO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Prepared for:

CITY OF SAN JUAN BAUTISTA

Roger Grimsley
311 2nd Street
San Juan Bautista, CA 94045

Prepared by:

OLBERDING ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
3170 Crow Canyon Place, Suite 260
San Ramon, California 94583
Phone: (925) 866-2111 ~ Fax: (925) 866-2126

APRIL 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

This document should be cited as: Olberding Environmental, Inc. April 2016. *Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Copperleaf Residential Development Project, City of San Juan Bautista, San Benito County, California*. Prepared for the City of San Juan Bautista, California.

A. SUMMARY OF PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Copperleaf Residential Development Project – Edenbridge Homes

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of San Juan Bautista
311 Second Street/ P.O. Box 1420
San Juan Bautista, CA 95045

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Roger Grimsley, Planning Director (cityplanning@san-juan-bautista.ca.us)
Office (831) 623-4661
Fax (831) 623-4093

4. Project Location:

The proposed Copperleaf residential development project (Project) is located north of Old San Juan Hollister Road in San Juan Bautista, California. Attachment 1, Figure 1 depicts the regional location of the Property in San Benito County, while Figure 2 illustrates the vicinity of the Property in relationship to the City of San Juan Bautista. Figure 3 identifies the location of the Property on a USGS 7.5 Quadrangle Map, while Figure 4 shows the site on an aerial photograph. All attachments, including Attachment 1 with Figures, follow the Initial Study.

5. Project Applicant:

Edenbridge Homes
Katharine Oesterreich, Project Manager
21771 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200A
Cupertino, California 95014
(669) 231-4246

6. General Plan Designation: Existing: County 2035 General Plan Land Use Map – Agriculture
Existing: City General Plan 2035 – Low Density Residential

7. Zoning: Existing: San Benito County – Agriculture (A)
Proposed: City of San Juan Bautista - Low-Density Residential (R-1)

8. City of San Juan Bautista land use applications under review for the proposed Project:

- Annexation to the City (ANNEX -2015-101)
- Preliminary Zoning (PZ-2015-101)
- Tentative Map (TM-2015-101)

The Project will also acquire ministerial permits, including grading, drainage and building permits, from the City prior to initiation of construction activities.

9. Legal Description:

The proposed Project site consists of all or portions of five separate parcels totaling approximately 12.52 acres of land in San Juan Bautista, California.

The site includes all of Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 012-130-031, 012-130-032 (existing pump structure), and 002-520-011(with an existing barn), as well as portions of APNs 012-130-121 and 012-130-023.

The site originally totaled 13.34 acres, however, portions of APNs 012-130-121, 012-130-023, comprising the fenced ranch complex area located at 102 Old San Juan Hollister Road, is no longer considered a part of the subject Project. The existing property owner is retaining the 0.82 acre fenced ranch complex area (Lot C) with an existing residence and various outbuildings.

10. Gross Project Density: Gross 12.52 acres with 45 lots = 3.59 lots per gross acre

11. Uses for This CEQA Document:

This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are intended to be used by the lead agency and any responsible agencies in conjunction with all permits, approvals, and entitlements required for the Project. The City of San Juan Bautista will act as the lead agency for the Project under the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Approval from the City of San Juan Bautista is required for the following discretionary entitlements:

- Annexation to the City (ANNEX -2015-101)
- Preliminary Zoning (PZ-2015-101)
- Tentative Map (TM-2015-101)

The Project will also acquire ministerial permits, including grading, drainage and building permits, from the City prior to initiation of construction activities.

12. Additional Permitting and Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Public Agencies with Approval Responsibilities include the followin**g:**

- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) - Flood mapping and insurance

Reviewing Agencies (without permits) include:

- Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Copperleaf Residential Development Project is a single family residential subdivision proposed by Edenbridge Homes (applicant) to be located on the north side of Old San Juan Hollister Road, about 300 feet east of the intersection with The Alameda/Salinas Grade Road, in the City of San Juan Bautista, California. State Highway 156 is adjacent to the Project's northern boundary. There are two entrances to the Project from the Old San Juan Hollister Road. No site access will be available from State Highway 156.

The subdivision will consist of 45 new single family residences with an open space area that includes a drainage retention pond. In addition, the Project will include curbs, gutter, sidewalks, street trees, landscaping, and street lighting that will complement the other residential neighborhoods in the City. A masonry sound wall (height varies upon location) will be constructed along the Project's northerly boundary with Highway 156. A public sidewalk will be provided along Old San Juan Hollister Road.

Utilities including water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, electrical, gas, telephone, cable TV, and communication facilities will serve each residence. The City of San Juan Bautista will service the Project's water, sanitary sewer and stormwater infrastructure. Electricity and gas will be provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, phone service by AT&T, and other communication-related utilities (wireless and cable services) will be available from private companies.

The applicant is requesting the City's approval of an Annexation, Rezoning and Vesting Tentative Map to allow subdivision of the site into 45 lots for single-family residences. Upon annexation, the site's General Plan designation would change from County Agriculture to City Low Density Residential, and its zoning would be changed from County Agriculture (A) to City Low-Density Residential (R-1).

To develop the proposed site, the land would be subdivided into lots that meet R-1 zone district criteria. The City's R-1 standards include: minimum lot area (gross) – 7,000 square feet; density range of 0.50 to 5 dwelling units per acre; and building coverage of 40 percent and a floor to area ratio (FAR) of 0.45. Setbacks minimums permitted under the R-1 zoning (Front-20 feet; Side-5 feet; and Rear – 20 feet) would be met, and the residences would not exceed the zone district's 2-story, 30-feet maximum height limitations.

The proposed Vesting Tentative Map shows 45 single-family residential lots ranging from about 7,020 to nearly 13,000 sq. ft. (See Figure 5). The majority of the lots are between 7,100 and 7,250 sq. ft. in size. The map also shows the 56-foot wide public road rights of way to access each lot, and three additional lots that would be used as indicated:

- Lot A Open Space with storm drainage retention/detention/water quality basin – 85,250 sq. ft.
- Lot B Municipal Well Site – 12,200 sq. ft.
- Lot C with Existing Structures to Remain – 35,700 sq. ft.

C. SITE DESCRIPTION

Existing Site Structures and Roads

A gravel and dirt driveway with a locked gate is present on the eastern end of the Project site, entering the site from Old San Juan Hollister Road. The road and a 12-inch water line lead to a small existing fenced enclosure that surrounds the municipal water-supply well owned by the City of San Juan Bautista. The enclosure contains a water well and a small structure that contains pumps and water-treatment equipment and supplies. Existing views of the site are shown in Attachment 3, Site Photographs.

An existing barn and fence are present on the western end of the site. The barn will be removed as part of development. A line of overhead PG&E power poles transect the site from north to south, and provide electricity to an existing residence. Additional power poles are located from east to west along the San Juan Hollister Highway.

Current Uses of Adjoining Properties

The site is bordered on the north by California State Highway 156, across which are residential and agricultural properties. The site is bordered on the south by Old San Juan Hollister Road, across which are lands zoned (County) agricultural in active row crop production. The site is bordered on the east by the Mission RV Park that is zoned high density residential (R-3).

Located at the southwest corner of the site (Lot C on the Tentative Map) is a ranch complex located at 102 Old San Juan Hollister Road that contains a residence, a garage and several out buildings used for storage. This ranch complex was historically associated with the subject site but is not part of the property proposed for redevelopment. West of the ranch complex is a 42-unit motel and additional vacant land, both zoned commercial. The vacant land is currently planned for development as a gasoline station with a convenience store/minimart.

Proposed Infrastructure Improvements

The Project roadways would include 56-foot rights-of way and cul-de-sac roadways, and a 60-foot right of way for the Old San Juan Hollister Highway. All streets would include curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Parking would be permitted on all interior streets. City of San Juan Bautista representatives indicate that the residential development proposed for the site will be supplied by local municipal sewer and water service. Water and sewer services would be provided via hookups to the City's existing systems, which would be extended on to the site from existing lines located within existing rights-of-way. Gas and electricity would be provided by extending existing PG&E lines to serve the proposed residences. The Project will include street lighting that would be shielded as required in the City's Dark Sky Ordinance.

Project Density

In keeping with the Project's R-1 zone district, the gross density of the Project is limited to five dwelling units/acre. This includes all street easements and the storm drainage retention/detention/water quality basin. The net effective density when excluding street areas and the detention basin area is approximately 5.34 units per acre. The proposed rezoning and general plan amendment to allow low-density residential development would allow densities between 0.5 and five dwelling units per acre. This development would meet the density limitations of the proposed R-1 zone district.

D. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project. Please see the checklist and discussion of each topic beginning on page 6 for additional information.

☒	Aesthetics	☒	Agriculture and Forestry	☒	Air Quality
☒	Biological Resources	☒	Cultural Resources	☒	Geology/Soils
☒	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☒	Hydrology/Water Quality
☒	Land Use/Planning	☐	Mineral Resources	☒	Noise
☒	Population/Housing	☒	Public Services	☒	Recreation
☒	Transportation/Traffic	☒	Utilities/Service Systems	☒	Mandatory Findings of Significance

E. LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: Roger Grimsley, City of San Juan Bautista Planning Director

Date: 4/11/16

F. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following Environmental Checklist contains the environmental checklist form presented in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The checklist form is used to describe the impacts of the proposed Project. A discussion follows each environmental issue identified in the checklist. Included in each discussion are Project specific mitigation measures recommended as appropriate as part of the proposed Project.

For this checklist, the following designations are used:

Potentially Significant Impact. An impact that could be significant, and for which no mitigation has been identified. If any potentially significant impacts are identified, an EIR must be prepared. However, if the analysis indicates that all such impacts can be avoided or mitigated to less-than-significant levels, a Mitigated Negative Declaration can be prepared.

Less Than Significant With Mitigation. An impact that could be significant but with the incorporation of clearly defined mitigation measures into the project, such impacts will be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels.

Less Than Significant Impact. Any impact that would not be considered significant under CEQA and the effect would not exceed a threshold of significance which has been established by the Lead or a Responsible Agency. No mitigation measures are required.

No Impact. The project would not have any impact.

I. AESTHETICS

AESTHETICS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Setting

The visual character of the Project site is a largely vacant field with trees clustered on its eastern end. A small municipal water supply well building is located in the eastern portion of the site, and a dilapidated barn is located on the western boundary. There is a ranch complex area, consisting of a small home and outbuildings, located on Lot C in the southwest. A row of trees along State Route 156 filters views from

the highway into the property, and motorists have a partial view of the field through the trees. There are only a few trees limiting views from the southern property line along the Old San Juan Hollister Highway.

The Property is bound by Highway (State Route 156) to the north and a substantially less traveled road, Old San Juan Hollister Road, to the south. The cluster of 2-story San Juan Inn (renamed Hacienda de Leal) buildings with their red tile roofs can be seen directly to the west, while the Mission Farm RV Park, located immediately to the east, is fully shielded from view by dense trees. A mix of residential development and agricultural land can be seen across State Route 156 to the north while irrigated row crops have been planted to the south. Rolling grass-covered hills are located to the far south. Existing views of the site are shown in Attachment 3, Site Photographs.

Discussion

a, c) The Project would change the existing views of the Project site from a primarily vacant field with mature trees to that of a residential development composed of single family detached homes. Overall, the current view would change from open, rural scenery to a single-family residential neighborhood with 45 homes, streets, landscaping, fences, sidewalks, street-lights, and a detention basin/open space parcel. The dilapidated barn would be removed, and the well structure would be relocated to the eastern end of the site. None of the nearby off-site structures, including the existing ranch complex, would be directly modified by the proposed development.

The Project's one-story and two-story homes will be visible from adjacent roads and open land toward the north and south directions of the site. Also, the proposed Project will be somewhat visible from the San Juan Inn and the existing ranch structures to the west. The Mission Farm RV Park, located immediately to the east, would continue to be shielded from view by dense trees.

This low-density suburban development would extend residential uses from existing city neighborhoods into a mixed commercial/agricultural area. However because the site would continue to be surrounded by sparsely developed open fields to the north and south and the pre-existing Mission Farm RV Park to the west, the proposed development would not disrupt or create a significant impact on the existing area's rural visual quality and character.

