RESOLUTION NO. _____ (CM)

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE APPROVING THE FINAL INITIAL STUDY WITH MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE AIRPORT BOULEVARD RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT, NO. ST-16-02 (AT AIRPORT BOULEVARD BETWEEN FREEDOM BOULEVARD AND WATSONVILLE CITY LIMITS), IN COMPLIANCE WITH CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

WHEREAS, Rincon Consultants, Inc., assisted the City with preparation of the Final Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Final Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated starting on February 17, 2016, for a 30-day period in compliance with the requirements of CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the appropriate public noticing procedures have been followed and a public hearing was held according to Section 15072 of Chapter 3 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered all written and verbal evidence regarding the Final Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that the project is consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act with the proposed mitigations; and

WHEREAS, after City Council approval, staff shall submit the Final Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration to the State and begin final design of the Airport Boulevard Reconstruction Project, No. ST-16-02.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, AS FOLLOWS:

Reso No. _____ (CM)
Q:\COUNCIL\2016\051016\Airport Blvd Reconstruction Project IS & Neg Dec Reso.docx
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AJS ______ CAM ______ PWU 1
That the City Council hereby adopts the Final Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Airport Boulevard Reconstruction Project, No. ST-16-02 (at Airport Boulevard between Freedom Boulevard and Watsonville City limits), attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit “A.”
Airport Boulevard Reconstruction
from Freedom Boulevard to City Limits

City of Watsonville

At Airport Boulevard between Freedom Boulevard and Watsonville City Limits

Final Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration

March 2016
**Project Description**

The proposed project is the reconstruction of the existing Airport Boulevard roadway and pedestrian facilities between Freedom Boulevard and the Watsonville City Limits, in the City of Watsonville, Santa Cruz County, California. The total project length would be 1,130 linear feet (LF) and the total project area would be 1.92 acres. Improvements include removal and replacement of existing curbs, gutters and sidewalks for 507 LF on the north side of the roadway and 942 LF on the south side of the roadway. In addition, new curbs, gutters and sidewalks would be added for 577 LF along the north side of the roadway, where no such improvements currently exist. The project would additionally include the construction of a 140 LF refuge island and rectangular rapid flashing beacon in the western portion of the roadway segment, near the existing shopping center parking lot. A bus pullout and shelter would also be installed in this location. A three-foot tall and 90-foot long retaining wall would be constructed behind the bus pullout. Lastly, bike lanes currently exist on both sides of the roadway segment would be reinstalled upon project completion. All curb ramps, sidewalks and pathways would be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.

The project site includes an existing roadway corridor which generally runs in a southwest – northeast direction. The road includes one 12-foot lane traveling northeast and one to two 10-foot lanes traveling southeast (one lane in the northeast half of the corridor and two lanes in the southwest half of the corridor). The southwest-bound direction also contains several turning lanes, each of which is 10 feet wide. The majority of the roadway segment includes five-foot wide bicycle lanes, except along the north side of the roadway where a 20-foot wide shoulder is located. The site is primarily surrounded by existing urban development within the City of Watsonville, including a large shopping center and associated parking lot on the south side of the roadway and commercial uses fronting the north side of the roadway. The easternmost 577 feet of the north side of the roadway is bordered by an undeveloped area containing one existing tree and some vegetation. No existing utilities in the project area would require relocation during the construction of the proposed project; however, manhole covers and utility box lids would be adjusted to grade.

The project would not widen the existing roadway, nor increase the number of lanes or cause substantial horizontal or vertical alterations. The project would include some vegetation removal and the removal of one tree on the north side of the roadway, where new curbs, gutters and sidewalks would be installed.

Three staging areas are identified for the project: (1) a 24,979 square foot parking lot at the Watsonville City Recycling yard located at 320 Harvest Drive, (2) a 10,291 square foot parking lot located at 220 Aviation Way, and (3) a 17,534 square foot parking lot located at 1509 Freedom Boulevard. These staging areas are located approximately 2.5 miles south, 0.8 mile southwest, and 0.7 mile southeast of the project area, respectively. These parking lots are not natural habitats and do not contain any vegetation. Project activities that would occur in the staging areas would be restricted to the limits of the parking areas only and would not extend beyond the limits of the road base surface onto adjacent vegetated areas.

**Determination**

This proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is included to give notice to interested agencies and the public that it is the City of Watsonville’s intent to adopt an MND for this project.
This does not mean that the City’s decision regarding the project is final. This MND is subject to change based on comments received by interested agencies and the public.

The City has prepared an Initial Study for this project and pending public review, expects to determine from this study that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

The proposed project would have no effect on visual or aesthetic resources, land use, growth, community impacts, utilities/emergency services, traffic and transportation/pedestrian and bicycle facilities, cultural resources, paleontological resources, hydrology and flooding and geology/soils/seismic/topography.

The proposed project would have no significant effect on farmland, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions/climate change, or noise.

In addition, the proposed project would have no significant adverse effect on storm water runoff, wetlands and other waters of the U.S., hazardous waste/materials, construction impacts, natural communities and threatened and endangered or invasive species because the following mitigation measures would reduce any potential effects to insignificance:

**Storm Water Runoff**

- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared and implemented during construction to the satisfaction of the Resident Engineer. The SWPPP will outline erosion and sedimentation control measures required under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general construction permit.
- Prior to the onset of work activities, a plan must be established for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills and all workers shall be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should an accidental spill occur.

**Construction Impacts**

- Adherence to Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) rules, ordinances and regulations is a required part of all land disturbing construction and shall effectively reduce and control temporary construction dust emissions to a less than significant level.
- A Traffic Control Plan shall be prepared to minimize temporary impacts to the local circulation system during periods of construction.
- All vehicles and equipment shall be in good working condition and free of leaks.
- All construction activities shall be limited to daylight hours.
- Construction activities shall include use of methods and equipment that will provide the lowest level of noise and ground vibration impact such as alternative low noise pile installation methods.
- Utilize construction methods or equipment that will provide the lowest level of noise and ground vibration impact such as alternative low noise pile installation methods.
- Newer equipment shall also be used, with improved muffling. All equipment shall have the manufacturers’ recommended noise abatement measures such as mufflers, engine closures and engine vibration isolators intact and operational. Likewise, all equipment...
shall be inspected at periodic intervals to ensure proper maintenance and presence of noise control devices (e.g. mufflers and shrouding, etc.).

- All idling equipment shall be turned off.
- Plan noisier operations during times of least sensitivity to receptors.
- Keep noise levels relatively uniform and avoid impulsive noises.
- Maintain good public relations with the community to minimize objections to unavoidable construction impacts; provide frequent activity updates of all construction activities.

**Natural Communities**

- Herbicide shall not be used on-site.
- No pets or firearms shall be permitted on-site.

**Threatened and Endangered or Invasive Species**

- If possible, trees or shrubs that would be impacted by project construction shall be removed during the non-nesting season (between September 2 and February 14).
- If removal of trees and shrubs is to be done during nesting season (February 15 to September 1), all trees and other suitable nesting habitat within the limits of work shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist prior to initiating construction related activities. A preconstruction survey will be conducted within 3-5 days prior to work. If no nests are observed, construction activities will be initiated within 3-5 days. If more than 3-5 days pass and construction has not been initiated, another survey will be conducted.
- If, during the breeding season, an active nest is discovered in a tree or shrub to be removed, the tree or shrub shall be protected using orange construction fence or the equivalent. The protective fencing shall be placed around the tree or shrub at the following distance depending on species: 100 feet from the drip line of the tree or shrub for passerines and non-raptors; 300 feet from the drip line of the tree for raptors. No parking, storage of materials, or work will be allowed within this area until the end of the breeding season or until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.
- If, during the breeding season survey, an active nest is discovered in a tree or shrub to be removed, a qualified biologist would monitor construction until the end of breeding season or until the young have fledged. The monitoring biologist, in consultation with the project manager will determine the appropriate protection for active nests on a case by case basis using the criteria described above.
- City staff shall be notified immediately if any nesting bird species protected under federal law (including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)) and/or California Fish and Game Code are observed during surveys.
- During construction, the project shall make all reasonable efforts to limit the use of imported soils for fill. Soils currently existing on-site should be used for fill material. If the use of imported fill material is necessary, the imported material must be obtained from a source that is known to be free of invasive plant species; or the material must consist of purchased material such as crushed aggregate, sorted rock, or other similar substances which has been verified to be free of invasive species.
• All erosion control materials including straw bales, straw wattles, or mulch used on-site must be free of invasive species seed.

