City of Capitola Monarch Cove Hotel Project

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Volume I: Report

Planners

Englneers



Environmental Scientists

May 2014

Monarch Cove Hotel Project

Draft

Environmental Impact Report

Volume I: Report

SCH # 2013082080

Prepared for: **City of Capitola** 420 Capitola Avenue Capitola, California 95010

Contact: Richard Grunow, Community Development Director 831-475-7300 Email: rgrunow@ci.capitola.ca.us

> *Prepared by:* **Rincon Consultants, Inc.** 437 Figueroa Street, Suite 203 Monterey, California 93940

> > May 2014

This report is printed on 30% recycled paper.

Monarch Cove Hotel Project

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Table of Contents

Volume I: Report

Executive Summary	ES-1
Project Synopsis	
Alternatives	
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	
	1 1
1.0 Introduction	
1.1 Environmental Impact Report Background	
1.2 Purpose and Legal Authority	
1.3 Scope and Content/Environmental Factors Potentially A	.ffected1-10
1.4 Lead, Responsible and Trustee Agencies	1-11
1.5 Environmental Review Process	1-12
2.0 Project Description	
2.1 Project Applicant and Representative	
2.2 Project Location	2-1
2.3 Current Land Use and Setting	2-1
2.9 Carlent Land Ose and Regulatory Setting	2-4
2.5 Project Characteristics	2-6
2.6 Project Objectives	
	0.1
3.0 Environmental Setting	
3.1 Location	
3.2 Physiography and Climate	
3.3 Natural Resources	
3.4 Historical Context	
3.5 Cumulative Projects Setting	
4.0 Environmental Impact Analysis	4-1
4.1 Aesthetics/Visual Resources	
4.2 Air Quality	
4.3 Biological Resources	
4.4 Cultural Resources	
4.5 Geology	

4.0 Greenin	ouse Gas Emissions	4.6-1
4.7 Hydrold	gy and Water Quality	4.7-1
4.8 Land Us	e and Planning	4.8-1
4.9 Noise	-	4.9-1
4.10 Public S	Services	4.10-1
4.11 Traffic a	and Circulation	4.11-1
4.12 Utilities	5	4.12-1
5.0 Other CEOA R	autrad Sections	51
5.0 Other CEQA-Re	Inducement	
5.1 Grown 5.2 Irreversi	hle Environmental Effects	
0.2 11000131		
6.0 Alternatives		6-1
6.1 Alternat	ive 1: No Project	6-1
6.2 Alternat	ive 2: Reduced Project	6-2
6.3 Alternat	ive 3: Alternative Access	6-6
6.4 Alternat	ive 4: Alternative 4: Modified Project (No Events)	6-14
6.5 Alternat	ive Locations	6-18
6.6 Environ	mentally Superior Alternative	6-18
70 Potoroncos and	Proportor	
7.0 References and 7.1 Reference		7_1
7.1 Kerererk 7.2 List of P	renarers	7-1 7 - 9
	reputers	
List of Figures		
Figure 1-1	CEQA Environmental Review Process	1-13
Figure 2-1	Regional Location Map	
i iguie = i	0 1	= =
Figure 2-2	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses	2-3
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses	2-3 2-7
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East	2-3 2-7
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations	2-3 2-7
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations	2-3 2-7 2-8 2-9
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and North Elevations	2-3 2-7 2-8 2-9 orth 2-10
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4d	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations	2-3 2-7 2-8 2-9 orth 2-10 2-11
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4d Figure 2-4e	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations	2-3 2-7 2-8 2-9 orth 2-10 2-11 2-12
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4d Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings	2-3 2-7 2-8 2-9 orth 2-10 2-11 2-12 2-17
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings Proposed Grading Plan	2-3 2-7 2-8 2-9 orth 2-10 2-11 2-12 2-17 2-18
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6 Figure 2-7	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings Proposed Grading Plan Site Profiles and Sections	
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-8	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings Proposed Grading Plan Site Profiles and Sections Proposed Stormwater Management Plan	2-3 2-7 2-8 2-9 orth 2-10 2-11 2-12 2-17 2-18 2-19 2-19
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-8 Figure 2-9	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings Proposed Grading Plan Site Profiles and Sections Proposed Stormwater Management Plan Proposed Planting Plan	
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-8 Figure 2-9 Figure 2-10	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings Proposed Grading Plan Site Profiles and Sections Proposed Stormwater Management Plan Proposed Planting Plan	
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-8 Figure 2-9 Figure 2-10 Figure 4.1-1	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings Proposed Grading Plan Site Profiles and Sections Proposed Stormwater Management Plan Proposed Landscape Plan Project Site Photos	
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-8 Figure 2-9 Figure 2-10 Figure 4.1-1 Figure 4.1-2	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings Proposed Grading Plan Site Profiles and Sections. Proposed Stornwater Management Plan Proposed Landscape Plan Project Site Photos Views from Project Site	
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-8 Figure 2-9 Figure 2-9 Figure 2-10 Figure 4.1-1 Figure 4.1-2 Figure 4.3-1	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Proposed Grading Plan Site Profiles and Sections. Proposed Stormwater Management Plan Proposed Planting Plan Proposed Landscape Plan Project Site Photos Views from Project Site Habitat Map	
Figure 2-2 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-3 Figure 2-4a Figure 2-4b Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4c Figure 2-4e Figure 2-4e Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5 Figure 2-5 Figure 2-6 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-7 Figure 2-8 Figure 2-9 Figure 2-9 Figure 2-10 Figure 4.1-1 Figure 4.3-2	Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses Site Plan Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and N Elevations Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations Project Renderings Proposed Grading Plan Site Profiles and Sections Proposed Stormwater Management Plan Proposed Planting Plan Proposed Landscape Plan Project Site Photos Views from Project Site Habitat Map CNDDB Occurrences within 5 Miles.	2-3 2-3 2-7 2-8 2-9 orth 2-10 2-11 2-12 2-17 2-18 2-17 2-18 2-19 2-21 2-21 2-22 2-23 4.1-2 4.1-3 4.3-3 4.3-12