The Project would include a landscaping plan, plus fencing around the south, east and west perimeter of the Project. The existing row of large trees that partially obscures views of the site from State Route 156 would remain and a masonry noise wall (height varying) would be added to the north. In addition, the proposed houses and other development features would be guided by the City's General Plan 2035 policies (City, 2016a) and subject to the City's site plan and design review permit process, as described in the City's Municipal Code, Title 11 – Zoning (City, 2016c). Although the site's visual character would be changed from a field to residential, the impact on the existing scenic vista and visual quality of the site and its surroundings would be ***less than significant after mitigation*** Measure AESTHETICS-1, below.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure AESTHETICS-1: Site Plan and Landscape Plan

AES-1 The applicant shall submit for review a Project site plan that shows design features including a landscape and irrigation plan to the City prior to approval of the Final Map. The site plan and landscaping design shall depict the types of vegetation planned for areas adjacent to driveways, streets, and storm drainage areas, as well as landscaping of the individual residences to complement the planned architectural design and to uphold the visual quality of the site. The landscape plan shall also depict Project sound walls (along State Route 156) per the noise study, plus fences, and other design features. The Project shall meet the City's site plan and design review standards, as outlined in the City's Municipal Code, and General Plan 2035 Conservation Policy that supports use of local native plant species for landscaping, and avoidance of invasive plant species.

b) The Project would not damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. None of the adjoining roadways are designated as a State Scenic Highway (2035 San Benito County General Plan EIR, February 2013, p 5-7) and there are no historic buildings, rock outcroppings or trees of significant scenic value located on or adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, there are ***no impacts*** on scenic resources.

d) The Project would provide street and residential outdoor lighting fixtures, but it would not be a substantial source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area because the Project would be required to submit a lighting plan and show compliance with the City's Dark Sky Ordinance. The lighting plan would minimize the light and glare created by the development in order to protect the night views of the area. The City's Dark Sky Ordinance is intended to create standards for outdoor lighting in San Juan Bautista to minimize light pollution (a.k.a., "sky glow"), glare, waste, and light trespass caused by inappropriate or misaligned light fixtures, while improving nighttime public safety, utility security, and preserving the night sky as a valued natural resource in the community. (Ordinance Number. 2007 - 07 of the City Council of the City of San Juan Bautista Adding Section 11.13 ("Lighting") to Title 11 of the SJB Municipal Code, p 1-2)

Additional light from the Project could adversely affect nearby residents but this impact would be reduced to a ***less-than-significant after mitigation*** Measure AESTHETICS-2, below.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure AESTHETICS-2: Lighting Plan

AES-2 The applicant shall submit a lighting plan for the Project conforming to the City's dark sky regulations and standards, with provisions for shields on all lighting fixtures. All light fixtures shall be directed into the Project site.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

The Project site is comprised of land classified by the State as Farmland of Local Potential. No Prime, Grazing, Unique, or Farmlands of Statewide Importance are mapped as existing on the site (California Farmland Mapping Program, California Important Farmland Finder, accessed May 8, 2015). The Project site is not under Williamson Act contract (Oesterreich pers. com, April 2015). No forest resources exist on the site, which is composed primarily of open fields of ruderal non-native grassland vegetation.

Discussion

a) The Project would have ***no impact*** on conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program because no such designated lands are mapped on the site. The Project would result in the conversion of approximately 12.5 acres of ruderal non-native grassland habitat to urban uses, which would not result in conversion of important farmland to non-agricultural uses.

b) The Project proposes to change the site's existing zone district to low-density residential. The tentative map and use of the property to construct detached, single family homes would be consistent with the

current general plan and also consistent with the proposed zoning. As discussed above, the site is not under Williamson Act Contract, so ***no impacts*** associated with contract consistency would occur.

c, d) The Project would not affect forest lands or forest zoning because no such lands or zoning exist or are proposed on the site, therefore, ***no impacts***.

e) Lands directly across the Old San Juan Hollister Road to the south of the Project site as well as land to the northwest (north of Highway 156) are designated Prime by the State (California Farmland Mapping Program, California Important Farmland Finder, accessed May 8, 2015). Additional Prime farmland surrounds the City. In response, San Benito County has a "Right to Farm" ordinance. The ordinance addresses the problem of urban growth encroaching on agricultural land by seeking to reduce nuisance complaints about farm operations from residential neighbors. This is an educational and disclosure measure, not a regulatory requirement. Using several different disclosure methods, purchasers and existing owners of residential property are informed about the local importance of agriculture and the possible negative impacts of residing near normal farm operations. The ordinance is intended to protect existing farming operations from pressure to cease or curtail operations when residential development occurs nearby. With the County "Right to Farm" ordinance in place, Project impacts related to conversion of farmland would be ***less than significant***.

III. AIR RESOURCES

AIR RESOURCES: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

An air quality and greenhouse gas emissions assessment was prepared for the proposed Copperleaf Subdivision Project (Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., 2015a) in order to fully evaluate impacts to air resources. The study report is provided as Attachment 4 to this document.

The Project is located in the northern portion of San Benito County, which is in the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB or Air Basin). The NCCAB comprises a single air district, the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), which encompasses Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey counties. The MBUAPCD prepared the 2008 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and continues to prepare triennial updates (Triennial Plan Revision 2009–2011) to the AQMP in order to attain state and federal ambient air quality standards in the air basin. The AQMP and the triennial updates accommodate growth by projecting the growth in emissions based on different indicators. The most recent AQMP triennial update was adopted by the MBUAPCD Board of Directors on April 17, 2013.

Ambient Air Quality Standards: Ambient air quality standards have been established at both the State and federal level. The Air Basin meets all ambient air quality standards with the exception of ground-level ozone and respirable particulate matter (PM10). High ozone levels are caused by the cumulative emissions of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOX). These precursor pollutants react under certain meteorological conditions to form high ozone levels. Controlling the emissions of these precursor pollutants is the focus of the MBUAPCD's attempt to reduce ozone levels. Ambient air quality standards are provided in Table 1, below.

Toxic Air Contaminants: Toxic air contaminants (TACs) are a broad class of compounds known to cause morbidity or mortality and include, but are not limited to, the criteria air pollutants. TACs are found in ambient air, especially in urban areas, and are caused by industry, agriculture, fuel combustion, and commercial operations (e.g., dry cleaners). TACs are typically found in low concentrations, even near their source (e.g., diesel particulate matter near a freeway). Because chronic exposure can result in adverse health effects, TACs are regulated at the regional, State, and federal level.

Diesel exhaust is the predominant TAC in urban air and can be carcinogenic over long exposure durations. According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), diesel exhaust is a complex mixture of gases, vapors, and fine particles. This complexity makes the evaluation of health effects of diesel exhaust a complex scientific issue. Some of the chemicals in diesel exhaust, such as benzene and formaldehyde, have been previously identified as TACs by the CARB, and are listed as carcinogens either under the State's Proposition 65 or under the Federal Hazardous Air Pollutants programs.

CARB has adopted and implemented a number of regulations for stationary and mobile sources to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM). Several of these regulatory programs affect medium and heavy duty diesel trucks that represent the bulk of DPM emissions from California highways.

Table 1. Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standard	Federal Standard[a] – Primary[b,c]	Federal Standards[a] – Secondary[b,d]
Ozone (O_3)	8-hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m3)	0.075 ppm (147 µg/m3)	Same as primary
	1-hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m3)	—e	Same as primary
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	8-hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m3)	9 ppm (10 mg/m3)	—
	1-hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m3)	35 ppm (40 mg/m3)	—
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	Annual	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m3)	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m3)	Same as primary
	1-hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m3)	0.100 ppm[f] (188 µg/m3)	—
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	Annual	—	—g	—
	24-hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m3)	—g	—
	3-hour	—	—	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m3)
	1-hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m3)	0.075 ppm[g] (196 µg/m3)	—
PM_{10}	Annual	20 µg/m3	—	Same as primary
	24-hour	50 µg/m3	150 µg/m3	Same as primary
$PM_{2.5}$	Annual	12 µg/m3	12 µg/m3h	
	24-hour	No Separate State Standard	35 µg/m3	
Lead	Calendar Quarter	—	1.5 µg/m3	Same as primary
	30-day Average	1.5 µg/m3	—	—

Notes: ppm = parts per million
µg/m3 = micrograms per cubic meter
mg/m3 = milligrams per cubic meter
(a) California standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter (PM10, PM2.5, and visibility reducing particles), are not to be exceeded. National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth highest 8-hour concentration measured at each site in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM10, the 24 hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 µg/m3 is equal to or less than one. For PM2.5, the 24 hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over three years, are equal to or less than the standard.
(b) Concentrations are expressed first in units in which they were promulgated. Equivalent units given in parenthesis.
(c) Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health. Each state must attain the primary standards no later than 3 years after that state's implementation Plan is approved by the EPA.
(d) Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.
(e) The national 1-hour ozone standard was revoked by U.S. EPA on June 15, 2005. A new 8-hour standard was established in May 2008.
(f) The form of the 1-hour NO2 standard is the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average concentration.
(g) On June 2, 2010 the U.S. EPA established a new 1-hour SO2 standard, effective August 23, 2010, which is based on the 3-year average of the annual 99th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum. The EPA also revoked both the existing 24-hour and annual average SO2 standards.
(h) On December 14, 2012 the U.S. EPA strengthened the annual NAAQS for PM2.5 to 12.0 µg/m3

Significance Thresholds: In order to evaluate a project's contribution to air pollution, the MBUAPCD has established significance thresholds for emissions of criteria air pollutants. As the lead agency, the City utilizes the MBUAPCD's significance thresholds listed in Table 2, expressed in pounds per day (lbs./day), as air quality standards in the evaluation of air quality impacts associated with proposed development projects. Thus, if a project's emissions exceed the pollutant thresholds presented in Table 2, it would be considered to have a potentially significant effect on regional air quality and the attainment of federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Table 2. Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Criteria Air Pollutants	Construction Thresholds – Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs./day)	Operational Thresholds – Average Daily Emissions (lbs./day)
VOC	Not Applicable	137
NO_x	Not Applicable	137
CO	Not Applicable	550
PM_{10}	82	82
SO_2	Not Applicable	150
Note: VOC = volatile organic compound, NOX = nitrogen oxides, CO = carbon monoxide, PM10 = course particulate matter or particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers (μm) or less, and SO2 = sulfur dioxide.		

Sensitive Receptors: There are groups of people more affected by air pollution than others. CARB has identified the following persons who are most likely to be affected by air pollution: children under 14, the elderly over 65, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. These groups are classified as sensitive receptors. The closest sensitive receptors to the Project site are single-family residences across Old San Juan Hollister Road to the south, an existing ranch house on Lot C, and any longer-term RV residents to the east in the Mission RV Park. The Project would introduce new sensitive receptors in the form of new residences.

Discussion

a) The proposed Project would not generate population growth in excess of anticipated regional growth assessed in the AQMP therefore its implementation would result in ***less-than-significant*** air quality impacts.

b) As discussed above, the Project would have emissions less than the significance thresholds adopted by MBUAPCD for evaluating impacts to ozone and particulate matter. Therefore, the Project would not contribute substantially to existing or projected regional violations of those standards. Carbon monoxide emissions from traffic generated by the Project would be the pollutant of greatest concern at the local level. Congested intersections with a large volume of traffic have the greatest potential to cause high-localized concentrations of carbon monoxide. Air pollutant monitoring data indicate that carbon monoxide levels have been at healthy levels (i.e., below State and federal standards) for years. As a result, the region has been designated as attainment/unclassified for the standard. Also there are no roadway segments or intersections within the air basin that have traffic volumes that would approach levels under which CO emissions would exceed air quality standards, and no further emissions modeling for CO was

deemed necessary. Therefore, the Project does not have the potential to cause a CO violation at affected intersections and this impact would be ***less than significant.***

c) The California Emissions Estimator Model, Version 2013.2.2 (CalEEMod) was used to predict Project operational and construction emissions. CalEEMod output worksheets and construction assumptions are included in Attachment 1 of the Air Quality Assessment provided as an attachment to this IS/MND.

Construction Period Emissions

Emissions during construction were predicted using the CalEEMod model. Construction of the Project is anticipated to begin in mid- 2016.

Construction Exhaust Emissions: Construction exhaust emissions of ozone precursors VOC and NOX would be generated by both on-site activities, including diesel equipment such as dozers, tractors, graders, and pavers, and off-site activities due to materials hauling, and worker and vendor trips. However, based on MBUAPCD CEQA Guidelines, exhaust emissions from these typical construction activities would not result in a significant impact because their emissions are already accounted for the emissions inventories of the State- and federally-required air plans. They would not have a significant impact on the attainment and maintenance of the ozone AAQS and therefore, this impact would be considered ***less than significant.***

Construction Fugitive Dust and PM10 Emissions: During grading and construction activities, dust would be generated. Most of the dust would result during grading activities. CalEEMod modeling results indicated that construction of the Project could generate up to 17.3 pounds per day maximum of PM10 emissions during the first year of construction and grading activities, which would not exceed the MBUAPCD threshold of 82 pounds per day. This impact would be considered ***less than significant.***

While mitigation is not required in regards to PM10 emissions, several Best Management Practices (BMPs) are recommended to control dust and exhaust. These BMPs would be implemented by the Project contractor during grading and other ground disturbance activities to reduce the air quality impacts associated with grading and new construction:

1. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
2. Prohibit all grading activities during periods of high wind (i.e., over 15 mph);
3. Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand or loose materials;
4. Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible after construction and grading;
5. Cover inactive storage piles;
6. Install wheel washers at the entrance to the construction site for all existing trucks;
7. Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site; and
8. Post a publicly visible sign which specifies the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the MBUAPCD shall be visible.

Operational Period Emissions

The CalEEMod model along with the Project vehicle trip generation rates (HMM, 2015) were used to predict operational period air pollutant emissions associated with operation of a fully developed site under the proposed Project. The model uses mobile emission factors from the California Air Resources Board's EMFAC2011 model. This model is sensitive to the year selected, since vehicle emissions have and continue to be reduced due to more stringent exhaust controls, newer vehicle fleet, fuel efficiency standards and low carbon fuels.

The earliest full year the Project could possibly be in operation would be 2018 and therefore operational emissions were computed for the year 2018. Full build out occurring later than 2018 would result in lower emissions. Based on the air quality analysis, and as shown in Table 3, maximum daily emissions associated with Project operation would not exceed the MBUAPCD significance thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered ***less than significant***.

Table 3. Daily Air Pollutant Emissions from Operation of the Project (maximum lbs./day)

Scenario	VOC	NOX	CO	PM10	SO2
Proposed Project 2018	89.2	16.9	168.7	18.7	0.1
Daily Emission Thresholds	137	137	550	82	150
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No

d) To determine if construction or operation of the Project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, the area's sensitive receptors and toxic air contaminants (TACs) were analyzed. Sensitive receptors are typically defined as facilities where sensitive populations (e.g., children, elderly, acutely and chronically ill) are likely to be located. The Project is located on an undeveloped lot and existing residences are located 30 feet or more away from the property line. The Project would introduce new sensitive receptors in the form of new single family residences.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) identifies particulate matter from diesel-fueled engines (DPM)) as a Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC). Diesel particulate matter emissions can be carcinogenic over long exposure durations (i.e., most analyses consider exposure periods of 10 to 70 years). During construction, various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment would be in use on the site, however due to the relatively short duration of grading and construction, this impact is considered ***less-than-significant.***

Post construction, due to its proximity to State Route 156, future Project residents have the potential to be exposed to diesel particulate matter emissions over long periods. SR156 at The Alameda in San Juan Bautista has 23,700 average daily trips (ADT), as reported by Caltrans for 2013. Highway 156 is the only roadway in the Project vicinity expected to potentially result in a significant community risk impact. Other roadways have much lower traffic volumes and are not truck routes. An analysis of the impacts of TACs emitted from SR 156 traffic was conducted to evaluate potential cancer risks.