• Exotic and invasive plant species shall be excluded from any erosion control seed mixes and/or landscaping plant palettes associated with the proposed project.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources  ☐ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources  ☐ Cultural Resources  ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards & 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
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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 potential 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

Date

Printed Name
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Chapter 1  Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The City of Watsonville (City), in coordination with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), is proposing safety improvements to Airport Boulevard from Freedom Boulevard to the City limits. The proposed project will receive Federal Highway Administration funding and project oversight from Caltrans. The project proposes providing a median island, installing a rectangular rapid flashing beacon at the crosswalk, installing a new bus shelter and reconstructing the paved portion of the existing roadway. Additionally, the proposed project would replace all existing curbs, gutters and sidewalks within the project area, as well as install new curb, gutter and sidewalk along the north side of the roadway. The project would not widen the existing roadway, nor increase the number of new lanes or cause substantial horizontal or vertical alterations and would include three staging areas. The property surrounding the project area is primarily developed urban land.

1.2 Purpose and Need

1.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the project is to improve pedestrian safety along Airport Boulevard from Freedom Boulevard to the Watsonville City limits.

1.2.2 Need

There were three pedestrian fatalities within the Watsonville city limits between 2005 and 2010 (UC Berkeley, 2011). This placed Watsonville 4th out of 104 similar California cities for number of pedestrian collisions per 1,000 daily vehicle miles traveled (UC Berkley, 2011). Through consultation with local law enforcement and public works officials as well as review of the CHP Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS), the City has identified the project site as representing one of the City’s highest crash concentrations for collisions between vehicles and pedestrians (Watsonville, City Of, 2013). Causes include a lack of defined pedestrian facilities and limited sight distance. Sight distance is hindered by the location being on a grade, within a curve and a poorly located bus stop on the north side of Airport Boulevard. The bus stop is located such that pedestrians leaving the bus and using the crosswalk are blocked from the view of westbound traffic by the bus. Some collisions have occurred when pedestrians have crossed Airport Boulevard without using the crosswalk. Without construction of the proposed improvements, these safety hazards would continue.

1.3 Project Description

The project site location is Airport Boulevard between Freedom Boulevard and the Watsonville City Limits, in the City of Watsonville, Santa Cruz County, California (Figures 1 and 2). Specifically, the site is located in the northern portion of the City of Watsonville, approximately 1.5 miles east of Highway 1 within the Watsonville West, California United States Geological
Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle. The approximate center of the site is located at 36°56'17.88"N, 121°46'41.10"W. The area of potential effect (APE) for the project and associated staging areas is shown in Figures 3 and 4.

The City of Watsonville proposes the reconstruction of the existing roadway and pedestrian facilities. The total project length would be 1,130 linear feet (LF). Improvements include removal and replacement of existing curbs, gutters and sidewalks for 507 LF on the north side of the roadway and 942 LF on the south side of the roadway. In addition, new curbs, gutters and sidewalks would be added for 577 LF along the north side of the roadway, where no such improvements currently exist. The project would additionally include the construction of a 140 LF refuge island and rectangular rapid flashing beacon in the western portion of the roadway segment, near the existing shopping center parking lot. A bus pullout and shelter would also be installed in this location. A three-foot tall and 90-foot long retaining wall would be constructed behind the bus pullout. Lastly, bike lanes currently exist on both sides of the roadway segment and these would be reinstalled upon project completion (Figure 5). All curb ramps, sidewalks and pathways would be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.

The project would improve safety along Airport Boulevard from Freedom Boulevard to the City limits. The project would address these safety hazards by:

- Installing a sidewalk on the north side of Airport Boulevard where none currently exists. This would provide a defined area for pedestrians and enhance their visibility to south-westbound vehicles.

- Relocating the bus stop from the near side to the far side of the crosswalk to prevent the bus from restricting site distance for southwestbound vehicles.

- Providing a median island to improve channelization of vehicles and provide a refuge area for pedestrians crossing the street.

- Installing a rectangular rapid flashing beacon at the crosswalk to improve motorist awareness of pedestrians crossing Airport Boulevard.

With installation of these facilities, pedestrian safety along the roadway segment would be improved.

The project would not widen the existing roadway, nor increase the number of new lanes or cause substantial horizontal or vertical alterations. The project would include some vegetation removal and the removal of one tree on the north side of the roadway, where new curbs, gutters and sidewalks would be installed.

Three staging areas are identified for the project: (1) a 24,979 square foot parking lot at the Watsonville City Recycling yard located at 320 Harvest Drive, (2) a 10,291 square foot parking lot located at 220 Aviation Way and (3) a 17,534 square foot parking lot located at 1509 Freedom Boulevard. These staging areas are located approximately 2.5 miles south, 0.8 mile southwest and 0.7 mile southeast of the project area, respectively (Figure 4). These parking lots
are not natural habitats and do not contain any vegetation. Project activities that would occur in
the staging areas would be restricted to the limits of the parking areas only and would not
extend beyond the limits of the road base surface onto adjacent vegetated areas.

Construction of the proposed project would require earthwork, paving, installation of minor
concrete structures and striping. Excavation and grading would include cut and fill. Cut materials
would be exported and baserock materials would be imported. A total of 1,895 cubic yards (CY)
would be excavated from the site, including 840 CY for minor concrete work, 1,020 CY for re-
grading the roadway and 35 CY for the retaining wall. The project would not require the
relocation of any existing utilities, nor install any new above-ground or underground utilities.
However, manhole covers and utility box lids would be adjusted to grade. The following is a list
of the equipment that is anticipated to be used onsite during project implementation:

- Wheel Loader
- Excavator
- Scraper
- Backhoe
- Truck
- Pick Up
- Trencher
- Dump Truck
- Cement Truck
- Grader
- Grinder
- Mill
- Roller
- Loader
- Compactor
- Concrete Cutter
- Paver
- Water Truck

A traffic control plan would be prepared for the project and would outline how all vehicular,
bicycle and pedestrian traffic would be controlled. The plan would outline how access, parking,
staging and construction would be done and how the traffic from these activities would be
controlled. There would be no road closures during construction. However, there may be
temporary traffic control work that occupies one lane for part of a day.

Construction is anticipated to begin in January 2017 and is expected to take approximately 100
working days, or approximately 20 weeks. Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) will
be utilized and areas of temporary disturbance would be revegetated with native plants.

1.4 Permits and Approvals Needed

The following permits, reviews and approvals would be required for project construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Permit /Approval</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>General Construction Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Encroachment Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Vicinity Map

Project Location

Figure 1
Project Location Map

Imagery provided by the National Geographic Society, ESRI, and its licensors © 2015. The topographic representation depicted in this map may not portray all of the features currently found in the vicinity today and/or features depicted in this map may have changed since the original topographic map was assembled.
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Chapter 2  Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences and Avoidances, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

As part of the scoping and environmental analysis carried out for the project, the following environmental issues were considered but no significant adverse impacts were identified. As a result, there is no further discussion about these issues in this document.

**Visual/Aesthetics** – The project site consists of a two to three lane roadway with center and dedicated turn lanes. The site is bordered on both sides by urban land developed with commercial buildings, including the Freedom and Airport Shopping Center to the east and a mix of auto shops and self-storage facilities on the west. Two single family residences are located approximately 60 feet northwest of the project boundary and separated from the project site by a masonry wall.

The proposed project involves the reworking of the existing roadway, addition of new curbs, gutters and sidewalks, signage, striping and construction of a new bus shelter and retaining wall. Additionally, the proposed project would replace all existing curbs, gutters and sidewalks in the project area, as well as install new curb, gutter and sidewalk along the north side of the roadway. The proposed improvements would not expand the existing footprint of the roadway and would be consistent with the existing visual environment. Impacts to scenic vistas and the existing visual character of the project site would therefore be less than significant.

The project would not introduce any new buildings or sources of glare into the existing environment. The project would, however, include the addition of a flashing beacon at pedestrian crosswalk. This would be a new light source to the project area, but would not significantly affect any nighttime or daytime views. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would require the removal of one Eucalyptus tree (*Eucalyptus* sp.) along the north side of the roadway. The Eucalyptus tree is a stand-alone tree in an approximately 60 foot strip of undeveloped land between Airport Boulevard and existing residences. Removal of the tree would leave no trees between the existing residences and Airport Boulevard. However, because this tree is not part of a grove, it does not currently provide substantial visual screening, such that the removal would not significantly alter the views from the existing residences. Existing landscaping trees in the Airport Freedom Center parking lot, across Airport Boulevard, would remain. Impacts to scenic resources would be less than significant.