Figure 4	.4-1 Boundary of Historical English Cottages, El Salto Estate, and	
	Proposed Project Site	4.4-5
Figure 4	.4-2 Historic and Current Photographs of the Main House	4.4-10
Figure 4	.4-3 Cottage Relocation Mitigation	4.4-24
Figure 4	.4-4 Current, Proposed Temporary and Proposed Final Location of th	ie
	Main House	
Figure 4	.5-1 Regional Faults	4.5-3
Figure 4	.5-2 Soils Map	4.5-6
Figure 4	.5-3 Estimated Cliff Retreat	4.5-8
Figure 4	.5-4 Projected Sea Level Rise Close	4.5-10
Figure 4	.10-1 Nearest Location of Emergency Service Providers	4.10-2
Figure 4	.11-1 Existing Bicycle Lanes	4.11-3
Figure 4	.11-2 Existing Transit Services	4.11-4
Figure 4	.11-3 Study Intersections and Road Segments	4.11-8
Figure 4	.12-1 Soquel Creek Water District Service Area	4.12-2
Figure 4	.12-2 Production Wells and Service Areas 1 through 4	4.12-3
Figure 6	-1 Alternative 3: Alternative Access	6-7
Figure 6	-2 Alternative 4: Modified Project (No Events)	6-16
0	,	
List of Tables		
Table ES	5-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Mea	sures,
	and Residual Impacts	ES-4
Table 1-1	1 Summary of Scoping Period Comments	1-1
Table 2-1	1 Existing Site Characteristics	2-4
Table 2-2	2 Project Development Program Summary	2-6
Table 4.2	2-1 Current Federal and State Ambient Air Ouality Standards	4.2-2
Table 4.2	2-2 Ambient Air Quality Data	4.2-4
Table 4.2	2-3 MBUAPCD Air Quality Significance Thresholds for Criteria Poli	utants
	of Concern - Operational Impacts	4.2-7
Table 4.2	2-4 Maximum Daily Unmitigated On-Site and Off-Site Construction	Air
	Pollutant Emissions	4 2-9
Table 4 2	2-5 Operational Emissions (lbs/day)	4 2-10
Table 4.3	3-1 Special Status Species	4.3-6
Table 4.5	5-1 Project Site Soil Hazard Potential	4 5-5
Table 4.6	6-1 Estimated Construction Emissions of Greenhouse Gases	4 6-13
Table 4.6	6-2 Operational Emissions of Greenhouse Gases	4 6-14
Table 4.6	6-3 Combined Annual Emissions of Greenhouse Gases	4 6-15
Table 4.8	R-1 General Plan Local Coastal Program and Zoning Consistency	4 8-5
Table 4 G	-1 Human Response to Different Levels of Groundborne Vibration	4 9-2
Table 4.9	2. Land Use Compatibility Standard for Community Noise	
1 auto 4.5	Environments	4 9-3
Table 4 (2-3 Significance of Changes in Operational Roadway Noise Exposure	Δ / Q_7
Table 4.2	A Typical Noise Levels at Construction Sites	/ 0 Q
Table 4.2	25 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipmont	/ 0 1 7
Table 4.2	6 Project Contribution to Noighborhood Poodurar Noice Levels	1 .7-12
Table 4.5	7 - Droject Contribution to Erectuer Niciss I evels	
rable 4.5	-7 I TOJECI COMUTOUION IO PTEEway INOISE LEVEISI	