Using the criteria and methods discussed in the air quality assessment for emissions modeling and dispersion modeling, potential cancer risks from inhalation of toxic air contaminants were calculated based on the annual average concentration, an inhalation dose, and the cancer potency of the TAC.

The inhalation dose depends on a person's breathing rate, exposure time and frequency of exposure, and the exposure duration over a 70-year lifetime period. For this analysis, residential receptors are assumed to be exposed for 24 hours per day for 350 days per year over a 70-year exposure period. The maximum increased cancer risk at the site for a 70-year exposure is modeled to be 11.2 in one million, occurring in the northwest corner of the Project site closest to Highway 156, at a distance of about 70 feet from the edge of the roadway. Cancer risks would decrease at increasing distance from Highway 156.

Under the MBUAPCD CEQA guidelines, an incremental risk of greater than 10 cases in one million or a Hazard Index of greater than 1.0 would be considered a significant impact. A portion of the Project site adjacent to Highway 156 could have cancer risks greater than 10 in one million. Attachment 1, Figure 6 (see Attachment 4, Figure 2 in the air quality report) shows the distribution of projected cancer risks throughout the Project site and the 10 in a million risk contour line. As seen on Figure 6, only those locations closest to Highway 156 would have increased cancer risks at or above 10 in one million. The significant exposure for new Project receptors is judged by increased cancer risk from DPM. Reducing exposure to diesel exhaust through requirements listed in Mitigation Measure AIR-1, below, would reduce cancer risk to ***less than significant after Mitigation*** levels.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AIR RESOURCES-1: Limit Exposure to Sources of TAC Emissions

AIR-1 The Project shall include the following measures to minimize long-term TAC exposure for new Project occupants:

- Design buildings and site to limit exposure from sources of TAC emissions. The site layout shall locate windows and air intakes as far as possible from Highway 156 traffic lanes, using Figure 6 as a guide. Any modifications to the site design shall incorporate buffers between residences and the freeway.
- To the greatest degree possible, plant vegetation along the Project site boundary with Highway156 and around outdoor use areas. This barrier shall include trees and shrubs that provide a dense vegetative barrier.
- Mechanical ventilation shall be installed on an individual unit-by-unit basis, with individual air intake and exhaust ducts ventilating each unit separately in the case of single-family housing. Install air filtration in residential buildings where cancer risk is greater than 10 in one million (see Figure 6). Air filtration devices shall be rated MERV11 or higher. To ensure adequate health protection to sensitive receptors, this ventilation system shall meet the following minimal design standards:
    - A MERV11 filter or higher rating at receptors shown to exceed 10 in one million (or 1 in 100,000 cancer risk) in Figure 6;
    - At least one air exchange(s) per hour of fresh outside filtered air; and
    - At least four air exchange(s) per hour recirculation.
- Ensure that the property purchase documents include assurance that new owners are provided information on the ventilation system, including cleaning and maintenance requirements.

e.) Residential land uses are not typically associated with the creation of objectionable odors. Construction and operation of the Project, including an open space/retention basin and a municipal well, would not create objectionable odors. This would result in a ***less-than-significant*** impact related to objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

A biological assessment report was prepared for the site by Olberding Environmental, Inc. (Biological Resources Analysis Report for the Manning Property, San Juan Bautista, San Benito County, California, February 2015). This study included a field reconnaissance conducted January 30, 2015 and literature review for the purpose of identifying sensitive plant and wildlife species, sensitive habitats, and biological constraints potentially occurring on the Project site. The study report is provided as Attachment 5 to this document.

Jurisdictional Wetlands: Results of a biological survey indicate that the Property does not contain any wetlands or waters that may be potentially considered jurisdictional by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). A comprehensive review of the site resulted in a negative finding for wetland soils, hydrology, and vegetation. There are no drainages or creek channels on the Property.

Special-Status Plants: Due to the lack of suitable habitats, ongoing agricultural disturbance of the site, and lack of suitable soils within the survey area, there is no potential for any special-status plant species to occur. A plant's potential to occur within the survey area was based on the presence of suitable habitats, soil types, and CNDDB occurrences. None of the special-status plants identified in the CNDDB listing were observed during the January 2015 site survey.

Special-Status Birds: A total of 14 bird species were identified as having a potential to occur on the Property with nine of these species having a potential to occur in a foraging capacity only. These bird species include Cooper's hawk (Accipiter cooperii), sharpshinned hawk (Accipiter striatus), snowy egret (Egretta thula), red-tailed hawk (Buteo jamaicensis), red-shouldered hawk (Buteo lineatus), northern harrier (Circus cyaneus), golden eagle (Aquila chrysaetos), American kestrel (Falco sparverius), and great horned owl (Bubo virginianus). The remaining five bird species have a potential to occur on the Property in a foraging and nesting capacity. These bird species include white-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus), yellow-breasted chat (Icteria virens), loggerhead shrike (Lanius ludovicianus), yellow warbler (Setophaga petechia), and barn owl (Tyto alba). These bird species have a potential to nest within the willow dominated riparian area located within the southern portion of the Property and the on-site barn structure. The barn will be removed as part of development

The Project site currently appears to be unsuitable to support burrowing owl due to the lack of small mammal burrows and tall vegetation heights.

Special Status Mammals: Special-status mammals with the potential to occur on the Property include the Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), a California Special Concern species. There are tree cavities and the old barn structure which could serve as potential roosting habitat on the Property and in the surrounding buffer. Due to the high mobility of bats, difficulty in surveying for them, and presence of suitable habitat it was determined that bats have a moderate possibility of occurring on the Property. Tree hollows and the barn structure may serve as day roosting sites, and foraging may occur over the site.

Special-Status Amphibians: The California tiger salamander (CTS) and California red legged frog (CRLF) are considered unlikely to occur within the Project area. Breeding habitat does not exist for CTS or CRLF on the Property or in close proximity to the site. Annual mowing of the site and presence of intensively planted agricultural crops to the south would preclude the presence of suitable upland habitat. Development occurs to the east and west reducing the suitability of the surrounding landscape. Barriers to dispersal north of the Project area include busy State Route 156 and the City of San Juan Batista.

Discussion

a) If Project construction-related activities occur during the nesting season (February through August), then special status birds nesting on or near the Project site could be disturbed by Project construction noise and removal of vegetation used for nesting or foraging. Likewise, special status bats could be disturbed during removal of the existing trees or structures, including the existing barn, on the Project site. Impacts would be considered ***less than significant after Mitigation*** after implementation of the following measures.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure BIOLOGY-1: Pre-construction Bird Survey

BIO-1 If Project construction-related activities would take place during the nesting season (February through August), preconstruction surveys for nesting passerine birds within the Project site, and the surrounding area of influence of the Project site, should be conducted by a competent biologist prior to the commencement of the tree removal or site grading activities. Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to any vegetation removal. If any bird listed under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act is found to be nesting within the Project site or within the area of influence, an adequate protective buffer zone should be established by a qualified biologist to protect the nesting site. This buffer shall be a minimum of 75 feet from the Project activities for passerine birds, and a minimum of 200 feet for raptors (birds-of prey). The distance shall be determined by a competent biologist based on the site conditions (topography, if the nest is in a line of sight of the construction and the sensitivity of the birds nesting). The nest site(s) shall be monitored by a competent biologist periodically to see if the birds are stressed by the construction activities and if the protective buffer needs to be increased. Once the young have fledged and are flying well enough to avoid Project construction zones (typically by August), the Project can proceed without further regard to the nest site.

Mitigation Measure BIOLOGY-2: Pre-construction Bat Survey

BIO-2 To avoid "take" of special status bats, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to the removal of any existing trees or structures, including the barn, on the Project site:

a) A bat habitat assessment shall be conducted by a qualified bat biologist during seasonal periods of bat activity (mid–February through mid–October – ca. Feb. 15 –Apr. 15, and Aug. 15 – October 30), to determine suitability of each existing structure as bat roost habitat.

b) Structures found to have no suitable openings can be considered clear for Project activities as long as they are maintained so that new openings do not occur.

c) Structures found to provide suitable roosting habitat, but without evidence of use by bats, may be sealed until Project activities occur, as recommended by the bat biologist. Structures with openings and exhibiting evidence of use by bats shall be scheduled for humane bat exclusion and eviction, conducted during appropriate seasons, and under supervision of a qualified bat biologist.

d) Bat exclusion and eviction shall only occur between February 15 and April 15, and from August 15 through October 30, in order to avoid take of non–volant (non–flying or inactive, either young, or seasonally torpid) individuals.
OR
A qualified wildlife biologist experienced in surveying for and identifying bat species should survey the portion of the Project where tree removal is proposed to determine if any special–status bats reside in the trees. Any special–status bats identified should be removed without harm. Bat houses sufficient to shelter the number of bats removed should be erected in open space areas that would not be disturbed by Project development.

b) There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the US Fish and Wildlife Service present on the Project site. There are also no oak woodlands on the site that could be affected by the proposed Project. Therefore no further discussion or mitigation related to sensitive natural communities is warranted since there is ***no impact.***

c) There are no jurisdictional wetlands and waters potentially regulated under the authority of the Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW present on the Property, therefore ***no impact*** and no further discussion or mitigation is warranted.

d) Wildlife corridors are described as pathways or habitat linkages that connect discrete areas of natural open space otherwise separated or fragmented by topography, changes in vegetation, and other natural or human induced factors such as urbanization. The fragmentation of natural habitat creates isolated "islands" of vegetation that may not provide sufficient area or resources to accommodate sustainable populations for a number of species, thus adversely affecting both genetic and species diversity.

The Project site is located between a highway to the north and a road to the south. Existing development to the east and west further limits the use of the site as a wildlife corridor. It does not contain any wetlands, streams or natural habitat that serves as a travel path for wildlife. As such, the Project property does not serve as a wildlife corridor, and therefore ***no impact*** or further discussion or mitigation is warranted.

e) The Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The 2016 Update of the San Juan Bautista General Plan, Open Space Element includes Goal CO 4 concerning protection of wildlife, habitat, air quality, and water resources. Objective CO 4.1 states: Protect all state and federally listed special-status species and their critical habitat, and includes the following two policies:

- Policy CO 4.1.1 - Comply with federal and state laws regarding the protection of special-status species and habitat, as defined by US Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Program CO 4.1.1.1 - Provide a list of local native plant species for landscaping in order to prevent the introduction of invasive species.

The proposed Project site does not have any USFWS-defined special status species or habitat. For the Project's landscape design, local native plant species will be recommended for landscaping, and introduction of invasive plant species will be avoided, therefore impacts would be ***less than significant***.

f) The site is not within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, therefore ***no impact***, no further discussion or mitigation related to this topic is warranted.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Setting

A cultural resources assessment report was prepared for the site by the cultural resources firm of WSA, Inc. (originally William Self Associates, Inc.) in October 2015. That study included a literature/database review and site reconnaissance. In an effort to identify all potentially significant cultural resources that could be impacted by the Project, WSA investigators implemented a records search, which was conducted by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) at Sonoma State University in Rohnert Park, California, of a 1/4-mile radius surrounding the proposed Project area.

Results indicate that the Project area was extensively surveyed in 1999 by JRP Historical Consulting Services (JPR 1999) in association with the widening of Highway 156 and that four historic sites have been previously recorded within the Project area, while the northern border of the large San Juan Canyon Historic District extends into the southern portion of the Project area. In addition to historic components, the district contains a prehistoric site with discrete boundaries (located 800 feet from the Project area).

A WSA staff archaeologist conducted an intensive pedestrian archaeological survey of the Project area on May 12, 2015. No new historic or prehistoric-period archaeological sites were identified as a result of the field survey. A WSA architectural historian visited the site that same day to document the present condition of the structures on the property and to evaluate their eligibility for listing in the CRHR in light of previous evaluations. None of the structures were indicated as eligible.

There is a dilapidated barn on the western end of the site that is planned for removal as part of site development. This Breen/Taix Barn along the west edge of the project area was recorded by Bloomfield

in 1989 and again by JRP Historical Consulting in June 1999 and has been assigned a primary number (P-35-00407). Michael M. Machado of the San Juan Bautista Cultural Resources Board also prepared a Historic Resources Inventory for the structure in 1981. JRP described the barn as a classic utilitarian agricultural structure that is found most commonly in California with a high gabled center structure and shed wings extending from the sides. Successful in the arrangement of its elements, this basic form has been built repeatedly for decades, with variations in local materials and adaptation in the use for which each individual barn was intended (JRP 1999). The barn was again surveyed for its historic significance and the following determination made: "WSA concurs with JRP's earlier evaluation that the barn does not meet significance criteria under CEQA (WSA 2015)."

A 425-foot-long section of the San Juan Pacific Railroad grade was recorded in the western portion of the project area in February 2000 (Wheeler 2000). A commemorative plaque that reminds visitors of the former railroad route is located adjacent to the project area (near the driveway that accesses the residence at 102 San Juan-Hollister Road). The plaque will remain undisturbed in the "Lot C" area.