Based on review of plans.

**Land Use** – The proposed project is consistent with the goals set for City corridors in the City of Watsonville’s Vista 2030 General Plan Update (General Plan). The General Plan establishes the goal to focus on the redevelopment of Boulevards within the City to make them more pedestrian-friendly (City of Watsonville, 2013). The proposed improvements do not expand the
existing roadway, increase the number of lanes, or cause substantial horizontal or vertical alterations. The addition of new curbs, gutters and sidewalks along the northwest portion of the project area would expand into undeveloped land adjacent to single family residences. There would be no impacts to any existing land uses.

Based on review of plans.

*Population and Housing* – No change in the existing growth patterns would occur as a result of the proposed project. The project is necessary to improve pedestrian safety and does not increase number of lanes or directly contribute to any growth. Additionally, the project is located on the existing roadway and would not displace significant amounts of housing or people. There would be no impacts to population and housing.

Based on review of plans.

*Utilities* – The project would not place an increased demand on any utilities or service systems. The project would involve the replacement and addition of sidewalks and bicycle lanes, construction of a pedestrian refuge island, addition of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon, a bus turnout and shelter, and a retaining wall behind the new bus pullout. While the project would add 577 linear feet of curbs, gutters and sidewalks in the project area which are not currently in place, the project would not widen the existing roadway. Therefore, impacts to storm water drainage facilities would be less than significant.

Additionally, because the project involves improvements to an existing roadway, it would not generate any wastewater or require any water supply. Any existing utilities within the right-of-way (ROW) would not be relocated and no new utilities would be added. There would be no impact.

Based on review of project plans.

*Cultural Resources* – No cultural resources are present at the project site, based on the September 2015 Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) and the September 2015 Historic Properties Survey Report (HPSR) prepared for the project. The ASR concluded that there are no previously-recorded cultural resources within the study area and no historical or prehistoric materials were discovered during the survey. Based on the survey and the archival research, the ASR concluded that the likelihood of encountering significant prehistoric or historical cultural deposits is low. However, if previously unidentified cultural materials are unearthed during construction, section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires that work be halted in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. Impacts would be less than significant.

Based on ASR and HPSR.

*Greenhouse Gas Emissions* – The proposed project involves roadway improvements that would improve pedestrian and bicycle safety. This is consistent with the goals and policies of the City of Watsonville General Plan, as well as the City’s Climate Action Plan, to promote pedestrian and bicycle transportation in an effort to reduce vehicle greenhouse gas emissions. Additionally,
the project would not permanently increase traffic volumes, and therefore, not result in a permanent increase in vehicle emissions. Impacts to greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant. **Hydrology and Flooding** – The project site is located in “Zone X”, which is outside of the 100-year and 500-year flood zones (National Flood Insurance Program, 2012). The proposed project would not result in any encroachments into the floodplain. Additionally, the project site is located on predominantly flat terrain and away from any large body of water. Therefore, the project would not be exposed to risk of inundation by dam failure, seiche, tsunami or mudflow. There would be no impacts. Based on review of project plans and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map 06087C0384E, updated 2012.

The project involves improvements to an existing roadway to improve pedestrian safety and would not substantially increase the amount of impermeable surfaces. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the hydrology of the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography** – The project is located in the seismically active area of California. However, the project involves improvements to an existing roadway and construction is predominantly at grade level. Therefore, there are no major geologic or seismic hazards that would either be exacerbated by development in the project area, or which would pose significant hazards to persons living or working in the project area. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project site is located within the urban setting of the City of Watsonville on predominantly flat terrain. Additionally, the project does not require the use of a septic tank or any waste water disposal system. Therefore there would be no impact due to risk of landslides within the project area or soils incapable of supporting wastewater disposal.

Based on review of project plans.

**Noise** – The proposed improvements would not permanently increase traffic volumes or associated vehicular noise. Therefore impacts would be less than significant. Temporary impacts during construction are discussed below in Section 2.1.4 Construction Impacts.

**Farmland and Timbers** – The land immediately surrounding the project area is zoned either thoroughfare commercial or single family residential (City of Watsonville, 2007). Immediately along the northwest portion of the project site is a small portion of land that is currently undeveloped, but is zoned for single family residential. Approximately 250 feet to the north of the project area, there is land designated as Prime Farmland (Department of Conservation & The Natural Resource Agency, 2014). However, this land is outside the project area and there would be no direct or indirect impact associated with the project construction. Therefore, no impacts to agricultural or timber lands would occur.

**Hazards** – The project is in an urban setting with commercial development along the east and southwest portions of the project site and single family residential and undeveloped open space along the northwest portion. Existing urban uses surround the project site to the east, west, and south. Approximately 200 feet to the northwest of the project site is Corralitos Creek and
beyond that is developed agricultural land. Because of this setting, the project site would not expose people or structures to any significant risk of wildland fires. There would be no impact.

Furthermore, the proposed project involves improvements to Airport Boulevard. During project construction there would be temporary traffic delays. However, there would be no road closures throughout project construction and a traffic control plan would be developed as part of the project to outline how vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle traffic would be controlled and emergency access would be provided. These improvements would not conflict or hinder any emergency response plan or evacuation routes. Impacts to emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans would be less than significant.

Mineral Resources – The project site is located within the existing roadway and within the urban setting of the City of Watsonville. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource. Additionally, the project site is zoned as thorough fare commercial in the City of Watsonville Vista 2035 General Plan (City of Watsonville, 2013) and would not 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. There would be no impacts.

Public Services – The project would involve the replacement and addition of sidewalks and bicycle lanes, construction of a pedestrian refuge island, addition of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon, a bus turnout and shelter, and a retaining wall behind the new bus pullout. These improvements would serve to increase pedestrian safety within the project area. There would be no impact to fire protection, police protection, school facilities, parks or other public facilities that would require new or expanded facilities to maintain acceptable performance objectives. Based on review of the plans.

Recreation – The project would involve changes to an existing roadway to improve pedestrian safety. Construction of the project would not result in the increased use of any existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The project does not include any recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. There would be no impacts. Based on review of the plans.

### 2.1 Physical Environment

#### 2.1.1 Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff

**Regulatory Setting**

*Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act*

California’s Porter-Cologne Act, enacted in 1969, provides the legal basis for water quality regulation within California. This act requires a “Report of Waste Discharge” for any discharge of waste (liquid, solid, or gaseous) to land or surface waters that may impair beneficial uses for surface and/or groundwater of the state. It predates the CWA and regulates discharges to
waters of the state. Waters of the state include more than just waters of the U.S., like groundwater and surface waters not considered waters of the U.S. Additionally, it prohibits discharges of “waste” as defined and this definition is broader than the CWA definition of “pollutant.” Discharges under the Porter-Cologne Act are permitted by Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) and may be required even when the discharge is already permitted or exempt under the CWA.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and RWQCBs are responsible for establishing the water quality standards (objectives and beneficial uses) required by the CWA and regulating discharges to ensure compliance with the water quality standards. Details about water quality standards in a project area are included in the applicable RWQCB Basin Plan. In California, Regional Boards designate beneficial uses for all water body segments in their jurisdictions and then set criteria necessary to protect these uses. As a result, the water quality standards developed for particular water segments are based on the designated use and vary depending on that use. In addition, the SWRCB identifies waters failing to meet standards for specific pollutants. These waters are then state-listed in accordance with CWA Section 303(d). If a state determines that waters are impaired for one or more constituents and the standards cannot be met through point source or non-point source controls (NPDES permits or WDRs), the CWA requires the establishment of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). TMDLs specify allowable pollutant loads from all sources (point, non-point and natural) for a given watershed.

State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards

The SWRCB administers water rights, sets water pollution control policy, issues water board orders on matters of statewide application and oversees water quality functions throughout the state by approving Basin Plans, TMDLs and NPDES permits. RWQCBs are responsible for protecting beneficial uses of water resources within their regional jurisdiction using planning, permitting and enforcement authorities to meet this responsibility.