Table 4.11-1 Level of Service Definitions for Signalized Intersections Based	
on Control Delay	4.11 - 7
Table 4.11-2 Level of Service Definitions for Unsignalized Intersections Based	
on Control Delay	4.11-7
Table 4.11-3 Existing Intersection Levels of Service Summary	4.11-9
Table 4.11-4 Existing Freeway Segment Levels of Service Summary	4.11-10
Table 4.11-5 Project Trip Generation Estimates	4.11-12
Table 4.11-6 Existing Plus Project Intersection Capacity Analysis	4.11-16
Table 4.11-7 Neighborhood Street Traffic Volumes	4.11-18
Table 4.11-8 Existing Plus Project Freeway Segment Levels of Service	4.11-21
Table 4.11-9 Cumulative Intersection Capacity Analysis	4.11-27
Table 4.11-10 Cumulative Conditions Freeway Segment Levels of Service	4.11-31
Table 4.12-1 Treatment Capacity and Flow Projections for Wastewater Treatment	;
Facilities in Santa Cruz County (million gallons per day)	4.12-6
Table 4.12-2 Remaining Capacity of Landfills in the Project Vicinity	4.12-6
Table 4.12-3 Water Demand	4.12-8
Table 6-1 Comparison of Project Alternatives Buildout Characteristics	6-2
Table 6-2 Impact Comparison of Alternatives	6-20

Volume II: Appendices

Appendices

Appendix A	Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and Comments
Appendix B	Air Quality Data
Appendix C	Biological Resources Studies
C.1	Tree Resource Evaluation Construction Impact Analysis & Arborist
	Report Update
C.2	Report on Overwintering Monarch Butterflies
Appendix D	Cultural Resources Studies
D.1	Historic Resources Technical Report
D.2	Phase I Archaeological Resources Survey
Appendix E	Geotechnical Report
Appendix F	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data
Appendix G	Preliminary Drainage Report
Appendix H	Noise Data
Appendix I	Traffic Impact Analysis

Appendix J Acronym List

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed project, and the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts associated with the proposed project.

PROJECT SYNOPSIS

Project Applicant

Robert Blodgett PO Box 1697 Capitola, California 95010

Project Representative

Hamilton Swift Associates, Inc. 500 Chestnut Street, Suite 100 Santa Cruz, California 95060

Project Description

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to examine the potential environmental effects of the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project. The following is a summary of the full project description, which may be found in Section 2.0 *Project Description*.

The proposed project is an expansion of the existing 11-room Monarch Cove Inn to 41 rooms and associated hotel and event facilities. The project would involve demolition of two existing guest cottages, an existing L-shaped building (consisting of garage spaces and the hotel office), and the outdoor deck. These structures would be replaced by a proposed new hotel that would include three buildings: two new buildings, and an existing Victorian building to remain. A two-level, below grade parking garage (8,322 square feet on each level) with 56 parking stalls and 27 bicycle parking spaces is also proposed. A separate bicycle entrance would be included to the below grade parking garage. Four additional surface parking spaces would be included near the entrance to the main building.

The proposed new main building would be a 16,729 square foot, two-story building containing 22 guest rooms, two meeting rooms, kitchen facilities for catering and internal use, and a courtyard. The second building would be a two-story, 5,894 square foot building with 10 guest rooms, located along the western property line. The heights of the proposed new buildings would be a maximum of 30 feet above average grade. The proposed project also includes renovation of an existing nine-room Victorian building on the site, including seismic improvements, construction of a new foundation and a slight reorientation of the structure. The existing nine rooms in the Victorian house would be retained as guest rooms. In total, the proposed hotel would include 41 guest rooms (nine existing guest rooms and 32 new guest rooms), an increase of 30 rooms.