Discussion

a, b) At this time, one cultural resource, the San Juan Canyon Historic District, has been identified within the southern portion of the Project area, but not within the Project boundaries. The district has been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places, includes multiple historic-period contributing elements (none of which are located in the Project area) and a prehistoric archaeological site located within 800 feet of the Project area. Should elements of the district or previously unknown resources be identified during the course of Project-related ground disturbance, Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-1 shall be implemented.

c) Because the site surface soils are recent colluvium and alluvium, and deep excavation is not proposed, it is unlikely that any paleontological resources would be encountered. No further measures related to paleontological resources are proposed, therefore, ***no impact***.

d) A significant impact would occur if ground-clearing or ground-disturbing activities associated with site preparation, grading, and construction activities could disturb Native American human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. The potential to uncover Native American human remains exists in locations throughout California. Although not anticipated, human remains may be identified during site preparation and grading activities, resulting in a significant impact to Native American cultural resources. Mitigation Measures CULTURAL-2 shall be implemented to reduce potential adverse impacts to human remains to a ***less than significant after mitigation*** levels.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-1: Historic and Prehistoric Resources

CULT-1 In accordance with CEQA Guideline §15064.5 (f), should any previously unknown historic-period resources, including but not limited to privies, trash deposits or similar debris, be discovered during grading, trenching, or other on-site excavation(s), earthwork within the immediate vicinity of such

discoveries shall be stopped until a qualified professional archaeologist has an opportunity to evaluate the potential significance of the find. If the find is recommended as not significant, excavation will resume. If the find is recommended to be potentially significant, or requires further testing in order to make such a determination, the archaeologist in consultation with the Project sponsor and the lead agency will develop an appropriate plan to mitigate the loss of the resource. Significant resources typically include intact deposits with physical integrity, such as refuse-filled privies, that contain the variety and quantity of artifacts required to answer research questions regarding the historic development of the Project area. Sparse sheet refuse scatters and isolated artifacts are not typically considered significant.

Should any previously unknown prehistoric resources, including but not limited to charcoal, obsidian or chert flakes, grinding bowls, shell fragments, bone, or pockets of dark, friable soils be discovered during grading, trenching, or other on-site excavation(s), earthwork within 25 feet of such discoveries shall be stopped until a qualified professional archaeologist has an opportunity to evaluate the potential significance of the find and suggest the appropriate steps to protect the resource.

Mitigation Measure CULTURAL-2: Unidentified Human Remains

CULT-2 If human remains are encountered during earth-disturbing activities for the Project, all work in the adjacent area shall stop immediately and the San Benito County Coroner's office shall be notified. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the NAHC within 24 hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendant (MLD) of the deceased Native American. The MLD may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

With implementation of Mitigation Measures Cultural-1 and Cultural-2, potential impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to ***less than significant after mitigation*** levels.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒	☐	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

A design level geotechnical evaluation report for the proposed Copperleaf residential development was prepared by Berlogar Stevens & Associates (BSA, 2015a) and used to prepare this section of the IS/MND. The December 15, 2015 design level report presents the results of the Project's geotechnical investigation, and provides conclusions and recommendations related to site preparation and grading; utility trench excavation and backfill; pavement area subgrade and aggregate base; surface drainage; house foundations; retaining walls; concrete flatwork; corrosivity considerations; and structural pavement sections for the design and construction of the Project site (see Attachment 7). Previously, BSA completed a Fault Ground-Rupture Investigation of the site (BSA, 2015b) dated February 19, 2015 (see Attachment 8 of this IS/MND) that identified Project seismic issues.

Soils: The NRCS (2014) reports three soil types within the site. The soils mapped included the following types, with the relative percent of site coverage indicated:

- HaA: Hanford coarse sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (13.9%) – The Hanford series can be found at elevations between 150 and 3,500 feet with 0 to 15 percent slopes. The Hanford series consists of very deep, well drained soils that formed in moderately coarse textured alluvium dominantly from granite.
- Pc: Pacheco loam (0.5%) – The Pacheco series consists of very deep, poorly or somewhat poorly drained soils that formed in alluvium derived mostly from sedimentary rocks. Pacheco soils are on flood plains and have slopes of 0 to 2 percent. Pacheco soils are on nearly level flood plains at elevations of 10 to 400 feet. They formed in medium textured alluvium derived mostly from sedimentary rocks.
- SaA: Salinas clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes (85.6%) – The Salinas series consists of deep, well drained soils that formed in alluvium weathered from sandstone and shale. Salinas soils re on alluvial plains, fans, and terraces and have slopes of 0 to 9 percent. Salinas soils are on

alluvial plains, fans, and terraces not subject to current accretions. Slopes are 0 to 9 percent. The soils formed in mixed alluvium mostly from sandstone and shale. They are at elevations of 50 to 2,000 feet.

A total of ten soil borings were conducted to depths of 15 to 21.5 feet and fourteen Cone Penetrometer Tests were performed to depths of 20 to 45 feet on the site. Additional subsurface exploration was conducted on the site during the earlier fault ground-rupture investigation that included excavation of seven exploratory test pits and three trenches (BSA, 2015a).

The upper approximately 8 to 20 feet of the eastern portion of the site (west of Street 'C') consists of varying layers of silty to sandy clays. The surficial clay layer extends to the east and is about 2 feet thick. The western portion of the site is composed of interbedded layers of clayey, silty and gravelly sands that extended to the depth explored of approximately 20 feet. The sand deposits are dense to medium dense. The near-surface clay soils were determined to be moderately to highly expansive (expansive soils expand and shrink substantially when wetted and dried, respectively) (BSA, 2015a).

Groundwater: Groundwater was found in two of the ten borings drilled for this investigation at depths of 15 to 20 feet below the ground surface. Groundwater was also encountered at a depth of 28 feet in the ground-rupture investigation Trench T-10. Groundwater levels may vary over time and at different location on the site due to variations in irrigation, precipitation, climatic conditions, pumping, and other factors.

Seismic Hazards: The Project site is located within the Earthquake Fault Zone of the San Andreas Fault, as designated by the California Geologic Survey (formerly California Division of Mines and Geology) under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (1972). A geologic investigation to demonstrate that proposed buildings for human occupancy would not be constructed across active faults was conducted (BSA, 2015b). The Copperleaf site plan includes setbacks with a building exclusion zone on the west side of the main trace of the San Andreas Fault (see Attachment 1, Figure 5).

The site will likely be subject to at least one moderate to severe earthquake and associated ground shaking during the useful life of the proposed Copperleaf development, as well as periodic slight to moderate earthquakes. The geotechnical report identified the design level peak ground acceleration (PGA) of 1004 according to the USGS Earthquake hazards program website. The California Building Code (CBC) requires that all residential structures meet a minimum life safety design criteria under which structures do not collapse.

Study data and analysis indicates that portions of the "sandy silt & silty sand" layers encountered below the site are potentially liquefiable. Lateral spreading, a potential hazard associate with liquefaction, could occur in the eastern portion of the site. Lateral displacement could be on the order of 4 to 8 inches with consideration of the deposits with a liquefaction potential of high to very high risk. The effects of liquefaction and lateral spreading can be mitigated through foundation design.

Discussion:

a, c) As described above, the site may be subject to significant earthquake fault rupture, liquefaction and/or lateral spreading. Landslide hazards to the Project would be minimal and do not require further

evaluation. The Project's geotechnical investigation report (BSA, 2015a) provides conclusions and recommendations for the following aspects of Project development: site preparation and grading; utility trench excavation and backfill; pavement area subgrade and aggregate base; surface drainage; house foundations; retaining walls; concrete flatwork; corrosivity considerations; and structural pavement sections for the design and construction of the Project site. The mitigation measures provided below are based upon the recommendations in the design level report. Mitigation would reduce this impact to a ***less than significant after mitigation*** level.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure – GEOLOGY AND SOILS-1: Geologic Instability

GEO-1 Seismic and other soil and geologic instability shall be addressed by adhering to design recommendations in the Project's geotechnical design report and to the satisfaction of the Project engineer and City staff.

b) Grading would be required for site preparation, including excavation of the detention basin with cuts and fills on the order of a few feet to create level lots in the lower portions of the site, and slightly deeper cuts and fills anticipated to create level lots in the upper (western) portion of the site. Trenching would be required for underground infrastructure installation. Although no grading plans have been developed, the grading would be balanced onsite, to the extent feasible. Site grading could result in erosion and subsequent off-site deposition, which could adversely affect onsite and nearby drainages. Best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented by the Project contractor during grading and other ground disturbance activities to reduce PM10 air quality impacts associated with grading and new construction would also serve to mitigate soil erosion impacts to a ***less than significant after mitigation*** level.

Mitigation Measure – GEOLOGY AND SOILS-2: Soil Erosion

GEO-2 Soil erosion shall be addresses by development and implementation of construction and post-construction erosion control programs in the form of a SWPPP and a SWMP, and otherwise adhering to design recommendations in the Project's geotechnical design report and to the satisfaction of the Project engineer and City staff.

d) The predominant geotechnical considerations for the Project are the presence of liquefaction induced settlement, discussed above, and expansive clays. The site's near-surface clay soils were determined to be moderately to highly expansive (expansive soils expand and shrink substantially when wetted and dried, respectively). These soils, if not properly treated or designed for, could damage house foundations and infrastructure.

Mitigation Measure – GEOLOGY AND SOILS-3: Expansive Soils

GEO-3 The presence of expansive soils shall be addressed in foundation, infrastructure, and roadway design according to the Project's geotechnical design report and to the satisfaction of the Project engineer

and City staff. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a ***less than significant after mitigation*** level.

e) Project houses would not use septic systems, but rather would be connected to the City's sewage treatment system. Therefore ***no impacts*** associated with septic systems and soil permeability would occur as a result of the Project.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

Setting

An air quality and greenhouse gas emissions assessment was prepared for the proposed Copperleaf Subdivision Project (Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., 2015) in order to fully evaluate greenhouse gas emissions. The assessment is provided as Attachment 4 to this Draft IS-MND.

Global temperatures are affected by naturally occurring and anthropogenic-generated (generated by humankind) atmospheric gases, such as water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide. Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called greenhouse gases (GHG). Solar radiation enters the earth's atmosphere from space, and a portion of the radiation is absorbed at the surface. The earth emits this radiation back toward space as infrared radiation. Greenhouse gases, which are mostly transparent to incoming solar radiation, are effective in absorbing infrared radiation and redirecting some of this back to the earth's surface. As a result, this radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is now retained, resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This is known as the greenhouse effect.

The greenhouse effect helps maintain a habitable climate. Emissions of GHGs from human activities, such as electricity production, motor vehicle use and agriculture, are elevating the concentration of GHGs in the atmosphere, and are reported to have led to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth's natural climate, known as global warming or global climate change. The term "global climate change" is often used interchangeably with the term "global warming," but "global climate change" is preferred because it implies that there are other consequences to the global climate in addition to rising temperatures. Other than water vapor, the primary GHGs contributing to global climate change include the following gases:

- Carbon dioxide (CO_2), primarily a byproduct of fuel combustion;

- Nitrous oxide (N_2O), a byproduct of fuel combustion; also associated with agricultural operations such as the fertilization of crops;
- Methane (CH_4), commonly created by off-gassing from agricultural practices (e.g. livestock), wastewater treatment and landfill operations;
- Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) were used as refrigerants, propellants and cleaning solvents, but their production has been mostly prohibited by international treaty;
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) are now widely used as a substitute for chlorofluorocarbons in refrigeration and cooling; and
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6) emissions are commonly created by industries such as aluminum production and semiconductor manufacturing.

These gases vary considerably in terms of Global Warming Potential (GWP), a term developed to compare the propensity of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another GHG. GWP is based on several factors, including the relative effectiveness of a gas to absorb infrared radiation and the length of time of gas remains in the atmosphere. The GWP of each GHG is measured relative to CO_2. Accordingly, GHG emissions are typically measured and reported in terms of CO_2 equivalent (CO_2e). For instance, SF_6 is 22,800 times more intense in terms of global climate change contribution than CO_2.

GHG Significance Thresholds: The Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District MBUAPCD has no formal recommendation for a quantified GHG threshold for land-use development projects, however, a February 2013 document published by MBUAPCD recommends the 2,000 metric tons (MT) CO2e/year metric for futther review. This recommendation was made after considering AB 32 goals and scoping plan measures that would reduce regional emissions.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were computed for the full build out scenario of the proposed project by evaluating both construction and operational emissions. The CalEEMod model was used to compute criteria air pollutant emissions. The model also predicts emissions of GHG in the form of equivalent carbon dioxide emissions or CO2e.

Construction Period Emissions: The same CalEEMod model that was used to predict criteria pollutant emissions was also used to predict construction GHG emissions. CO2e emissions associated with construction are anticipated to occur in 2016 and 2017. Under this scenario, construction of the project would emit up to 279 metric tons (MT) of CO2e (in 2016) per year. Neither the City of San Juan Bautista nor the MBUAPCD have quantified thresholds for construction activities. However, this would be less than the MBUAPCD operational threshold of 2,000 MT of CO2e per year currently under review.

Operational Period Emissions: The CalEEMod model along with the project vehicle trip generation rates and estimates were used to predict operational period GHG emissions associated with operation of a fully developed site under the proposed project. The model uses mobile emission factors from CARB's EMFAC2011 model. This model is sensitive to the year selected, since vehicle emissions have and continue to be reduced due to fuel efficiency standards and low carbon fuels. Adjustments to the modeling are described below.

- Year of Analysis: Emissions associated with vehicle travel depend on the year of analysis. The earlier the year, the higher the emission rates as CalEEMod uses the California Air Resources Board's EMFAC2011 motor vehicle emissions model. This model assumes reduced emission rates as newer vehicles with lower emission rates replace older, more polluting vehicles through attrition of the overall vehicle fleet. The earliest full year the project could possibly be in operation would be 2018 and therefore operational emissions were computed for the year 2018. Full build out occurring later than 2018 would result in lower emissions.