Construction General Permit

Construction General Permit (Order No. 2009-009-DWQ), adopted on September 2, 2009, became effective on July 1, 2010. The permit regulates storm water discharges from construction sites that result in a Disturbed Soil Area (DSA) of one acre or greater and/or are smaller sites that are part of a larger common plan of development. By law, all storm water discharges associated with construction activity where clearing, grading and excavation result in soil disturbance of at least one acre must comply with the provisions of the General Construction Permit. Construction activity that results in soil disturbances of less than one acre is subject to this Construction General Permit if there is potential for significant water quality impairment resulting from the activity as determined by the RWQCB. Operators of regulated construction sites are required to develop storm water pollution prevention plans; to implement sediment, erosion and pollution prevention control measures; and to obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit.

The 2009 Construction General Permit separates projects into Risk Levels 1, 2, or 3. Risk levels are determined during the planning and design phases and are based on potential erosion and transport to receiving waters. Requirements apply according to the Risk Level...
determined. For example, a Risk Level 3 (highest risk) project would require compulsory storm water runoff pH and turbidity monitoring and before construction and after construction aquatic biological assessments during specified seasonal windows. For all projects subject to the permit, applicants are required to develop and implement an effective Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). In accordance with the Department’s Standard Specifications, a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) is necessary for projects with DSA less than one acre.

**Section 401 Permitting**

Under Section 401 of the CWA, any project requiring a federal license or permit that may result in a discharge to a water of the United States must obtain a 401 Certification, which certifies that the project will be in compliance with state water quality standards. The most common federal permits triggering 401 Certification are CWA Section 404 permits issued by the USACE. The 401 permit certifications are obtained from the appropriate RWQCB, dependent on the project location and are required before the USACE issues a 404 permit.

In some cases, the RWQCB may have specific concerns with discharges associated with a project. As a result, the RWQCB may issue a set of requirements known as Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) under the State Water Code (Porter-Cologne Act) that define activities, such as the inclusion of specific features, effluent limitations, monitoring and plan submittals that are to be implemented for protecting or benefiting water quality. WDRs can be issued to address both permanent and temporary discharges of a project.

**City Stormwater Post-Construction Requirements**

The primary objective of the City’s Stormwater Post-Construction Requirements is to ensure the reduction of pollutant discharges to the maximum extent practicable and preventing stormwater discharges from causing or contributing to a violation of receiving water quality standards in applicable development projects that require approvals and/or permits issued by the City. Performance Requirement No. 2 relates to water quality treatment, and requires that all projects (with a few exceptions) treat stormwater runoff to reduce pollutant loads and concentrations using physical, biological, and chemical removal. Methods of treatment may include low impact development (LID) treatment systems, biofiltration treatment systems, or non-retention based treatment systems. Each project subject to this requirement must include a Stormwater Control Plan sufficiently demonstrating the project design meets the water quality treatment performance requirements, subject to City approval.

**Affected Environment**

The project site is relatively flat and consists of the Airport Boulevard roadway as well as a strip of undeveloped land along the northwest portion of the project area. During seasonal rain events, water may pool on portions of the site. Runoff water can be controlled using BMPs along with the gutters along the roadway.

**Environmental Consequences**

Construction of the proposed project would require ground disturbance in excess of one acre. A SWPPP would need to be prepared, which would include BMPs to control and/or treat roadway
surface runoff. Examples of BMPs include installation of catch basins along the roadway that incorporate oil and grease traps as well as expeditious cleanup of any hazardous material or motor vehicle fluid spills. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the City’s Stormwater Post-Construction Standards for water quality treatment, including through preparation of a Stormwater Control Plan that demonstrates that the project will meet water quality treatment performance requirements. Overall, compliance with standard requirements, such as preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs would ensure that impacts to water quality remain less than significant.

Caltrans implements a storm water protection program to comply with Caltrans’ State-wide NPDES Storm Water Permit and ensure that construction, design and treatment BMPs are implemented. Effective BMPs that are commonly implemented for road and highway activities such as those that would occur under the proposed project include but are not limited to the following:

- Protecting areas that provide important water quality benefits;
- Identifying areas susceptible to erosion or sediment loss;
- Limiting land disturbance such as clearing and grading and cut/fill to reduce erosion and sediment loss;
- Limiting disturbance of natural drainage features and vegetation;
- Placing bridge structures in locations so that sensitive and valuable aquatic ecosystems are protected;
- Preparing and implementing an approved erosion control plan;
- Ensuring proper storage and disposal of toxic materials;
- Incorporating pollution prevention into operation and maintenance procedures to reduce pollutant loading in surface runoff; and
- Developing and implementing runoff pollution controls for existing road systems to reduce pollutant concentrations and volumes.

Additionally, because the proposed project would disturb one acre or more of soil, the following actions shall be followed:

- A Notification of Construction (NOC) shall be submitted to the appropriate RWQCB at least 30 days prior to start of construction.
- A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented during construction to the satisfaction of the Resident Engineer. The SWPPP will outline erosion and sedimentation control measures required under the NPDES general construction permit.
- A NOCC shall be submitted to the Regional Board upon completion of construction and site stabilization. A project will be considered complete when the criteria for final stabilization in the construction General Permit are met.

Through the incorporation of proper and accepted engineering practices and BMPs, as well as compliance with the City’s Stormwater Post-Construction Requirements, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to water quality during construction or operation.
Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

Impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

2.1.2 Hazardous Waste/Materials

Regulatory Setting

Hazardous materials, including hazardous substances and wastes, are regulated by many state and federal laws. Statutes govern the generation, treatment, storage and disposal of hazardous materials, substances and waste and also the investigation and mitigation of waste releases, air and water quality, human health and land use.

The primary federal laws regulating hazardous wastes/materials are the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA). The purpose of CERCLA, often referred to as “Superfund,” is to identify and clean up abandoned contaminated sites so that public health and welfare are not compromised. The RCRA provides for “cradle to grave” regulation of hazardous waste generated by operating entities. Other federal laws include:

- Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) of 1992
- Clean Water Act
- Clean Air Act
- Safe Drinking Water Act
- Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA)
- Atomic Energy Act
- Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA)
- Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)

In addition to the acts listed above, Executive Order (EO) 12088, Federal Compliance with Pollution Control Standards, mandates that necessary actions be taken to prevent and control environmental pollution when federal activities or federal facilities are involved.

California regulates hazardous materials, waste and substances under the authority of the California Health and Safety Code and is also authorized by the federal government to implement RCRA in the state. California law also addresses specific handling, storage, transportation, disposal, treatment, reduction, cleanup and emergency planning of hazardous waste. The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act also restricts disposal of wastes and requires cleanup of wastes that are below hazardous waste concentrations but could impact ground and surface water quality. California regulations that address waste management and prevention and clean up contamination include Title 22 Division 4.5 Environmental Health Standards for the Management of Hazardous Waste, Title 23 Waters and Title 27 Environmental Protection.

Worker and public health and safety are key issues when addressing hazardous materials that may affect human health and the environment. Proper management and disposal of hazardous material is vital if it is found, disturbed, or generated during project construction.
**Affected Environment**

The proposed project area includes the existing Airport Boulevard roadway and some additional undeveloped land along the northwest portion of the project area. There is no evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection to the existing roadway. Based on review of the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the State Water Resources Control Board records. Additionally, aerially deposited lead can cause contamination of exposed soils along freeways. The DTSC considers a soil to be hazardous waste when lead content is greater than 1,000 mg/kg or the soluble concentration is greater than 5 mg/l (Department of Toxic Substances Control, 2006). Ongoing testing by Caltrans has shown that total lead concentrations adjacent to freeways have typically ranged between 50 and 70 mg/kg, which is within the DTSC threshold and would not be considered hazardous (Geocon Consultants, Inc., 2007). The project involves improvements to Airport Boulevard, which currently consists of two to three lanes with occasional turning lanes. Based on the scale of the existing roadway, aerially deposited lead is not expected to be of concern.

Amesti Elementary School is approximately 0.5 mile northeast of the project site and Green Valley Christian School and Freedom Elementary are roughly 0.5 mile to the south and southeast.

The project site is located within the Traffic Pattern Zone and partially within the Inner Turning Zone as designated by the 2008 Watsonville Municipal Airport Master Plan (City of Watsonville, 2008). The southern portion of the project site is located approximately 600 feet to the northeast of the airport property. However, the proposed project improvements include minor changes to an existing roadway. Improvements would include replacement and addition of sidewalks and bicycle lanes, construction of a pedestrian refuge island, addition of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon, a bus turnout and shelter, and a retaining wall behind the new bus pullout.

**Environmental Consequences**

Construction and operation of the proposed project could potentially involve the storage, handling, or transportation of hazardous materials. It is likely that some vehicles using Airport Boulevard would transport hazardous materials and waste; however, this would not be a change from current conditions. Additionally, the proposed project is approximately 0.5 mile from the nearest school facilities. Therefore, the project would not result in hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous materials or substances within one-quarter mile of a school facility.