The proposed hotel would continue to host special events such as weddings and corporate retreats. Special events are currently regulated by an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The project applicant has indicated that future events would continue to adhere to conditions in the CUP which limit the frequency, size, and operating characteristics of special events. However, some conditions may be removed or reworded in the permit review process (refer to Section 2.0, *Project Description*). The proposed project would demolish the outdoor deck currently used to host weddings and other events. Future special events would occur indoors in the new pavilion building under the proposed project.

It should be noted that although the project applicant has proposed to demolish the two existing guest cottages, mitigation contained in this EIR would require the cottages to be preserved and relocated within the project site (refer to Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*).

ALTERNATIVES

Four alternatives to the proposed project were selected for consideration as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Project
- Alternative 2: Reduced Project
- Alternative 3: Alternative Access
- Alternative 4: Modified Project (No Events)

Alternative 1: No Project

This alternative assumes that the proposed hotel expansion and associated improvements are not implemented. Thus, the project site would continue to be occupied by the existing 11-room Monarch Cove Inn, which consists of nine rooms in the historic Victorian structure, two guest cottages, and an outside deck that is used to host special events. Site access would continue to be via El Salto Drive. The hotel would continue to operate under an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP) that limits events to a maximum of 40 guests Monday through Thursday and 75 guests Friday through Sunday; requires the use of shuttles from an off-site parking area for larger events; limits weddings or events to no more than one per day, two per week, and six per month; requires adherence to the City Municipal Code standards for noise limits and use of amplified sound; and requires a security guard to be present on-site during all events to control traffic, parking, and guests.

Alternative 2: Reduced Project

This alternative would involve an expansion of the Monarch Cove Inn from its current 11 rooms to 22 rooms, representing a 46% reduction in overall rooms as compared to the proposed project and a 63% reduction in new rooms (11 versus 30). To accommodate the 11-room expansion, it is anticipated that the existing L-shaped building (garage spaces and hotel office) would be demolished, but that the outdoor deck would be retained and the two cottages proposed for demolition as part of the project would be preserved and relocated on-site. As such, events would continue to occur primarily outside under this alternative, as an indoor pavilion would not be constructed. One new two-story building with 11 rooms would be built, bringing the total number of on-site hotel rooms to 22. Parking would be provided in a surface parking lot

with 28 stalls and 14 bicycle spaces (half of what is proposed as part of the two-level below grade garage included in the project). The surface parking lot would be constructed in lieu of some of the proposed landscaping. Similar to the proposed project, primary site access would be from El Salto Drive, with secondary access provided from Escalona Drive.

Because of the limited size of the expansion under this alternative, the hotel would maintain its current character in lieu of the proposed conversion to a "boutique" hotel. As such, this alternative would not include such amenities as valet parking, 24-hour concierge service, enhanced landscaping, and possibly trails for ADA and neighbor access.

Alternative 3: Alternative Access

The development characteristics of this alternative would be the same as those of the proposed project. Two existing small cottages, an existing L-shaped building (consisting of garage spaces and the hotel office), and an outdoor deck would be demolished and replaced by a new hotel that would include three buildings: two new buildings, and an existing building to remain, as described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*. As with the proposed project, this alternative would involve a net increase of 30 hotel rooms, bringing the overall number of rooms on-site to 41. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would also include a two-level, below grade parking garage with 56 parking stalls and 27 bicycle parking spaces. Four additional surface parking spaces would also be included near the entrance to the main building.

The only change for this alternative compared to the proposed project is the primary access point. Rather than continuing to provide primary access from El Salto Drive (the current condition), this alternative would relocate the main project driveway to Park Avenue, as shown on Figure 6-1. As a result of the driveway relocation, reconfiguration of on-site circulation would be required. The exact location of the driveway has not been determined, but the driveway would need to extend roughly 200 feet and presumably would be located in the heavily wooded area between the project site and Park Avenue.