- Trip Generation Rates: CalEEMod allows the user to enter specific trip generation rates. As described above, Hatch Mott MacDonald (HMM, 2015) provided the trip generation rates for the Project, which were entered into the model.

- Electricity Generation: Energy usage emissions include those from natural gas combustion and electricity usage. CalEEMod model default energy usage inputs were used in the modeling. CalEEMod has a default rate of 641.3 pounds of CO2 per megawatt of electricity produced, which is based on PG&E's 2008 emissions rate. The PG&E rate was updated to the most recent rate reported in the California Climate Registry for 2013, which is 429.64 pounds of CO2 per megawatt of electricity produced. The 2013 Title 24 Building Standards became effective July 1, 2014 and are predicted to use 25 percent less energy for lighting, heating, cooling, ventilation, and water heating than the 2008 standards that CalEEMod incorporates. Therefore, the CalEEMod run was adjusted to account for the greater energy efficiency.

- Other Inputs: Default model assumptions for GHG emissions associated with area sources, solid waste generation and water/wastewater use were applied to the project.

Discussion

a) As stated above, the MBUAPCD has no formal recommendation for a quantified GHG threshold for land-use development projects, but has recommended the 2,000 metric tons (MT) CO2e/year metric for further review (MBUAPCD 2014). Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, projects such as Copperleaf that have emissions below 2,000 MT of CO2e per year are considered to have ***less than significant*** GHG emissions.

GHG Operational Emissions: Table 4 presents the results of the CalEEMod model analysis in terms of annual metric tons of equivalent CO2 emissions (MT of CO2e/year). As described by source category (e.g. – traffic-related GHG Emissions) above and summarized in Table 4, below, operation of the project would not exceed the current recommendation under consideration by the MBUAPCD of 2,000 MT of CO_2e/yr. This impact is, therefore, considered to result in ***less than significant*** GHG emissions.

Table 4. Project GHG Emissions

Source Category	2018 Proposed Project (MT CO_2e/year)
Area	83
Energy Consumption	151
Traffic-related	1,069
Solid Waste Generation	31
Water Usage	10
Total	1,344
Significance Threshold	2,000

b) The Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases; ***no impact***.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

A Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed Copperleaf Subdivision (Northgate, 2015) in order to full evaluate potential hazards. Its findings are discussed below and the full report is provided as Attachment 9 to this document.

The Project site has been historically used for agriculture and grazing since at least the 1930s. An apparent railroad easement runs north-south along the western edge of the property. With the exception of a well structure now used as a municipal well, the site has not been previously developed for urban use. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was performed for the Project site. The site is not listed on any regulatory database related to the use, storage, or release of hazardous materials. Northgate performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) in conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527. This assessment revealed no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) in connection with the Project. California EPA's Envirostor database, accessed February 12, 2016, shows no "Cortese List" hazardous materials or cleanup sites in the City or in the County near the Project site.

Field observations made during the site reconnaissance indicated the presence of an old abandoned gasoline service station located across Old San Juan Hollister Road, about 250 feet southwest of the site, an old railroad easement located on the western boundary of the site, and a debris area located on the eastern end of the site. A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment was performed, to provide additional evaluation of the abandoned service station, the old railroad easement, and the debris area. The site was also tested for possible agricultural chemicals and fertilizer residues that may be present on the site. Based on the soil sampling, groundwater and soil vapor test results, Northgate concluded there are no significant environmental impacts to soil, groundwater or soil vapor quality at the site. In addition, residual pesticides do not appear to be present in shallow soil in the vacant field areas of the site at concentrations above health-based screening levels for residential land use established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Discussion

a, c) The proposed Project is a residential subdivision and would not result in the use, transport, or generation of substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Petroleum products, paint, solvents, and other construction-related potentially hazardous substances would be used during construction. These would typically be in small containers, transported and handled by professionals, and any spills would be promptly cleaned up. Therefore they would not constitute a significant hazard or risk of upset. After construction, small quantities of hazardous materials would be in household use. These also would not

constitute a hazard to public health or safety and therefore there are ***no impacts***.

b) A Phase II environmental site assessment was conducted to determine whether there exists the potential for significant hazards to the public or the environment involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment (Northgate, 2015). Based on the groundwater and soil sampling test results, there does not appear to be impacted soil, groundwater, or soil vapor quality at the subject site from an off-site abandoned gasoline service station, a former railroad easement, a debris burial area, or the former agricultural land uses resulting in ***no impact***.

However, the soil test results of the ranch complex area(Lot C on the Tentative Map) indicates the shallow soil around the eastern side of the ranch complex garages and outbuildings contains organochlorine pesticide compounds above the RWQCB Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs) for residential land use. The ranch complex is not part of the Project site, but it is recommended that a permanent wall be constructed between the Project site and the eastern ranch complex property line to preclude soil from the ranch complex inadvertently migrating on to the Project site. This is considered a ***potentially significant*** impact unless mitigated.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure – HAZARDS and HAZARDOUS MATERIALS-1: Soil Hazard

HAZ-1 The potential migration of contaminated soils from Lot C onto the Project site shall be addressed through the construction of a permanent wall along the Project boundary (shown on Attachment 1, Figure 8). Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a ***less than significant after mitigation*** level.

d) As discussed in the Background section, above, there are no Cortese List (Government Code Section 65962.5) sites on or near the Project area, and therefore ***no impact***.

e, f) There are no airports or airstrips in San Juan Bautista or within two miles of the Project site. The nearest major airports are in Monterey and San Jose. The City of Hollister also has a municipal airport about 12 miles from the site. Therefore there would be ***no impact*** from airport-related hazards to or from the Project.

g) The Project includes two access points onto the San Juan Highway, and no direct access to State Highway 156. Both access roads are 2-lane collectors that allow full left and right turning into and out of the Project subdivision. The City has reviewed the Project site plan including its emergency access. The proposed Project would not impede emergency access or evacuation, and therefore there would be ***no impact.***

h) The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) fire hazard maps show the northern and western portions of the site as in Moderate and High wildfire hazard areas (San Juan Bautista, Draft General Plan Background Report, 2013, Chapter 10, Public Safety, Map 10.2). CAL FIRE has a legal responsibility to provide fire protection within State Responsibility Area (SRA) lands. The

designation of SRA lands depends on land ownership, population density, and land use (CAL FIRE, 2013). The City of San Juan Bautista is located within a Local Responsibility Area, therefore within the City, fire protection services are provided by the San Juan Bautista Fire Department. Although the lands adjacent to the city limits are within a SRA, there would be ***less than significant impacts*** related to wildfire hazards as a result of the proposed Project. Fire protection is discussed further in Section XIV, Public Services.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☒	☐	☐
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☒	☐	☐

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

A 100-Year Hydraulic Impact Analysis was prepared for the proposed Copperleaf Subdivision Project (Schaaf & Wheeler, 2015) in order to fully evaluate the 100-year floodplain impacts. Detailed site topography and proposed property grading were used by Project hydraulic engineers to model the site's hydrology. Based on requirements by FEMA and the City of San Juan Bautista, existing and proposed floodplain conditions were analyzed to determine the impact from the project site. The analysis is provided as Attachment 6 to this Draft IS-MND.

Hydrology: The Project Site is located in between San Juan Creek (to the west) and San Juan Creek Tributary (to the east); with a portion of the Site within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Special Flood Hazard Area (i.e. 100-year floodplain) (see Attachment 1, Figure 2). The 100-year flood is the base flood event for land use planning and protection of property and human safety. The delineation of areas within the 100 year floodplain represents a statistical probability for the long-term average occurrence of flooding of 1 percent annually. Flooding in a 100 year floodplain can occur more or less frequently than once in a hundred years, and is considered a high risk area.

Storm water runoff would be directed to a storm water retention/detention/water quality basin located at the north east boundary of the site where it would infiltrate back into the ground. The storm drainage system will be sized to keep the volume of post Project runoff less than existing conditions on the Project site.

Discussion

a, f) The Project would include a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to prevent contamination of nearby waterways from construction stormwater. Post construction, runoff from the site could include oil and grease from Project roadways, and herbicides and pesticides associated with landscaping. This runoff would be retained and cleaned by vegetation in the proposed stormwater retention/detention water quality basin. A Stormwater Management Plan, as identified in Mitigation Measure GEOLOGY-2, also would reduce water quality impacts of the proposed houses and roadways to ***less than significant***. The following additional measures shall be implemented to reduce this impact to ***less than significant after mitigation***.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure HYDROLOGY-1: Stormwater Pollution

HYD-1 The applicant shall retain a qualified SWPPP consultant to prepare and submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City of San Juan Bautista that identified specific actions and

maps Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent stormwater pollution during construction activities.

b) The project would cover much of the site with impervious surfaces, which would slightly reduce infiltration to the regional groundwater aquifers. This would not significantly affect overall groundwater conditions in the aquifer, which is extensive and used primarily for agricultural purposes. Because the depth to groundwater is over 20 feet, impacts would be ***less than significant***.

c, d, e) The Project would have an internal drainage system that would replace the existing natural drainage. The project's system would consist of a system of curbs, gutters, inlets, and in-street storm sewers that would direct runoff to a retention/detention/water quality basin located in the northeast portion of the site. The storm drain system would be sized to keep the volume of post construction runoff peak flows to less than the pre-project conditions on the site. . See also Item a), above regarding erosion and sedimentation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1, above, would reduce potential impacts to ***less than significant after mitigation***.

g, h) A portion of the site is mapped as within a 100-year flood hazard zone. During a100-year storm event, water approaches the Project site from both the San Juan Creek and San Juan Creek Tributary as a result of spills. From the San Juan Creek Tributary, 450 cubic feet per second (cuffs) spills from the creek at Salinas Road and moves towards San Juan Hollister Road and the Site. Based the topography of the area, the majority of the water continues past the Project site to the west along the Alameda and Highway156. Only a small portion of the flow, approximately 50 cuffs, is contained and conveyed via the San Juan Hollister Road to the site. Spills from San Juan Creek approach the Site from the east. Approximately, 700 cfs spills upstream of San Juan Hollister Road and another 100 cuffs spills upstream of Highway 156. Some of this flow is conveyed to the easterly portion of the project site since topographically, the eastern portion of the site is lower than the western portion.

A Post Project Conditions Hydraulic Analysis was conducted using the assumption that 45 single family residential homes and associated infrastructure is built. To determine the impact from the Site on San Juan Creek, the cross sections in the existing floodplain model were extended to encompass the proposed development. The site was modeled as a blocked obstruction at the area of interest. Based on this analysis, it was found that the proposed development does not increase the upstream or downstream water surface elevation in San Juan Creek by more than 1 foot. Furthermore, the Site is expected to have no impact on the San Juan Creek Tributary since the majority of the spills from the tributary are not conveyed through the site. All the water that does potentially make it to the site from San Juan Creek Tributary will be contained and conveyed within San Juan Hollister Road.

According to FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM panel 06069C0158D and 06069C0159D) a portion of the site is located in a FEMA special flood hazard area AO (1.0 foot) indicating an average flood depth of 1 foot throughout the flood hazard zone. Specifically, for an area that is inundated by the Zone AO Special Flood Hazard Area, FEMA methodology dictates that the average existing ground elevation be added to the flood depth to establish the FEMA Base Flood Elevation. This is the methodology that will be utilized for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) application for the property. The CLOMR application, with the information described above and in Table 5, would be submitted by the Project developer to FEMA in order to meet FEMA and City requirements.

Table 5. Proposed FEMA Base Flood Elevations (NGVD)

Building Lot Number in AO Zone	Average Ground Elevation (NGVD)	FEMA Base Flood Elevation (NGVD)
1	212.0	213.0
24	199.0	200.0
25	200.5	201.5
26	201.5	202.5
27	202.5	203.5
28	206.0	207.0
29	204.5	205.5
30	203.5	204.5
35	206.0	207.0
36	207.0	208.0
37	208.5	209.5
45	210.0	211.0

The southeasterly portion area of the Project is currently a designated Zone AO (depth 1 ft.). As shown in Table 5, 12 of the 45 proposed lots are located in Zone AO. Due to the necessary passage of flow through the Site, the CLOMR application will propose removal of the proposed structures, or areas defined by structures, only. Portions of the Site unoccupied by structures will remain in the floodplain. The results of the FEMA Base Flood Elevation analysis are presented in Table 5. Furthermore, per section 12-1-310 of the municipal code, it was determined that the effect of the proposed development will not increase the water surface elevation of the base flood more than one foot (1.0 foot) at any point in the San Juan Creek or San Juan Creek Tributary. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-2 would reduce potential impacts to ***less than significant after mitigation***.

Mitigation Measure HYDROLOGY 2: Flood Management

HYD-2 To comply with FEMA requirements and the San Juan Bautista Municipal Code (section 12-1-400), the lowest floor elevation of each structure in the Zone AO shall be 1 foot above the highest adjacent grade. The final grading of each building in the special flood hazard area shall be at least at the base flood elevation as indicated in Table 5.

i) Dam failure presents only a small risk to San Juan Bautista. Earthquakes can cause levees and dams to break down. The San Justo Reservoir dam is located upstream of San Juan Bautista, and flooding could reach San Juan Bautista in the event of full dam failure. Keeping the dam and levees properly maintained is critical to mitigating the risks of flooding from dam failure, and the risk of the San Justo Reservoir dam failing is minimal (San Juan Bautista, General Plan Background Report, 2013, Chapter 10, Public Safety. p. 10-10). Therefore, ***no impact***.

j) San Juan Bautista is located approximately 14 miles from the coastline and is 217 feet above sea level. Given the Project site location, the site is not located in an area subject to significant seiche, tsunami or mudflow risk (San Juan Bautista, General Plan Background Report, 2013, Chapter 10, Public Safety. p. 10-10) therefore, resulting in ***no impact.***

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The Project site is at the western edge of the City of San Juan Bautista, with existing and approved State highway and agricultural uses to the north; agricultural uses to the south; a multi-family RV Park to the east; and commercial development to the west.