Although the project is within the planning area of the Watsonville Municipal Airport, the proposed improvements to the existing roadway are predominantly at ground level and would not lead to a significant change from the current conditions. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people within the project area despite its proximity to the Watsonville Municipal Airport.

**Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures**

Impacts to public safety due to transportation of hazardous materials would be less than significant. No avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures are required.
State Water Resources Control Board records show that there was a LUST site adjacent to the project area, approximately 200 feet to the east in the existing shopping mall. However, the site was cleaned and this LUST case was closed in 1991 (California State Water Resources Control Board, 2015). There are no records to suggest residual contamination having migrated within the project area. There would be no impact and no avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures required.

Impacts to safety hazards to people residing or working within the project area due to the proximity of Watsonville Municipal Airport would be less than significant. No avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures are required.

The project site is not within one quarter mile of an existing school facility. There would be no impact.

2.1.3 Air Quality

Regulatory Setting

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), as amended, is the primary federal law that governs air quality while the California Clean Air Act is its companion state law. These laws and related regulations by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and California Air Resources Board (ARB), set standards for the concentration of pollutants in the air. At the federal level, these standards are called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). NAAQS and state ambient air quality standards have been established for six transportation-related criteria pollutants that have been linked to potential health concerns: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM), which is broken down for regulatory purposes into particles of 10 micrometers or smaller (PM₁₀) and particles of 2.5 micrometers and smaller (PM₂.₅) and sulfur dioxide (SO₂). In addition, national and state standards exist for lead (PB) and state standards exist for visibility reducing particles, sulfates, hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) and vinyl chloride. The NAAQS and state standards are set at levels that protect public health with a margin of safety and are subject to periodic review and revision. Both state and federal regulatory schemes also cover toxic air contaminants (air toxics); some criteria pollutants are also air toxics or may include certain air toxics in their general definition.

Federal air quality standards and regulations provide the basic scheme for project-level air quality analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In addition to this environmental analysis, a parallel “Conformity” requirement under the FCAA also applies.

Conformity

The conformity requirement is based on Federal Clean Air Act Section 176(c), which prohibits the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) and other federal agencies from funding, authorizing, or approving plans, programs or projects that do not conform to State Implementation Plan (SIP) for attaining the NAAQS. “Transportation Conformity” applies to highway and transit projects and takes place on two levels: the regional—or, planning and programming—level and the project level. The proposed project must conform at both levels to be approved.
Conformity requirements apply only in nonattainment and “maintenance” (former nonattainment) areas for the NAAQS and only for the specific NAAQS that are or were violated. U.S. EPA regulations at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 93 govern the conformity process. Conformity requirements do not apply in unclassifiable/attainment areas for NAAQS and do not apply at all for state standards regardless of the status of the area.

Regional conformity is concerned with how well the regional transportation system supports plans for attaining the NAAQS for carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), ozone (O3), particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) and in some areas (although not in California) sulfur dioxide (SO2). California has attainment or maintenance areas for all of these transportation-related “criteria pollutants” except SO2 and also has a nonattainment area for lead (Pb); however, lead is not currently required by the FCAA to be covered in transportation conformity analysis. Regional conformity is based on emission analysis of Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and Federal Transportation Improvement Programs (FTIPs) that include all transportation projects planned for a region over a period of at least 20 years for the RTP and 4 years for the TIP. RTP and FTIP conformity uses travel demand and emission models to determine whether or not the implementation of those projects would conform to emission budgets or other tests at various analysis years showing that requirements of the Clean Air Act and the SIP are met. If the conformity analysis is successful, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), make determinations that the RTP and FTIP are in conformity with the SIP for achieving the goals of the FCAA. Otherwise, the projects in the RTP and/or FTIP must be modified until conformity is attained. If the design concept, scope and “open-to-traffic” schedule of a proposed transportation project are the same as described in the RTP and FTIP, then the proposed project meets regional conformity requirements for purposes of project-level analysis.

Conformity analysis at the project-level includes verification that the project is included in the regional conformity analysis and a “hot-spot” analysis if an area is “nonattainment” or “maintenance” for carbon monoxide (CO) and/or particulate matter (PM10 or PM2.5). A region is “nonattainment” if one or more of the monitoring stations in the region measures a violation of the relevant standard and the U.S. EPA officially designates the area nonattainment. Areas that were previously designated as nonattainment areas but subsequently meet the standard may be officially redesignated to attainment by U.S. EPA and are then called “maintenance” areas. “Hot-spot” analysis is essentially the same, for technical purposes, as CO or particulate matter analysis performed for NEPA purposes. Conformity does include some specific procedural and documentation standards for projects that require a hot-spot analysis. In general, projects must not cause the “hot-spot” related standard to be violated and must not cause any increase in the number and severity of violations in nonattainment areas. If a known CO or particulate matter violation is located in the project vicinity, the project must include measures to reduce or eliminate the existing violation(s) as well.

Affected Environment

The project site is located within the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB) which is under the jurisdiction of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD). The MBUAPCD is in non-attainment for the state ozone (O3) standards and non-attainment for state...
particulate matter (PM10) standards (MBUAPCD, 2015). The NCCAB is in attainment for both O₃ and PM₁₀ for national ambient air quality standards.

**Environmental Consequences**

*Regional Conformity* – Because the NCCAB is in attainment or attainment/unclassified for all national ambient air quality standards, this project is exempt from regional (40 CFR 93.127) conformity requirements. Separate listing of the project in the Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program and their regional conformity analyses, is not necessary. The project would not interfere with timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures identified in the applicable SIP and regional conformity analysis.

*Project Level Conformity* - Conformity at the project-level requires “hot spot” analysis if an area is “non-attainment” or “maintenance” for carbon monoxide (CO) and/or particulate matter (PM₂.₅ or PM₁₀). On March 10, 2006, the U.S. EPA published a final rule that establishes the transportation conformity criteria and procedures for determining which transportation projects must be analyzed for local air quality impacts in PM₂.₅ and PM₁₀ non-attainment and maintenance areas. According to the U.S. EPA Transportation Conformity Guidance, PM₁₀ and PM₂.₅ hot-spot analysis is required for Projects of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) in non-attainment areas (40CFR 93.123 (b) (1)). Projects that are exempt or not POAQC do not require hot-spot analysis.

Because the project is located in the NCCAB, which is in attainment or attainment/unclassified for all national ambient air quality standards, there is no project level conformity or “hot spot” analysis required (California Department of Transportation, 2013).

**Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required, as impacts would be less than significant.

**2.1.4 Construction Impacts**

*Regulatory Setting*

Construction impacts are those that result as a direct result of the construction process for the proposed project. Assessment of the construction impacts looks at the impact to the surrounding environment and community through the entire timeline of the project construction process. Construction impacts are generally concerned with impacts to air quality, noise and traffic as a direct result of the construction process. Actions such as the operation of machinery, movement of dust generating soils and the disruption of public roadways are of primary concern.

To mitigate the impacts of the construction process on the surrounding environment and community, regulatory bodies such as Caltrans and local cities and governments have established standards and regulations. Project contractors must adhere to these standards and are often required to apply for permits for certain, particularly impactful, activities. Caltrans’ Standard Specifications serve as a standard guideline for many roadway and highway construction projects. Chapters 12 *Temporary Traffic Control*, 13 *Water Pollution Control* and 14
Environmental Stewardship lay out standards to follow to address many of the associated construction impacts (California Department of Transportation, 2010).

Affected Environment

The only land uses in the vicinity of the project site that may be sensitive to construction-related noise and air quality impacts are residential uses located approximately 50 feet to the west of the northwest portion of the project site. Construction emissions are regulated by the MBUAPCD. As described in Section 2.2.3, Air Quality, the NCCAB is in non-attainment for state 8-hour ozone (O3) standards and non-attainment for state particulate matter (PM10) standards.

Environmental Consequences

Short-term degradation of air quality in the vicinity of the project site may occur during construction. Grading, excavation and hauling activities release fugitive dust (particulate matter), CO₂, nitrogen oxides (NOₓ), volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and toxic air contaminants (TACs) from diesel exhaust. In addition, O₃ is derived from NOₓ and VOCs in the presence of sunlight and heat. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site. In addition, the MBUAPCD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines require mitigation for construction projects with grading and excavating that are over 2.2 acres. The project site is 1.92 acres; therefore impacts would be less than significant.