Alternative 4: Modified Project (No Events)

This alternative would make a trade-off of event space for additional hotel rooms. According to the project applicant, this alternative would be feasible because the additional rooms would generate peak-season revenue that would offset the loss of non-peak season room bookings that would occur because of the event space. The proposed Main building would be redesigned internally to accommodate the additional rooms, through the replacement of the Pavilion room with ten additional guest rooms. Key features of this alternative are:

- 10 rooms added to the Main building by converting Pavilion space to hotel rooms, bringing the total number of on-site guest rooms to 51
- Minor reconfiguration of the building footprint to make a total building coverage increase from 14,728 SF to 16,254 SF
- The proposed Pavilion room would become a 2-story element to accommodate guest rooms
- Catering kitchen eliminated
- Small board room retained for breakfast area
- Bayview building and other elements retained

- Total parking would increase from 60 to 62 spaces
- No events

Like the proposed project, this alternative would involve a "boutique" facility that includes all of the amenities proposed as part of the project. Site access would be the same as for the proposed project.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 includes a brief description of the environmental issues relative to the proposed project, the identified environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts (the impact after application of mitigation, if any). Impacts are categorized by classes. Class I impacts are defined as significant, unavoidable adverse impacts which require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued per Section 15093 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* if the project is approved. Class II impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and which require findings to be made under Section 15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Class III impacts are considered less than significant impacts.

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES		
Impact AES-1. The proposed project would not affect views of the	None required	Less than significant
ocean and coastline from a public viewing area. Impacts would be		
Class III, less than significant.		
Impact AES-2. The proposed project would involve tree removal and changes to site landscaping, hardscaping, and layout, and would result in an increased intensity and scale of development on the project site. Impacts to the visual character and quality of the project site would be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> .	BIO-1(b) and BIO-7(a) through BIO-7(c). See Impacts BIO-1 and BIO-7 below.	Less than significant
Impact AES-3. The proposed project would involve an increase in structural development, hardscape, and intensity of use on the project site, including new and increased night lighting and the potential for increased daytime glare. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but</i> <i>mitigable</i> .	AES-3: Photometric Plans and Specifications . Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall submit photometric plans for review and approval by the City's Community Development Director. The plans shall demonstrate that proposed lighting prevents light trespass and complies with the provisions of the Capitola Municipal Code intended to ensure that only the area intended is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled. Compliance shall be confirmed through post-construction light level analysis performed by a qualified professional confirming that lighting impacts have been minimized through shielding, downward-directed fixtures, wattage control and other methods. Lighting shall not exceed 0.5 foot-candles at the property lines.	Less than significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts	,
Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts	

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
AIR QUALITY	·	
Impact AQ-1. Construction activity would generate on- and off-site air pollutant emissions. However, construction emissions would not exceed MBUAPCD thresholds. Impacts would be Class III, <i>less</i> <i>than significant</i> .	None required	Less than significant
Impact AQ-2. Operation of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions. However, emissions would not exceed MBUAPCD operational significance thresholds. Therefore, operational impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required	Less than significant
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Impact BIO-1. The proposed project may result in the loss of monarch foraging and sunning areas on the project site, and have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications on monarch butterfly. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> .	 BIO-1(a): Preconstruction Surveys and Construction Timing. At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction or any site preparation activities, the applicant shall deposit adequate funds to the Community Development Department to retain a qualified monarch butterfly biologist. A pre-construction meeting shall be held at least 7 working days prior to initiation of any construction or site disturbance. The biological monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting. Construction activities shall not be allowed during the wintering period of the monarch butterfly (the exact timing of monarch arrival and departure may vary from year to year but the wintering period is generally October 1 to March 1) unless absence of monarchs within the EGMBG has been determined by a monarch butterfly biologist. Construction can only occur during the wintering period if monarchs are not present at the site or within the adjacent EGMBG. Prior to any construction scheduled during the wintering period, a survey for monarch butterfly aggregation sites or individuals shall be conducted within the project area and adjacent EGMBH. The survey shall be conducted by the qualified monarch biologist to confirm whether butterflies are still present or have left the roost site. If wintering monarchs are present no construction activity will be allowed until after the wintering period. BIO-1(b): Revegetation Plan. A revegetation plan shall be developed for the project site. The plan shall be prepared by a habitat restoration specialist with input from a monarch butterfly expert, and shall identify and quantify impacts to existing trees and to existing monarch butterfly habitat, identify suitable species for tree replacement and landscaping, identify locations for plantings associated with new tree windbreak areas and monarch foraging habitat. 	Less than significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts,
Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	invasive English Ivy on the project site with suitable native species. The plan shall be developed prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, and shall include planting and irrigation specifications, and define success criteria and remedial measures if success criteria are not met. The plan shall ensure that monarch butterfly habitat is replaced at a minimum ratio of 1:1 and that trees are replaced at a minimum ratio of 3:1, or at a sufficient level determined by a qualified biologist to provide equal or greater monarch butterfly habitat functions and values, and that the new landscape meets the requirement to mitigate for the loss of existing foraging and sunning habitat from project development. The plan shall include at a minimum the following details:	
	<i>Tree Replacement.</i> Any trees (including fruit- bearing trees) that are removed to accommodate the project shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio. Figure 4.3-3 provides recommended areas (labeled "Proposed Wind Buffer Planting Areas") for landscaping trees to provide additional windbreak at the project site. Prior to issuance of grading and tree removal permits, a revised landscaping plan shall be prepared to include the replacement of all trees at a 3:1 ratio, and the plan shall be reviewed by a monarch butterfly expert to ensure consistency with required monarch butterfly habitat improvement measures. Trees that are removed shall be replaced with similar-sized mitigation trees if possible, to maintain secondary wind protection function for the main roost site at Escalona Gulch. Smaller trees can be used for replacement when similar sized trees are not available. Evergreen tree species that provide good windscreen function include Coast redwood (Sequoia sempervirens), Monterey Cypress, Swamp mahogany (Eucalyptus robusta), Sydney blue gum (Eucalyptus saligna), Coolibah (Eucalyptus microthecd).	
	Tree and Shrub Protection. Trees, shrubs, and vines that would not be removed during construction shall be protected by construction fencing and all workers shall be advised of the need to avoid damage to these areas and the plants in them. Warning signs shall be placed on the construction fencing to ensure all vegetation is protected. Project biologist shall supervise all staking and fencing installation. <i>New Shrub Plantings.</i> The revegetation plan shall incorporate additional plantings of preferred nectar plants to enable monarchs to continue to forage in the remaining sunlit portions of currently utilized foraging areas. These additional plantings shall include a mixture of flowering vines and shrubs. Vines such as California blackberry (Rubus sp.),	