The site's General Plan 2035 (City, 2016a) designation is Low-Density Residential, and its zoning is Low-Density Residential (R-1). The site was approved for annexation into San Juan Bautista by the City Planning Commission and City Council during March 2016. The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is conducting a separate review for the property annexation.

The site is not within a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan area.

Discussion

a) Because of the Project site's location at the western edge of the developed part of the City, it would not divide an established community, therefore, ***no impact***.

b) The proposed Project, once submitted for review and approval, would be subject to the 2035 General Plan land use and other goals and policies (City 2016b). The proposed Project approvals include Annexation to the City with zoning district designation of Low-Density Residential. The proposed Project's Tentative Subdivision Map, site plan and landscape design will also be subject to review and approval by the City's Planning Commission. The project would be consistent with the applicable land use plan, zoning and other approvals, therefore ***less than significant impact.***

c) As indicated in the Biological Resources discussion, above, the site is not within a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan area, and therefore would not conflict with any such plans, therefore, ***no impact***.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:

MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

There are no known mineral resources on the site and the site is not delineated as a mineral resource recovery site, and therefore the proposed Project would not conflict with any such plans.

Discussion

a, b) There are no known mineral resources on the site and the site is not delineated as a mineral resource recovery site, therefore the project would not affect any such resources, therefore, ***no impact***

XII. NOISE:

NOISE: Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

A Noise Assessment was prepared for the proposed Copperleaf Subdivision Project (Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc., 2015b) in order to fully evaluate sound and vibration-related impacts. The analysis is provided as Attachment 10 to this Draft IS-MND.

State CEQA Guidelines: CEQA contains guidelines to evaluate the significance of effects of environmental noise attributable to a proposed project. CEQA does not define what noise level increase would be considered substantial. Typically, project-generated noise level increases of 3 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL or greater would be considered significant where exterior noise levels would exceed the normally acceptable noise level standard (60 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL for residential land uses). Where noise levels would remain at or below the normally acceptable noise level standard with the project, noise level increases of 5 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL or greater would be considered significant.

City of San Juan Bautista General Plan: The City of San Juan Bautista General Plan 2035 was approved by the City Council on February 16, 2016. The General Plan establishes noise and land use compatibility standards that are used to evaluate a project's compatibility with the noise environment. Residential/low density single family land uses are considered "normally acceptable" in noise environments of 60 dBA L_{dn} or less. The City of San Juan Bautista also establishes policies in the Noise Element of the General Plan in order to achieve the goal of maintaining an acceptable community noise level. The following policies and programs are applicable to the proposed project:

- Policy N 1.2.1 All interior noise levels for new development will be no greater than 45 dB and all exterior noise levels will be mitigated to a normally acceptable noise level as displayed in Table 12.1. (shown as Table 3).

- Program N1.2.1.1 Require new developments along State Route 156 to mitigate noise impacts to acceptable range shown in Table 12.1. (shown in Table 3 of the General Plan).

- Policy N 1.4.1 Adopt regulations that limit construction activity to daylight hours.

- Program N 1.4.1.1 Require restrictions on hours of construction activity when issuing construction permits.

Discussion

The City of San Juan Bautista requires that interior noise levels within new residential units be maintained at or below 45 dBA Ldn. In buildings of typical construction, with the windows partially open, interior noise levels are generally 15 dBA lower than exterior noise levels. With the windows closed, standard residential construction typically provides about 20 to 25 decibels of noise reduction. For

example, a unit exposed to exterior noise levels of 60 dBA Ldn would be 45 dBA Ldn inside with the windows partially open and would range from 35 to 40 dBA Ldn with the windows shut. Attaining the necessary noise reduction from exterior to interior spaces is possible with proper wall construction techniques, the selection of proper windows and doors, and the incorporation of a forced-air mechanical ventilation system to allow the occupant the option of controlling noise by closing the windows.

Future Interior Noise Environment: The final design of the homes has not been completed at this time so the following analysis is based on typical California home construction. It was assumed that the exterior walls of the proposed units would be 2x4 wood studs with fiberglass insulation, a single layer of gypsum board attached to the inside of the studs, and a 7/8" exterior cement plaster (Stucco) finish. This exterior wall construction has an approximate rating of STC 46. Windows and doors were then tested to determine the necessary sound transmission class ratings of these building elements in order to reduce interior noise levels due to traffic to acceptable levels.

The nearest proposed unshielded residential façades facing SR 156 would be located approximately 120 feet from the roadway centerline. North-facing façades of these residential units would be exposed to future traffic noise levels of about 74 dBA Ldn. These façades would require sound rated building elements to control traffic noise intrusion, and should achieve a minimum outdoor to indoor composite noise reduction of 29 dBA to reduce traffic noise to below 45 dBA Ldn. Preliminary calculations indicate that windows and doors of stucco sided building façades would need minimum of 30 STC to adequately reduce noise levels indoors. In these homes, interior noise levels would be approximately 45 dBA Ldn with windows kept closed assuming typical California construction methods.

Attaining the necessary noise reduction (approximately 29 dBA) from exterior to interior spaces is readily achievable with proper wall construction techniques, the selections of proper windows and doors, and the incorporation of forced-air mechanical ventilation systems. Mitigation options for exterior areas are limited for residential land uses proposed nearest Highway 156 because of the high noise levels generated by traffic. Reasonable height noise barriers, constructed on the Project site, would not provide enough attenuation to achieve the 60 dBA Ldn standard for all residential outdoor use areas. The following mitigation measures will reduce noise impacts to ***less-than-significant with mitigation***.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure NOISE-1: Limit Exposure to Noise Sources

The following measures shall be incorporated into the proposed project to mitigate the impact to a ***less than significant*** level:

NOI-1a Ensure that all residents have access to outdoor use areas that achieve the City of San Juan Bautista's exterior noise criteria (Normally Acceptable 60 dBA Ldn for residential uses or Conditionally Acceptable 70 dBA Ldn after noise reduction features are included in the design). Based on the site plan provided, achieving 65 dBA Ldn would be possible for all residential land uses with the construction of a 9-foot high wall along the northern edge of the proposed development. The final barrier limits and heights shall be confirmed during final design, based on the latest site plan and grading plan.

NOI-1b A qualified acoustical consultant shall review the final site plan, building elevations, and floor plans prior to construction and recommend building treatments to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or lower. Treatments would include, but are not limited to, sound rated windows and doors, sound rated wall and window constructions, acoustical caulking, protected ventilation openings, etc. Results of the analysis, including the description of the necessary noise control treatments, shall be incorporated in the building plans and approved design.

NOI-1c Provide a suitable form of forced-air mechanical ventilation, as determined by the local building official, for all residences on the project site, so that windows can be kept closed at the occupant's discretion to control interior noise and achieve the interior noise.

b) Construction Vibration: Vibration levels generated during construction activities may at times be perceptible at neighboring residential land uses, but vibration levels would not be excessive causing cosmetic damage to buildings. The construction of the project may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools (e.g. jackhammers, hoe rams, etc.) are used. Construction activities would include excavation, grading, site preparation work, foundation work, and new building framing and finishing. This is a ***less-than-significant*** impact and no mitigation is required.

c) Project-Generated Traffic Noise: Project generated traffic would not substantially increase ambient noise levels in the area. Traffic volume information contained in the project's transportation assessment was reviewed to calculate the change in traffic noise levels attributable to the operation of the project. A comparison of the "Existing" and "Existing Plus Project" traffic scenarios shows that traffic volumes on all roadways serving the project site would only be slightly increased with the project as compared to existing conditions. Traffic noise levels on area roadways are calculated to increase by 1 dBA Ldn or less as a result of the project. Existing traffic noise levels would not increase by 3 dBA Ldn; therefore, the impact related to Project generated traffic would be a ***less-than-significant*** impact.

d) Construction-related Noise: Noise generated by project construction activities would temporarily elevate ambient noise levels at sensitive land uses in the vicinity. Due to the proximity of existing residential land uses, there is a potential that construction noise levels would exceed 60 dBA Leq, and the ambient by at least 5 dBA Leq, for a period greater than one year. ***This is a significant impact.***
Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise sensitive receptors. Construction noise impacts primarily occur when construction activities occur during noise-sensitive times of the day (early morning, evening, or nighttime hours), the construction occurs in areas immediately adjoining noise sensitive land uses, or when construction durations last over extended periods of time.

Typically, significant noise impacts do not result when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less. Once construction moves indoors, minimal noise would be generated at off-site locations.

Construction activities can generate high noise levels, especially during the construction of project infrastructure when heavy equipment is used. Maximum instantaneous noise levels from the majority of construction equipment ranges from about 73 to 85 dBA Lmax at a distance of 50 feet. Demolition tools, such as concrete saws and hoe rams, can result in maximum instantaneous noise levels of about 90 dBA Lmax at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Typical hourly average construction generated noise levels are about 81 to 88 dBA Leq measured at a distance of 50 feet from the center of the site during busy construction periods (e.g., earth moving equipment, impact tools, etc.). Construction generated noise levels drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of distance between the source and receptor. Shielding by buildings or terrain often result in lower construction noise levels at distant receptors.

For the proposed project, the larger equipment would be used for approximately 45 work days (Site Preparation – 5 days, Grading/Excavation – 15 days, and Trenching and paving – 25 days). The construction of the residential units would utilize less heavy equipment and would last approximately 390 work days. Construction activities for the entire project are anticipated to last approximately 20 months.

Hourly average noise levels are calculated to range from about 72 to 79 dBA Leq at the nearest receptors located between 50 and 140 feet from the construction site (single family home 50 feet and the San Juan Inn – 140 feet). Therefore, ambient noise levels at single-family residential land uses adjacent to the project site along the southwest boundary could be elevated by up to 10 to 15 dBA during project construction, depending on the proximity of the portion of the site under construction to the sensitive receptor. Noise from temporary construction activities would exceed 60 dBA Leq and the ambient noise environment by at least 5 dBA Leq at noise-sensitive uses in the project vicinity for a period greater than one year, and this would be considered a ***significant impact***.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure NOISE-2: Construction Noise

NOI-2 The construction contractor will implement the following controls in order to reduce construction noise levels emanating from the site, limit construction hours, and minimize disruption and annoyance. With the implementation of these measures, the substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels would be ***less-than-significant***:

- Limit construction activity to weekdays between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm and Saturdays and holidays between 9:00 am and 7:00 pm, with no construction on Sundays;
- Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area;
- Construct sound walls or other noise reduction measures prior to developing the project site, where feasible;
- Equip all internal combustion engine driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment;
- Prohibit all unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines; and
- Utilize "quiet" models of air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

e, f) The Project would not be located in an airport land use plan area or in the vicinity of an active airstrip. Therefore ***no impacts*** from those noise sources would occur.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

San Juan Bautista is considered to be a slow-growth community. In 2013 the population of San Juan Bautista was 1,922. The population was 1,862 at the 2010 census, up from 1,549 at the 2000 census. Information about the existing conditions of San Juan Bautista's housing stock is based on a 2013 Land Use Inventory and the 2010 Census. From this analysis, it was determined that San Juan Bautista has 554 housing units, of which 66% are single-family structures (San Juan Bautista, Draft General Plan Background Report, 2014, Chapter 3 and 4, Demographics and Land Use). The Project site is currently undeveloped.

Discussion

a, b, c) The Project would add 45 single family residences to the existing City housing stock. An additional 27 units are proposed for the D'Ambrosio project as well as 85 units at the Rancho Vista project, both located at the northern edge of the City. In total, these three projects would increase the City's housing stock by about (45 + 27 + 85 =) 157 units or an estimated 26%, with a commensurate increase in population. The increase is based upon about 471 new residents (at an estimated occupancy of 3.0 persons per unit). Therefore, ***a less than significant impact***.

The applicant would phase the project home construction to accommodate demand. The Project would contribute to improvement of water supply infrastructure to address water quality issues, which is addressed in the Utilities section. The ability of infrastructure and services to serve the site is addressed in the Public Services and Utilities sections of this Initial Study. No housing or people would be displaced as a result of Project construction. Therefore ***no impact***.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:

PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:	☐	☐	☒	☐
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

Fire Protection: The City of San Juan Bautista has a 24-hr staff that is part of a joint fire department with the City of Hollister and San Benito County. The Fire Department has three City fire engines fully equipped for structural fire protection service and a County of San Benito Fire engine. The San Juan Bautista Fire Department provides fire suppression, emergency medical services (basic life support), fire

prevention, weed abatement, public education, and rescue and extrication services to an area encompassing 70 square miles. The Department also provides first response to hazardous material incidents but does not provide cleanup or abatement. Their services are provided through a contractual agreement with the San Benito County Fire Department to an area extending from Highway 101 on the west to Union Road on the east, and from the San Benito River in the north to the Gabilan Mountains in the south.

The San Juan Bautista Fire Department is located at 311 Second Street in the City of San Juan Bautista, less than a mile from the proposed Project site. Although it is part of the City of Hollister Fire Department, the City employs 3 full-time firemen, and the station is manned 24 hours a day. The maximum fire department response time within the City limits is 7 minutes, but most locations can be reached within 5 minutes.