Project construction would generate temporary noise that could be audible to sensitive receptors near the project site. Noise impacts are a function of the type of activity being undertaken and the distance to the receptor location. The residences closest to the site are those located approximately 50 feet west of the northern portion of the site. During project construction, the predominant source of noise would be the operation of construction equipment, and vehicle noise associated with construction workers and trucks accessing the site. Typical noise associated with excavation and grading activities average 85 dBA at 50 feet from the source and typical noise associated with paving activities average 81 dBA at 50 feet from the source (FHWA, 2006).

Construction noise impacts would be temporary, and construction contractors would be required to comply with City of Watsonville Municipal Code requirements restricting hours of excessive noise generation. Section 5-8.02 of the Municipal Code prohibits offensive noise between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM. Therefore, the project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards. Additionally, the project would not increase long term vehicle traffic on Airport Boulevard, and therefore, would not increase any permanent noise levels at sensitive receptors. Impacts would be less than significant.

While Airport Boulevard would remain open through construction, temporary traffic delays can be expected. Development of a Traffic Control Plan is proposed as part of the project. Development of this plan would outline how all vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic would be controlled. The Traffic Control Plan would help to reduce temporary traffic impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.
Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

- Construction activities shall include use of methods and equipment that will provide the lowest level of noise and ground vibration impact such as alternative low noise pile installation methods.
- Newer equipment shall also be used, with improved muffling. All equipment shall have the manufacturers’ recommended noise abatement measures such as mufflers, engine closures and engine vibration isolators intact and operational. Likewise, all equipment shall be inspected at periodic intervals to ensure proper maintenance and presence of noise control devices (e.g. mufflers and shrouding, etc.).
- All idling equipment shall be turned off.
- Plan noisier operations during times of least sensitivity to receptors.
- Keep noise levels relatively uniform and avoid impulsive noises.
- Maintain good public relations with the community to minimize objections to unavoidable construction impacts; provide frequent activity updates of all construction activities.

2.1.5 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Affected Environment

The proposed project would not change the number of lanes on the existing roadway. By adding a bus pullout, pedestrian refuge island, rectangular rapid flashing beacon and additional sidewalk, pedestrian safety and circulation would be improved. Existing bicycle lanes would be reinstalled upon project completion.

Development of a Traffic Control Plan is proposed as part of the project. Development and implementation of the project Traffic Control Plan would outline how all vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic would be controlled, including how access, parking, staging and construction would be done and how the traffic from these activities would be controlled. There would be no road closures during construction.

Environmental Consequences

Because the proposed project requires work in and along an existing roadway, there would be temporary impacts to local traffic traveling both directions on Airport Boulevard. Development and implementation of the project Traffic Control Plan would keep this impact to a less than significant level.

Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

No avoidance, minimization or mitigation is required.

2.1.6 Community Impacts

Affected Environment

The proposed project involves the reworking of the existing roadway, addition of new curbs, gutters and sidewalks, signage, striping, and construction of a new bus shelter and retaining
wall to increase pedestrian safety. This would not disrupt an existing community, require relocations of any buildings, or have any adverse socio-economic effects aside from temporary impacts during construction.

**Environmental Consequences**

Because the proposed project requires work in and along an existing roadway, there would be temporary impacts to local traffic traveling both directions on Airport Boulevard. Development and implementation of the project Traffic Control Plan would keep impacts to a less than significant level.

During project construction, there would be temporary impacts due to construction noise. These impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation.

**Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures**

Avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures specified in above Section 2.1.4 Construction Impacts would keep impacts to the surrounding community to a less than significant level.

**2.2 Biological Environment**

A Natural Environment Study – Minimal Impact (NES-MI) was conducted by Rincon Consultants dated November 4, 2015. The NES-MI found minimal impacts to the biological environment from the proposed project.

2.2.1 Special Status Species

**Regulatory Setting**

Federal agencies that fund, authorize, or carry out actions that "may affect" a listed species and its habitat, must consult with the USFWS according to the provision in Section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) for federal actions. Provisions of the 1982 amendments to the Act authorize the USFWS to permit the taking of listed species, if such taking is "incidental to, and not the purpose of carrying out otherwise lawful activities [16 U.S.C. 1539 and Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Act] pursuant to Section 7 of Act for federal actions." As part of the process of compliance with the Act (Section 7(c)), this NES-MI was prepared to provide Caltrans, the lead federal agency, with adequate information to determine any project-related impacts on federally listed species, proposed species, and/or their habitat and whether consultation is necessary with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and/or USFWS.

**Affected Environment**

The proposed modifications to the existing roadway, as well as the strip of open space along the north end of the project area, are both within an existing urban setting. Land within the project area does not provide suitable habitat for any special status plant or animal species potentially found in the area and no special status species have been observed in the area, based on a literature review and site reconnaissance survey. Furthermore, according to the
project NES-MI report, there is no identified critical habitat within the project area that would be modified or destroyed.

**Environmental Consequences**

Due to the lack of suitable habitat within the project area, the project is not anticipated to affect any Federal or State listed endangered species. Therefore, consultation with the USFWS and/or NMFS is not expected. In addition, there is no federally designated critical habitat within the project area and therefore the project would not adversely modify or destroy any critical habitat.

**Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures**

Impacts would be less than significant and no avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures would be required.

### 2.2.2 Migratory Birds

**Regulatory Setting**

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) is a treaty with Canada, Mexico and Japan makes it unlawful at any time, by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, or kill migratory birds. The law applies to the removal of nests (such as swallow nests on bridges) occupied by migratory birds during the breeding season (February 15 through September 1). The California Fish and Game Code (Section 3500) also prohibits the destruction of any nest, egg, or nestling not specifically excluded in the Code.

**Affected Environment**

The proposed project calls for the removal of one Eucalyptus tree (*Eucalyptus sp.*) along the north end of Airport Boulevard in the project area. Most of the migratory birds that have the potential to breed within the project area are not special status species and are regionally common; thus, the project would not result in substantial adverse effects on populations of any bird species. Nevertheless, the project would implement measures to avoid and minimize effects to active nests of migratory birds to comply with the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code (see **Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures** below).

**Environmental Consequences**

Removal or disruption of trees or shrubs as a result to project construction holds the potential harm sensitive migratory bird species and their eggs, nests and young. The following mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures**

The following seasonal work restrictions would be implemented during construction to avoid impacts to nesting birds:
• If possible, the one Eucalyptus tree (Eucalyptus sp.) that would be impacted by project construction shall be removed during the non-nesting season (between September 2 and February 14).

• If removal of trees and shrubs is to be done during the nesting season (February 15 to September 1), all trees and other suitable nesting habitat within the limits of work shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist prior to initiating construction related activities. A preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 3-5 days prior to the start of work. If no nests are observed, construction activities should be initiated within 3-5 days. If more than 3-5 days pass and construction has not been initiated, another survey shall be required.

• If, during the breeding season, an active nest is discovered in a tree or shrub to be removed, the tree or shrub shall be protected using orange construction fence or the equivalent. The protective fencing shall be placed around the tree or shrub at the following distance depending on species: 100 feet from the drip line of the tree or shrub for passerines and non-raptors; 300 feet from the drip line of the tree for raptors. No parking, storage of materials, or work would be allowed within this area until the end of the breeding season or until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

• The monitoring biologist, in consultation with the project manager shall determine the appropriate protection for active nests on a case by case basis using the criteria described above.

2.2.3 Invasive Species

Regulatory Setting

In February 1999, Executive Order 13112 was signed, requiring federal agencies to work on preventing and controlling the introduction and spread of invasive species. Highway corridors provide opportunities for the movement of invasive species through the landscape. Invasive species can move on vehicles and in the loads they carry. Invasive plants can be moved from the site during spraying and mowing operations.

Affected Environment

Weed seed can be inadvertently introduced into the corridor on equipment during construction and through the use of mulch, imported soil or gravel, and sod. Weed seed can then be transported away from the highway corridor to areas of native vegetation.

Environmental Consequences

Introduction of invasive species to an area with native vegetation can potentially displace the native population.

Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

In compliance with the Executive Order on Invasive Species, Executive Order 13112, and subsequent guidance from the Federal Highway Administration, the landscaping and erosion
control included in the project would not use species listed as noxious weeds. Impacts would be less than significant and no avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures would be required.