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	and Lauraltinus (Viburnum tinus) shall be placed to grow on selected retained trees and shrubs, as well as fences or other structures such as trellises. Shrubs, such as Bottlebrush (Callistemon citrinus), California lilac (Ceanothus cuneatus var. cuneatus), Pride of Madeira (Echium candicans), Escalonia (Escalonia spp.), would be suitable. The use of low- growing nectar plants shall be avoided in these areas so foraging areas are not shaded by taller vegetation or nearby structures.	
	Long-Term Plan for English Ivy. Even though it is an invasive, existing stands of English Ivy shall be retained to the extent practical at the Monarch Cove Inn during construction and landscaping. In addition, it shall be planted at other locations on the grounds of the Monarch Cove Inn as an interim source of nectar until other non-invasive species have fully developed. Ivy shall be planted prior to construction in portions of the grounds where construction activities would not occur and be available to wintering monarchs before the project begins. Other nectar plants would require a period of years to mature and provide adequate, substitute sources of nectar for wintering monarchs. During this interim period, ivy would remain an important nectar source for the monarch. A phased plan to remove English ivy from the project site shall be developed, and as the other species of nectar plants mature and flower, the amount of ivy shall be gradually reduced and ultimately removed from the grounds of the Monarch Cove Inn. Annual post- construction monitoring shall occur for a period of 5 to 10 years to document that the other nectar plants survive, mature, and fulfill their function as substitute nectar sources for the butterfly before all ivy is removed. The period of monitoring shall be determined by a qualified restoration ecologist with support from a monarch butterfly expert. The extent of monitoring shall depend on the time needed for native nectar plants to become established, and shall ensure that natural foraging habitat is sufficiently developed so as to support wintering monarch butterfly, prior to the final removal of all English ivy.	
	<i>Long-Term Monitoring.</i> The Revegetation Plan shall include specifications for a long-term monitoring effort (up to 5 years or until success criteria is met) by a habitat restoration specialist. If success has not been documented after five years of monitoring, the remedial methods shall be initiated. Annual reports shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review.	
	<i>Financial Responsibility.</i> The applicant shall be required to deposit adequate funds to Community Development Department to retain a habitat	