Law Enforcement: The San Benito County Sheriff's Department provides law enforcement services within the City under contract with the City. The San Benito County Sheriff's Department patrols the City of San Juan Bautista. One full-time Deputy is assigned to San Juan Bautista. The Sheriff's Office and County Jail are located in the City of Hollister. The deputy sheriff is generally on duty for four 10-hour shifts a week. During off-duty periods, law enforcement is provided within the overall County beat structure. Responses to calls in San Juan Bautista are made by the closest patrol available at the time of the call. Response time varies from about 1 minute when the deputy sheriff is on duty to up to 30 minutes during off-duty periods. Neighborhood watch meetings are held on every second Thursday of each month at City Hall.

Schools: San Juan Bautista is served by the Aromas San Juan Unified School District (ASJUSD). The District covers approximately 100 square miles in western San Benito County, northern Monterey County, and eastern Santa Cruz County. It includes the City of San Juan Bautista and the unincorporated community of Aromas. The ASJUSD was formed in 1991 from territory formerly under the jurisdiction of the San Juan Union School District and the Pajaro Valley Unified School District. It includes elementary/middle schools (grades K-8) in San Juan Bautista (San Juan School) and Aromas (Aromas School), a Pre-School in San Juan Bautista, and Anzar High School (grades 9-12) located about two miles north of the Project.

Enrollment in the Aromas San Juan Unified School District peaked in 2008 with 1,296 students, and reached 1,291 students in 2010, but has declined since that time. Student enrollment in 2014 was down to 1,198. District wide enrollment at the K-8 level was 910 during the 2011-2012 school year, with 410 students at San Juan School and 400 students at Aromas School. As of 2014, more than 30% of the student instructional facilities are located in portable facilities. Aromas School has 9 portable classrooms that house 25 students each. San Juan School has no portables. Anzar High School, built in 1997, is located on 2000 San Juan Highway. During the 2011-2012 school year, 401 students' grades 9-12 were enrolled at Anzar High School. There are 16 classrooms, one gym, one library, three computer labs, a vocational education building, and several athletic fields. Anzar High School also has 6 portables with 25 students each.

Based on the Project's 45 single family houses and 0.67 (primary school) and 0.34 (secondary school) student per housing unit rates, at build-out, the Project would contribute an estimated 30 primary school age children and 15 secondary school age children to the school district.

Parks and Other Public Facilities: San Juan Bautista has 2 neighborhood parks (Abbe Park and Lauren E. Verutti Memorial Park) totaling 2.19 acres. The San Benito County Parks and Recreation Master Plan defines a neighborhood park as the traditional urban recreational and social focus of the neighborhood. Neighborhood parks should allow for recreational and social activities that cannot be accommodated in residential yards due to size or density limitations. They should be designed for both active and passive recreation activities and meet specific needs of the neighborhood, and should address the needs of all age groups and physical abilities. Recreational facilities found in a neighborhood park are preschool- and elementary-age play areas, picnic areas, shaded seat areas, open grass areas for informal play, and limited sports fields for league play (San Benito County Parks, 2010, p. 47). According to the San Benito County Parkland Classification system, the City should provide 3 to 10 acres, with a 5-acre minimum preferred, of neighborhood parkland within the City. Using the minimum 5 acres, the City has a deficiency of City owned parkland by 8.81 acres. The City concluded in the 1998 General Plan the deficiency is offset by the State Park and Mission, and by the School, which all provide open space and recreational facilities for public use (City of San Juan Bautista, 1998, p. 5-8).

Additional local parks, open space land and other public facilities are also available in the City. These include:

- San Juan Bautista State Historic Park: The State Park encompasses 6.47 acres, which includes a free picnic area, open lawn, restrooms, and historic buildings and maintenance yards on the property (San Juan Bautista General Plan, 1998, p. 5-8). The Historic Park includes four main historic structures built in the 1800s: the Plaza Hotel, the Zanetta House/Plaza Hall, the Plaza Stables, and the Castro-Breen Adobe.
- Mission San Juan Bautista: The Mission includes a 10-acre rodeo ground north of the Church, but the area is presently not in use (San Juan Bautista General Plan, 1998, p. 5-8). The Mission grounds in use totals 14.1 acres.
- San Juan School: San Juan Bautista has one public school in its City limits that provides recreational opportunities, and these facilities can be used when the school is not in session. The school provides education for grades K-8. The School contains playfields, basketball courts, and tennis courts that can be rented for non-school use at a nominal fee (San Juan Bautista General Plan, 1998, p. 5-8). A land use inventory was conducted in October 2013 to confirm the public recreational facilities. Currently, the School totals 20.57 acres, and open space makes up approximately half of this acreage.
- Carl Martin Luck Memorial Library: The Carl Martin Luck Memorial Library, in addition to providing library and media-related services, dedicates half of its 0.93-acre parcel to open space with trees, benches, and a bike rack.

Discussion

a) As described above, the Fire Department has the ability to provide service and response to the project area. Also, a Public Safety Fee will be paid by the developer to the City for each primary residential unit. Based upon the ability of the existing staff to provide services and the provision of development fees, impacts to public safety would be ***less than significant***.

b) As described above, the Sheriff's Department has the ability to provide service and response to the project area. Also, a Public Safety Fee will be paid by the developer to the City for each primary and accessory residential unit. Based upon the ability of the existing staff to provide services and the provision of development fees, impacts to public safety would be ***less than significant***.

c) The proposed 45 homes have the potential to generate as many as 30 primary school students and 15 high school students. Existing schools have adequate capacity for this additional student generation. Impact fees would be paid to the School District as part of the Project development. The Project also would also support safe pedestrian and bicycle travel to the San Juan School with development of sidewalks along its San Juan Hollister Highway frontage.

d,e) The proposed Project residents would add slightly to use of City and nearby State Park and other public facilities. The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) park standards and the San Benito County Parkland Classification system are used to analyze existing park conditions. According to the NPRA's recreation and open space standards, a neighborhood park should provide 1 to 2 acres of City parkland per 1,000 people. San Juan Bautista provides 1.35 acres per 1,000 people. With the Project, the City would still meet acceptable standards. Also, as part of any residential project park/open space in-lieu fees will be collected for future City park development, and therefore this impact would be ***less than significant***.

XV. RECREATION:

RECREATION: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Background

See discussion of **Parks** in Section XIV, Public Services, directly above.

Discussion

a, b) The Project residents of the proposed 45 new homes would add slightly to use of recreational facilities managed by the City and State Parks. The Project will include 58,320 square feet (1.34 acres) of open space/detention basin that will be open to public use, and 12,200 square feet (0.28 acres) for a municipal well that will be closed to public access. Residents will also have sidewalks (for pedestrians) and streets (for bicycles) available for resident and visitor use. Development of the Project with its proposed open space area, sidewalks and streets for bicycle use would avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities.

Also, a Park in lieu Fee will be paid by the developer to the City for each unit. Based upon the provision of on-site open space, and payment of park in lieu fees, impacts to recreation would be ***less than significant***.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Setting

A traffic study was prepared for the Project by Hatch Mott MacDonald (HMM, 2016). The discussion below summarizes the findings of HMM's February 12, 2016 report. The complete report is provided as Attachment 11 of this Draft IS/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Roads and Access

The primary roadways that will serve the proposed Project include Old San Juan Hollister Road, The Alameda, State Route 156 (SR 156) and Mission Vineyard Road. Old San Juan Hollister Road, located along the south side of the site, provides the two site access points. Near the Project site Old San Juan Hollister Road is a two-lane road without curbs or sidewalks.

The north side of the site borders the San Juan Highway, SR 156, which provides regional access to and from US 101 and SR 129 however will not directly connect with the residential subdivision. Near the project site, the San Juan Highway is a major arterial with multiple travel lanes plus turning lanes in both directions, and a center median. The only traffic signal located in San Juan Bautista city limits is at the intersection of The Alameda and Highway 156 (Background Report, 2014).

The Project area would be accessible via two access points connecting with Old San Juan Hollister Road. In addition to the access points, two intersections were studied for the Project transportation assessment: The Alameda / State Route 156 (SR 156); and Mission Vineyard Road – Breen Road / SR 156. Attachment 1, Figures 2 and 5 show the Project area roads and study intersections in relation to the Project.

The Alameda intersects with the Old San Juan Hollister Road about 500 feet (1/10 mile) west of the site and then continues north to intersect with SR 156. The Alameda is two lanes wide near the project site, and runs north into the City's downtown, where it turns into Third Avenue.

About 2,000 feet (0.4 mile) east of the site, Mission Vineyard Road intersects with Old San Juan Hollister Road. Mission Vineyard Road travels north, crosses SR 156 and turns into Breen Road on the northern side of SR156. Mission Vineyard Road and Breen Road are both two lane roads.

Transit, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Facilities

The City of San Juan Bautista is served by the San Benito County Transit "County Express" bus service. This bus line stops at Abbe Park located in the central part of the City about 0.7 miles from the Project site. The bus line also extends northward from Abbe Park to Anzar High School located about 1.2 miles northwest of the site. There is currently no bus service provided to properties along Old San Juan Hollister Road.

Sidewalks and bicycle facilities are discontinuous throughout the City, which is considered an issue for school children and other non-motorists (Background Report, 2014). There are no sidewalks or bike lanes along Old San Juan Hollister Road, SR 156, The Alameda or Mission Vineyard Road. According to the

2035 General Plan Update, circulation related goals include continuous sidewalks, bicycle lanes and other bicycle facilities to encourage safe circulation.

Traffic Conditions

The project is a 45-unit residential subdivision. In addition, approximately 20 percent of the residences will also have an accessory dwelling unit that equates to 9 additional accessory dwelling units on the study property. To be conservative, the trip generation estimate assumes both the 45 primary units and 9 accessory units will be constructed and occupied. The Project would generate an estimated 479 daily trips, with 38 trips during the AM peak hour (10 in, 28 out) and 50 trips during the PM peak hour (31 in, 19 out). Project trip generation estimates use rates from the Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers in 2012.

Two intersections were studied for the Project transportation assessment: The Alameda / State Route 156 (SR 156) which is the only signalized intersection in the City, and Mission Vineyard Road – Breen Road / SR 156. Level of Service (LOS) is a qualitative description of operating conditions ranging from LOS A, or free-flow conditions with little or no delay, to LOS F represents conditions at or above capacity. For each intersection, traffic counts were conducted during the AM and PM peak periods (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) and included cars, trucks, buses, pedestrians and bicycles.

The estimated trip assignments for the Project trips on the local road network uses both above trip generation and trip distribution to quantify the number of new project trips added to each direction of travel at each of the study intersections. Project trip distribution represents the percentage of project traffic that would travel to and from the project site at a localized level. Distribution was developed based upon the relative locations of compatible land uses and the relative magnitude of the existing traffic volumes within the study area.

The City of San Juan Bautista does not have an established significance criteria related to traffic impacts therefore the following criteria were used in the traffic study to evaluate significant impacts to the surrounding street system.

For a signalized intersection: An impact would be significant if:

- The project would cause operations to deteriorate from acceptable conditions (i.e. LOS A, B or C) to unacceptable conditions (i.e. LOS D, E, or F); or
- If operations are already unacceptable (i.e. LOS D, E or F), the project would add 5.0 seconds of delay, compared to "without project" conditions.

For an unsignalized intersection: An impact would be considered significant if:

- The project would cause side-street operations to either deteriorate to unacceptable LOS F conditions or would add one peak hour trip to an intersection with side-street operations at unacceptable LOS F under "without project" conditions; and
- The intersection meets any volume- or delay-based traffic signal warrant.

Operations at The Alameda / SR 156 would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS C; therefore the project would not represent a significant impact at this intersection under Existing Plus Project conditions.

Side Street operations of the Mission Vineyard – Breen/SR 156 intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS F (specifically t6he southbound Breen Road approach). However, neither of the Caltrans peak hour signal warrants (volume or delay) is met under Existing Plus Project conditions. Therefore, the project would not represent a significant impact at this intersection under Existing Plus Project conditions.

Discussion

a) The Project is not anticipated to significantly increase traffic or have an adverse impact on existing traffic load and capacity of the access roads or the surrounding street system. There is little through traffic on San Juan Hollister Highway, and the Project would generate a relatively low number of trips. Existing levels of service at both study intersections remain the same as under existing conditions when Project traffic volumes are added to the road network. Side-street operations of the Mission Vineyard – Breen / SR 156 intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS F (specifically the southbound Breen Road approach). However, neither of the Caltrans peak hour signal warrants (volume and delay) is met under Existing Plus Project conditions. Therefore, the project would represent a ***less than significant impact*** at this intersection under Existing Plus Project conditions (see HMM, page 3).

b) Cumulative Conditions represent projected traffic operations in the Year 2035, or 20 to 22 years into the future. This cumulative scenario includes both traffic from the proposed project, other pending projects in the area (such as the approved gas station and restaurant project on The Alameda at SR 156), and additional future traffic growth at The Alameda / SR 156 intersection. This additional future traffic growth is estimated to grow 2 percent per year for mainline traffic on SR 156 and 0.5 percent per year for all other movements at the intersection.

The future traffic growth at The Alameda /SR 156 intersection was also extended to the mainline traffic on SR 156 at the adjacent Mission Vineyard – Breen / SR 156 intersection. The HMM study determined that The Alameda / SR 156 intersection would continue to operate at LOS C during PM peak hour, but would operate at a deficient LOS D during the AM peak hour. The Mission Vineyard – Breen / SR 156 intersection operates at an acceptable overall LOS A (AM) and LOS B (PM), but the highest side street delay (southbound Breen Road approach) remains an unacceptable LOS F.