2.2.4 Wetlands and Other Waterways

Regulatory Setting

Executive Order 11990 requires agencies to minimize destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands, and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands in carrying out the agency’s responsibilities.

Affected Environment

The closest water body to the project site is Corralitos Creek, which runs northwest to southeast and is approximately 200 feet to the northeast of the northern end of the project area at its closest point. The project can be conducted completely outside Corralitos Creek and its associated riparian vegetation.

Environmental Consequences

There are no anticipated consequences to wetlands or other waterways resulting from the project construction. There would be no impact.

Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

Because BMPs would be utilized throughout construction and the project is not proposing to affect areas outside of the project boundaries, there are no anticipated direct or indirect impacts from project activities to Corralitos Creek, the associated riparian forest, or species that occur within this area. No potential jurisdictional waters or wetlands occur within the project area and no avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures are required.
Chapter 3  Comments and Coordination

Early and continuing coordination with the general public and public agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. It helps planners determine the necessary scope of environmental documentation and the level of analysis required, and to identify potential impacts and avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures, and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for this project will be accomplished through circulation of the Draft IS-MND for 30 days for public review and comment, as well as through the public hearing process for adoption of the IS-MND.

Additionally, the general public and public agencies have been involved in the planning for the proposed project through two venues. The first is a bi-monthly bicycle and pedestrian work group meeting that include representatives from the County Health Services Agency, the United Way, City staff, and occasional City Council members. Secondly, the public and public agencies were involved in the Pedestrian Safety Assessment (PSA) prepared for the City in 2011. In this process, City staff from the Planning, Public Works, and Police Departments; representatives from the Pajaro Valley Unified School District; the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission; and members of the public participated in a walking audit and an exit meeting with the PSA team.
This page intentionally left blank.
Chapter 4  List of Preparers

The following contributed to the preparation of this Draft IS-MND:

**Rincon Consultants, Inc.**

- Richard Daulton, MURP, Principal in Charge
- Megan Jones, MPP, Senior Program Manager
- Karen Holmes, QSD/P, Senior Regulatory Specialist
- Skyler Murphy, MESM, Associate Environmental Planner
- Kyle Brudvick, MA, Paleontologist, Geoarchaeologist, and Archaeologist
- Jennifer Kendrick, BS, Associate Biologist
- Doug Carriero, GIS Analyst
Chapter 5  Distribution List

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments--AMBAG
P.O. Box 809
Marina, CA  93933-0809

Calif. Dept. of Parks & Recreation
Central Coast Region
2211 Garden Road
Monterey, CA  93940

Calif. State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning/Research
P.O. BOX 3044
Sacramento, CA  95812

Coastal Commission
Central Coast Area Office
725 Front St., Ste. 300
Santa Cruz, CA  95060

FEMA Region IX
1111 Broadway, Ste. 1200
Oakland, CA 94607

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District
24580 Silver Cloud Ct.
Monterey, CA  93940

Regional Water Quality Control Board
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

County Clerk
c/o Clerk of the Board
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA  95060

Santa Cruz County Planning Dept.
Attn: Ken Hart
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA  95060

State Department of Fish & Wildlife
20 Lower Ragsdale Dr., Suite 100
Monterey, CA  93940

State Department of Fish & Wildlife
Bay Delta Region (Region 3)
7329 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
San Francisco District
333 Market Street
San Francisco, CA   94105-2197

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
2493 Portola Rd., Ste. B
Ventura, CA 93003

U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service
820 Bay Ave Suite 107
Capitola, CA  95010
Santa Cruz, CA  95064

California Department of Transportation
District 5, Local Assistance
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Santa Cruz County Planning Dept.
Attn: Ken Hart
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA  95060

State Department of Fish & Wildlife
20 Lower Ragsdale Dr., Suite 100
Monterey, CA  93940

State Department of Fish & Wildlife
Bay Delta Region (Region 3)
7329 Silverado Trail, Napa, CA 94558

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
San Francisco District
333 Market Street
San Francisco, CA   94105-2197

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
2493 Portola Rd., Ste. B
Ventura, CA 93003

U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service
820 Bay Ave Suite 107
Capitola, CA  95010
Santa Cruz, CA  95064

California Department of Transportation
District 5, Local Assistance
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
This page intentionally left blank.
Appendix A

California Environmental Quality Act Checklist

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the projects indicate no impacts. A "no impact" answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included either following the applicable section of the checklist or is within the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are related to CEQA, not NEPA, impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

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?

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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))?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. AIR QUALITY: 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:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☐ Less Than Significant Impact  ☒ No Impact

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☐ Less Than Significant Impact  ☒ No Impact

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☐ Less Than Significant Impact  ☒ No Impact

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☒ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☐ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☐ Less Than Significant Impact  ☒ No Impact

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☒ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☐ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

☑ 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation  ☒ Less Than Significant Impact  ☐ No Impact

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Options</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project:

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** Would the project:

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

---

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:
Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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)?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant with Mitigation
- Less Than Significant Impact
- No Impact
### X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Physically divide an established community?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the project:

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)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:**

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XV. RECREATION:**

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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?
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Appendix B  Glossary of Technical Terms

ADL – Aerially deposited lead
ASR – Archeological Survey Report
BSA – Biological Study Area
Caltrans – California Department of Transportation
CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act
CDFW – California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CRLF – California Red Leg Frog
EIR – Environmental Impact Review
ESA – Environmentally Sensitive Area
FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA – Federal Highway Administration
FPPA – Farmland Protection Policy Act
HPSR – Historic Properties Survey Report
ISA – Initial Site Assessment
LUST – leaking underground storage tank
MBTA – Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MBUAPCD – Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District
MND – Mitigated Negative Declaration
NCCAB – North Central Coast Air Basin
NOC – Notification of Construction
NOCC – Notice of Completion of Construction
NPDES – National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service
PIR – Paleontological Identification Report
SWPPP – Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan
RTP – Regional transportation plan
RWQCB - Regional Water Quality Control Boards
SR 1 – State Route 1
TPH-g – Hydrocarbons gasoline-range
USACE – United States Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS – United States Fish and Wildlife Service
WDRs – Waste Discharge Requirements
WPCP – Water Pollution Control Plan
VOCs – Volatile organic compounds
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Appendix C  Minimization and/or Mitigation Summary

Storm Water Runoff

- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared and implemented during construction to the satisfaction of the Resident Engineer. The SWPPP will outline erosion and sedimentation control measures required under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general construction permit.

- Prior to the onset of work activities, a plan must be established for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills and all workers shall be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should an accidental spill occur.

Construction Impacts

- Caltrans Standard Specifications pertaining to dust control and dust palliative requirements are a required part of all construction contracts and shall effectively reduce and control temporary construction emissions to a less than significant level. The provisions of Caltrans Standard Specifications, “Air Pollution Control” and “Dust Control” sections require the contractor to comply with the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) rules, ordinances and regulations.

- Standard Provision Section 7-1.011 of the Standard Specifications shall be included in the construction contract to minimize noise impacts.

- All vehicles and equipment shall be in good working condition and free of leaks.

- All construction activities shall be limited to daylight hours.

- Construction activities shall include use of methods and equipment that will provide the lowest level of noise and ground vibration impact such as alternative low noise pile installation methods.

- Utilize construction methods or equipment that will provide the lowest level of noise and ground vibration impact such as alternative low noise pile installation methods.

- Newer equipment shall also be used, with improved muffling. All equipment shall have the manufacturers’ recommended noise abatement measures such as mufflers, engine closures and engine vibration isolators intact and operational. Likewise, all equipment shall be inspected at periodic intervals to ensure proper maintenance and presence of noise control devices (e.g. mufflers and shrouding, etc.).

- All idling equipment shall be turned off.

- Plan noisier operations during times of least sensitivity to receptors.

- Keep noise levels relatively uniform and avoid impulsive noises.

- Maintain good public relations with the community to minimize objections to unavoidable construction impacts; provide frequent activity updates of all construction activities.

Natural Communities

- Herbicide shall not be used on-site.
• No pets or firearms shall be permitted on-site.

**Threatened and Endangered or Invasive Species**

• If possible, trees or shrubs that would be impacted by project construction shall be removed during the non-nesting season (between September 2 and February 14).

• If removal of trees and shrubs is to be done during nesting season (February 15 to September 1), all trees and other suitable nesting habitat within the limits of work shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist prior to initiating construction related activities. A preconstruction survey would be conducted within 3-5 days prior to work. If no nests are observed, construction activities should be initiated within 3-5 days. If more than 3-5 days pass and construction has not been initiated, another survey would be required.