As operations at The Alameda / SR 156 intersection during the AM peak hour worsen to an unacceptable LOS D under Cumulative conditions, the project would represent a significant impact at this intersection under Cumulative conditions. The previously recommended improvement at this intersection (i.e. for the aforementioned gas station and restaurant project) is the addition of an exclusive eastbound right turn lane. However, this improvement alone would not result in acceptable operations. It is also recommended that the project add a right turn overlap signal phase to the eastbound right turn movement. Both improvements together (i.e. the exclusive eastbound right turn lane and the eastbound right turn overlap signal phase) would result in acceptable operations at this intersection and lessen the project impact to a less-than-significant level. The Project would be responsible for its fair-share contribution towards these

improvements – 20% of the cost of both improvements – based upon the its percentage of the added traffic to the eastbound right turn movement at The Alameda / SR 156 intersection.

Side Street operations of the Mission Vineyard – Breen/SR 156 intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS F under Cumulative conditions (specifically the southbound Breen Road approach during the AM and PM peak hours and the northbound Mission Vineyard Road approach during the PM peak hour). However, neither of the Caltrans peak hour signal warrants (volume and delay) are not met under Cumulative conditions. Therefore, the Project would not represent a significant impact at this intersection under Cumulative conditions. Therefore, the project would represent a ***less than significant impact*** at this intersection under Cumulative conditions.

In addition to contributing 20% of the costs of the above referenced improvements at The Alameda/SR 156, the Project would, be responsible for payment of the San Benito County Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee. None of the identified mitigation improvements are funded by this fee. After payment of these fees per Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1, impacts would be ***less-than-significant after mitigation***.

Mitigation Measure

Mitigation Measure TRAFFIC-1: Cumulative Project Traffic

TRAF-1 The Project shall contribute (20 % of the cost) toward recommended traffic improvements (i.e. the exclusive eastbound right turn lane and the eastbound right turn overlap signal phase) based upon the its percentage of the added traffic. In addition, the Project will be responsible for payment of the San Benito County Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee.

c) The Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Therefore, there is ***no impact*** on air traffic from the Project.

d) The Project would not create any hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. Design of the Project's internal access roadways will adhere to City of San Juan Bautista design guidelines and requirements, including 56-foot wide internal roadways, to prevent hazards associated with site access or internal circulation. Further, the evaluation of site distance at the proposed Project indicates that adequate sight distance to prevent hazards would be provided at the proposed Project entrances along San Juan Hollister Highway. Therefore, there is ***no impact*** and the Project would not create or otherwise impact hazards due to design features.

e) The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The design of all internal access roadways should adhere to City of San Juan Bautista and San Benito County roadway design guidelines and requirements. Adhering to the recommended roadway design guidelines, the proposed internal roadway layout would provide adequate vehicular access (in particular emergency vehicle access) and on-

site circulation, making every proposed residential unit within the project development accessible (see HMM, page 4). Therefore, the Project would have a ***less than significant impact*** on emergency access.

f) The Project would not result in inadequate parking capacity because it would include driveways and garages for each new single family home that would be constructed. There would also be sufficient driveways and legal on-street parking for guests to park temporarily. Therefore, the Project would have ***no impact*** on parking.

g) The Project would not conflict with the City's adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks, pedestrian facilities, and bus stops). Assuming a three percent transit mode share, the project would not create a sufficient number of new transit riders to necessitate the need for additional transit or other facilities.

There are no sidewalks or bike lanes currently provided along streets near or within the Project site. The City's Updated 2035 General Plan recommends that sidewalks and bike lanes be provided along new streets within the City. Specifically, a sidewalk along the project's frontage on the north side of Old San Juan Hollister Highway should be constructed to provide residents, especially school children, and visitors with a safer sidewalk between the Project site, the San Juan Elementary School, and the downtown. It is already anticipated (based upon the Project site plan) that sidewalks be provided along both sides of all new streets within the Project site and project frontage. With installation of sidewalks in and along the Project site, the Project would have a ***less than significant impact*** on alternative transportation within the City.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☒	☐	☐

e) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

Water*:* The proposed Project would be connected to the City public water system. The Project would require an estimated 15 to 22 acre-feet of domestic water/year, which would be drawn from City owned and operated wells using water from local aquifers. The 15 acre-feet per year estimated amount is based on the current gallon per capita per day (gpcd) average in San Juan Bautista, which is 100 gpcd. The 22 acre-feet is based on the water consumption number that the City uses for planning, which is 140 gpcd.

The City's water supply is currently provided from three wells, Wells 1, 2, and 3. Well No. 2, located on the Project site, has good production rates but high nitrate levels and therefore is not currently used by the City. To use Well No. 2, the City is required to notify all users of the public water system that households with infants under 6 months old or pregnant women should not use this water. Bottled water is available for these residents. City water storage would be provided by a recently constructed 1.2 million gallon steel water reservoir. The existing City wells can produce between 360,000 and 400,000 gpd. At maximum capacity, the wells currently are able to produce 1.03 million gallons per day (mgd).

Wastewater*:* The City of San Juan Bautista provides sewer services to most properties within the city limits. Most residents in the unincorporated area are on private septic systems. The collection system includes two lift stations, and the treatment plant system has been upgraded from the original aerated pond system to a sequencing batch reactor (SBR) and sludge storage with flow equalization of the treated effluent from the SBR.

The wastewater treatment plant, located at the end of Third Street, can currently handle a dry weather flow of 270,000 gallons per day (gpd) and a wet weather flow of 500,000 gpd. The City currently averages 159,000 gpd (176,000 gpd peak flow and 148,000 gpd low flow). Treated effluent that can be reused for irrigation is pumped from recycled water storage tank of the treatment plant through a separate piping system, known as the "purple pipe" system, to public parks in the City. Effluent that cannot be reused is discharged into a drainage channel adjacent to the plant that is a tributary to San Juan Creek, which flows 3.5 miles to the San Benito River.

Stormwater: Stormwater from the site drains generally from north to south. There are no streams or ditches on the site.

Solid Waste: The City sends an estimated 836 tons of waste to John Smith Road Landfill per year. The countywide average residential per-capita disposal rate in 2012 was 2.41 pounds per capita per day (ppd), or 0.44 tons per-capita per year. The 2012 statewide average disposal rate was 4.3 ppd, the lowest state disposal rate to date.

Refuse collection services are provided to residential, commercial, and industrial users by a private carrier under contract with the City. As of 2016, Recology San Benito County is under contract with the City of San Juan Bautista, the City of Hollister, and the unincorporated area of San Benito County. A variety of waste reduction programs are available to City residents, including curbside recycling and organic material collection, composting facilities, commercial on-site recyclables pickup, school recycling programs, public outreach and education efforts, and special or hazardous waste handling programs.

Discussion

a, b, e) Sewage from the area would be discharged into the sewer collection system and treated at the City's waste-water treatment facility. The proposed Project could produce about 8,000 gpd to 12,000 gpd of wastewater. With the addition of the Project wastewater, the dry weather flows could reach about 180,000 gpd and wet weather flows could reach about 160,000 gpd. The total wastewater, including wastewater from the City and from the proposed Project, in both dry and wet conditions, is well below the maximum capacity of the wastewater treatment plant. Therefore, the Project would have a ***less than significant impact*** on wastewater related utilities.

c) Storm drainage and surface runoff flows would be directed to the proposed on-site retention/detention/water quality and storm drainage collection systems that would be incorporated into the design upon development. Therefore, the Project would have a ***less than significant impact*** on stormwater related utilities.

b, d) The proposed Project could have a water supply-related demand of between 14,000 and 19,000 gpd. The total demand, including average water demand from the City and the high estimate of water from the proposed Project (19,000 gpd), is well below the maximum daily supply capacity of the City. Also, the City has access to clean, safe water supplies supported by provision of a new municipal well site on the Project's "Lot B", indicated on the Project Tentative Map.

f, g) The property would be incorporated into the City of San Juan Bautista and be a part of the City's solid waste disposal contract services.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

a) Does the project have the potential to 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a) As described in section IV, Biological Resources, the Project may adversely affect a number of special status and protected avian and bat species however that impact would be reduced to a less-than significant level by implementation of identified biological mitigation measures. No cultural resources have been identified on the site. This IS includes mitigation measures to reduce the impacts to unidentified cultural resources to less-than-significant with mitigation in the event such resources are uncovered during Project development. Impacts related to quality of the environmental are considered ***less-than-significant with mitigation***.

b) In addition the proposed Project, two other residential projects, the 27-unit D'Ambrosio Vista subdivision and the 85-unit Rancho Vista development, are proposed for development roughly at the same time as the proposed Project. A gas station/mini mart project also has been approved at the southern entrance to the City. Construction of these projects may result in overlapping grading impacts, construction noise and construction traffic. Residents near the Project may be exposed to overlapping construction dust, noise and traffic resulting from the Project and the D'Ambrosio development. The three residential projects also would increase demand on the City's water and sewer systems. Mitigation measures to minimize environmental impacts will be applied to each project to reduce the related impacts to a less-than-significant levels. The City will ensure that City water and sewer infrastructure has or will have adequate capacity to accommodate these projects prior to Project construction. Therefore, when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and other current projects, these effects are considered ***less-than-significant with mitigation***.

c) The project would not involve the use or transport of hazardous materials, or create other potential health risks to the public. However, there is the potential that agricultural chemicals could migrate from the adjoining Lot C, and that toxic air contaminants would create long-term impacts to future residents

near Highway 156. This IS includes mitigation measures to reduce the impacts related to soil and air contaminants. Therefore, impacts related to health risks would be mitigated and are considered ***less-than-significant with mitigation***.

G. REFERENCES

Berlogar Stevens & Associates (BSA) - Soil Engineers and Engineering Geologists

BSA. 2015a. Design Level Geotechnical Investigation Report, Proposed Copperleaf Project. San Juan Hollister Highway, San Juan Bautista, California. Prepared for City of San Juan Bautista, California. December 15, 2015.

BSA. 2015b. Fault Ground-Rupture Investigation, Proposed Copperleaf Project. San Juan Hollister Highway, San Juan Bautista, California. Prepared for City of San Juan Bautista, California. February 19, 2015.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

CDFW. 2015. Natural Diversity Data Base, computer listings and map locations of historic and current recorded occurrences of special-status species and natural communities of special concern for USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle map: San Juan Batista, February 13, 2015.

CDFW. 2015a. California Wildlife Habitat Relationships. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cwhr/wildlife_habitats.asp

CDFW. 2015b. Special animals. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEAnimals.pdf

CDFW. 2015c. State and federally listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare plants of California. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEPlants.pdf

CDFW. 2015d. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) BIOS 2013; California Fish Passage Assessment; Coho Salmon ESU, Central California Coast; and Steelhead DPS, Central California Coast. Accessed March 20, 2014 from http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/bios/ .

CDFW 2012 California Department of Fish and Wildlife; Staff Report on Burrowing owl Mitigation, State of California, Natural Resource Agency March 7, 2012

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2015. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (online edition, v6-04d1). California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA. Accessed on February 13, 2015 from http://www.cnps.org/inventory

City of San Juan Bautista (City)

City. 2014. San Juan Bautista 2015 General Plan Update Background Report 2013-14. Version dated October 30, 2014 http://www.san-juan-bautista.ca.us/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/2-San-Juan-Bautista-2035-GP_Background-Report-FINAL-EDITS-3.pdf Online version accessed January 8, 2016.

City. 2016a. San Juan Bautista 2035 General Plan. Adopted February 2016.

City. 2016b. San Juan Bautista 2035 General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report. Certified February 2016.

City. 2016c. Municipal Code. Title 11 – Zoning. Online version at: http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/SanJuanBautista/?SanJuanBautista11/SanJuanBautista1118.html&?f Accessed February 5, 2016.

HMM. 2016. Hatch Mott MacDonald. Copperleaf Subdivision, San Juan Bautista, California. February 12, 2016.

Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. 2015a. Copperleaf Subdivision Project – Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment, San Juan Bautista, California. December 2, 2015.

Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. 2015b. Copperleaf Subdivision Project – Environmental Noise Assessment, San Juan Bautista, California. December 14, 2015.

JPR 1999. JRP Historical Consulting Services. DPR 523 Form prepared for the Breen/Taix Barn (P-35-000407). On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University. 1999.

MBUAPCD 2014. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, 2014. Receive a Presentation on District GHG Threshold Development. February 2014.

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2015. United States Department of Agriculture. Web Soil Survey. Accessed February 12, 2015. Available on-line at http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov

Northgate Environmental Management, Inc. 2015. Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Copperleaf Subdivision, Old San Juan Hollister Road, San Juan Bautista, California. March 23, 2015.

Olberding Environmental, Inc. 2015. Biological Resources Analysis Report for the Manning Property. San Juan Bautista, San Benito County, California. Prepared for City of San Juan Bautista, California. February 2015.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS):

USFWS. 2015a. Endangered and threatened plant and animal species. Accessed on February 11, 2015. http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/pub/stateListingAndOccurrenceIndividual.jsp?state=CA&s8fid=112761032792&s8fid=112762573902

USFWS. 2015b. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; review of plant and animal taxa that are Candidates or Proposed for listing as Endangered or Threatened; annual notice of findings on recycled petitions; annual description of progress on listing actions; proposed rule. Federal Register 64(205): 57534-57547.

USFWS. 2015c. Bald Eagle Management Guidelines and Conservation Measures. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. Accessed on February 11, 2015. Available on-line at http://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/protect/laws.html

Wheeler 2000. Wheeler, Thomas. DPR 523 Form prepared for the San Juan Pacific Railroad (P-35-000295). On file at the Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University. 2000.

WSA, Inc. 2015. Cultural Resources Assessment Report. Copperleaf Residential Development, City of San Juan Bautista, San Benito County, California. October 2015.

H. REPORT PREPARERS

City of San Juan Bautista

Roger Grimsley, City Planner

Consultant

Olberding Environmental, Inc.

Jeff Olberding, Principal
Deborah Kruse, Senior Environmental Planner/Project Manager
Lisa Henderson, Wildlife Biologist
Richard Lescalleet, Wildlife Biologist and GIS