• If, during the breeding season, an active nest is discovered in a tree or shrub to be removed, the tree or shrub shall be protected using orange construction fence or the equivalent. The protective fencing shall be placed around the tree or shrub at the following distance depending on species: 100 feet from the drip line of the tree or shrub for passerines and non-raptors; 300 feet from the drip line of the tree for raptors. No parking, storage of materials, or work would be allowed within this area until the end of the breeding season or until the young have fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

• If, during the breeding season survey, an active nest is discovered in a tree or shrub to be removed, a qualified biologist would monitor construction until the end of breeding season or until the young have fledged. The monitoring biologist, in consultation with the project manager would determine the appropriate protection for active nests on a case by case basis using the criteria described above.

• City staff shall be notified immediately if any nesting bird species protected under federal law (including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)) and/or California Fish and Game Code are observed during surveys.

• During construction, the project shall make all reasonable efforts to limit the use of imported soils for fill. Soils currently existing on-site should be used for fill material. If the use of imported fill material is necessary, the imported material must be obtained from a source that is known to be free of invasive plant species; or the material must consist of purchased material such as crushed aggregate, sorted rock, or other similar substances which has been verified to be free of invasive species.

• All erosion control materials including straw bales, straw wattles, or mulch used on-site must be free of invasive species seed.

• Exotic and invasive plant species shall be excluded from any erosion control seed mixes and/or landscaping plant palettes associated with the proposed project.
Appendix D  Responses to Comments

This section includes the comments received during circulation of the Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS-MND) prepared for the Airport Boulevard Reconstruction from Freedom Boulevard to City Limits Project and responses to those comments. Where a comment results in a change to the IS-MND text, a notation is made in the response indicating that the text is revised. Changes in text are signified by strikeouts (strikeouts) where text is removed and by underlined font (underline font) where text is added.

The IS-MND was circulated for a 30-day public review period that began on February 17, 2016, and concluded on March 17, 2016. The City received three comment letters on the Draft IS-MND. The commenters and the page numbers on which each commenter’s letters appear are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No. and Commenter</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Julia Dyer, Environmental Scientist, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Robert Nunes, Air Quality Planner, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scott Morgan, Director, State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Murray – I just reviewed the Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the above referenced project.

The IS/MND is silent on the Post-Construction Requirements. Watsonville City Code Title 6 Chapter 3 535 Post-construction requirements.

Could you please either point me to this language or explain why the requirement is not mentioned in the IS/MND?

Thank you,

Julia Dyer

Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Municipal, Construction, and Industrial Storm Water Programs
Environmental Scientist
QSD/QSP #24434
CPESC #7477
Ph: 805-542-4624
www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast
895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-7906

If you have observed any activity, conduct or physical evidence you suspect to be illegal or unauthorized or have knowledge of suspected illegal or unauthorized conduct impacting, or threatening to impact, California’s environment or the public health, the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) would like to know about it. Please use this Environmental Complaint Form to provide all the details you know and submit the same to CalEPA. http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/CalEPA_Complaint/index.cfm
Letter 1

COMMENTER: Julia Dyer, Environmental Scientist, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board

DATE: March 8, 2016

Response 1.1

The commenter notes that the IS-MND does not mention the City’s post-construction requirements. In response to this comment, the following text was modified in the IS-MND:

Section 2.1.1, Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff, Regulatory Setting:

*City Stormwater Post-Construction Requirements*

The primary objective of the City’s Stormwater Post-Construction Requirements is to ensure the reduction of pollutant discharges to the maximum extent practicable and preventing stormwater discharges from causing or contributing to a violation of receiving water quality standards in applicable development projects that require approvals and/or permits issued by the City. Performance Requirement No. 2 relates to water quality treatment, and requires that all projects (with a few exceptions) treat stormwater runoff to reduce pollutant loads and concentrations using physical, biological, and chemical removal. Methods of treatment may include low impact development (LID) treatment systems, biofiltration treatment systems, or non-retention based treatment systems. Each project subject to this requirement must include a Stormwater Control Plan sufficiently demonstrating the project design meets the water quality treatment performance requirements, subject to City approval.

Section 2.1.1, Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff, Environmental Consequences:

Construction of the proposed project would require ground disturbance in excess of one acre. A SWPPP would need to be prepared, which would include BMPs to control and/or treat roadway surface runoff. Examples of BMPs include installation of catch basins along the roadway that incorporate oil and grease traps as well as expeditious cleanup of any hazardous material or motor vehicle fluid spills. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the City’s Stormwater Post-Construction Standards for water quality treatment, including through preparation of a Stormwater Control Plan that demonstrates that the project will meet water quality treatment performance requirements. Overall, compliance with standard requirements, such as preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of BMPs would ensure that impacts to water quality remain less than significant.

... 

Through the incorporation of proper and accepted engineering practices and BMPs, as well as compliance with the City’s Stormwater Post-Construction Requirements, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to water quality during construction or operation.
March 11, 2016

Murray Fontes  
City of Watsonville Public Works  
250 Main Street  
Watsonville, CA  95076  

Re: Comment on Mitigated Negative Declaration for Airport Boulevard Reconstruction Project

Dear Mr. Fontes,

Thank you for providing the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District) the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced document. The Air District has reviewed the document and has the following comment:

Please be aware that if older underground piping is encountered during the reconstruction project, the requirements of Air District Rule 424 National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants could be triggered. Rule 424 contains the investigation and reporting requirements for asbestos. If you have any questions about District Rule 424, please contact Mike Sheehan, District Compliance Inspector III, at (831)647-9411 x 217.

Best Regards,

Robert Nunes  
Air Quality Planner

Cc: Mike Sheehan, District Compliance Inspector III
Letter 2

COMMENTER: Robert Nunes, Air Quality Planner, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District

DATE: March 11, 2016

Response 2.1

The commenter notes that, if older underground piping is encountered during construction, the requirements of Air District Rule 424 National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants could be triggered. Rule 424 contains the investigation and reporting requirements for asbestos. The comment is noted.
March 18, 2016

Murray Fontes  
City of Watsonville  
250 Main Street  
Watsonville, CA 95076  

Subject: Airport Boulevard Reconstruction from Freedom Boulevard to City Limits  
SCH#: 2016022949

Dear Murray Fontes:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on March 17, 2016, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan  
Director, State Clearinghouse
Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2016022049
Project Title Airport Boulevard Reconstruction from Freedom Boulevard to City Limits
Lead Agency Watsonville, City of

Type MND Mitigated Negative Declaration
Description The proposed project is the reconstruction of 1,130 linear feet (LF) of Airport Blvd. with a total project area of 1.82 acres. Improvements include removal and replacement of existing curbs, gutters, and sidewalks for 507 LF on the north side of the roadway and 942 LF on the south side of the roadway as well as new curbs, gutters and sidewalks for 577 LF along the north side of the roadway, where no such improvements currently exist. The project would also include the construction of a 140 LF refuge island and rectangular rapid flashing beacon in the western portion of the roadway segment, a bus pullout and shelter, a three-foot tall and 90-foot long retaining wall behind the bus pullout, and bike lanes currently exist on both sides of the roadway segment. All curb ramps, sidewalks and pathways would be ADA compliant.

Lead Agency Contact
Name Murray Fontes
Agency City of Watsonville
Phone 831-768-3117
Fax
Address 250 Main Street
City Watsonville
State CA Zip 95076

Project Location
County Santa Cruz
City Watsonville
Region
Lat / Long 36° 56' 22.2" N / 121° 46' 37.8" W
Cross Streets Airport Blvd. from Freedom Blvd. to City Limits
Parcel No. n/a - Roadway
Township
Range
Section
Base

Proximity to:
Highways 101
Airports Watsonville Municipal Airport
Railways
Waterways Corralitos Creek
Schools Freedom ES
Land Use NA- Road Right-of-Way

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Coastal Zone; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 3; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 4; Air Resources Board; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 3; Native American Heritage Commission

Date Received 02/17/2016 Start of Review 02/17/2016 End of Review 03/17/2016

65

Exhibit "A"
64 of 70

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
Response 3.1

The commenter states that the project has complied with State Clearinghouse review requirements pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. The commenter states that no state agencies submitted comments on the project. The comment is noted.
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List of Technical Studies

Archaeological Survey Report, October 2015

Historical Property Survey Report, October 2015

Natural Environments Study (Minimal Impacts), November 4, 2015
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