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	restoration specialist, and submit a deposit to the City to cover the costs of ongoing revegetation monitoring and reporting.	
	BIO-1(c): Fireplaces. In-room fireplaces shall be gas- or electric-powered and shall include fixed doors, thereby prohibiting guests from placing items in the fireplaces that may generate smoke. Barbeques, fire pits, or other exterior fire features (whether wood or gas powered) shall not be permitted.	
Impact BIO-2. The proposed project may result in direct impacts to nesting birds by causing injury, death, or nest failure. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> .	BIO-2: Nesting Bird Surveys and Avoidance. Initial site disturbance shall be prohibited during the general avian nesting season (February 1 – August 30), if feasible; however, limitations to construction activity outlined in measure BIO-1(a) the monarch wintering season takes precedence, as there are no alternate measures for mitigating impacts to monarchs during the winter roosting period. If breeding season avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall deposit adequate funds with the Community Development Department to retain a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey to determine the presence/absence, location, and status of any active nests on or adjacent to the project site. The extent of the survey buffer area surrounding the site shall be established by the qualified biologist to ensure that direct and indirect effects to nesting birds are avoided. To avoid the destruction of active nests and to protect the reproductive success of birds protected by MBTA and the FGC, nesting bird surveys shall be performed not more than 14 days prior to the scheduled vegetation clearance. In the event that active nests are discovered, a suitable buffer should be established around such active nests and no construction within the buffer allowed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (e.g. the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest). No ground disturbing activities shall occur within this buffer until the qualified biologist has confirmed that breeding/nesting is completed and the young have fledged the nest. Survey results shall be presented in a letter report and submitted to the Community Development Department. Nesting bird surveys are not sortice on the survey for the survey for the survey within this buffer until the qualified biologist has confirmed that the nest is no longer active in a survey results shall be presented in a letter report and submitted to the Community Development Department. Nesting bird surveys are	Less than significant
Impact BIO-3. The proposed project may directly impact California red- legged frog and other special status species by causing injury or death	between August 30 and February 1. BIO-3: Pre-construction Surveys for Special Status Species. Prior to issuance of a grading permit and initiation of any site preparation activities, the applicant shall deposit adequate funds to the Community Development Department to rate in a	Less than significant
Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys for special status species. A pre- construction meeting shall be held at least 7 working days prior to initiation of any construction or site disturbance. The biological monitor shall	

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts,
Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	attend the pre-construction meeting. Preconstruction surveys for special status species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist not more than 14 days prior to construction. Preconstruction survey shall be conducted across the entire project site. If species are observed on the project site during pre-construction survey, the individuals shall be monitored by the qualified biologists, and no construction shall be allowed until the individuals have left the project site. Survey results shall be presented in a letter report and submitted to the Community Development Department.	
Impact BIO-4. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Impacts would be Class III, <i>less</i> <i>than significant.</i>	None required	Less than significant
Impact BIO-5. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Impacts would be Class III, <i>less than</i> <i>significant</i> .	None required	Less than significant
Impact BIO-6. The proposed project may interfere with the movement of monarch butterflies. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> .	Mitigation measures BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(c) would reduce impacts to monarch butterflies, including impacts related to their migration. No additional mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact BIO-7. Construction activities may damage trees not proposed for removal. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but</i> <i>mitigable</i> .	BIO-7(a): Tree Protection during Construction. When possible, the root zone of retained trees shall remain undisturbed during development, eliminating the opportunity for damage and the resulting decline of the trees. The applicant shall deposit funds to CDD prior to issuance of grading permit to retain qualified arborist and arborist to prepare a letter report following completion of site preparation to document findings.	Less than significant
	The project arborist shall be on-site to attend the preconstruction meeting and to oversee all root- zone staking.	
	Avoidance fencing shall be placed around all trees encroached on by construction activity. Fencing shall be supported by metal posts embedded in the ground to create a long-term physical and visual barrier between the trees, the construction workers and their equipment. Straw bales shall be held in place with stakes and designed to prevent any excess grading soil or other debris from passing into	

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	the tree buffer zone. The barricade shall be designed so that it also diverts any excess moisture that can develop when natural drainage patterns are altered.	
	Where root zone avoidance is not possible, root pruning and monitoring shall be conducted during both demolition and excavation adjacent to any such trees, and specifically when working adjacent to trees #1, #23 and #24 of the Arborist Report (Hamb, 2013; see also Figure 4.3-2). The existing planting area for tree #1 shall remain undisturbed except for the removal of ivy growth. The demolition of the asphalt driveway and curb surrounding tree #1 shall be completed using small equipment and manual labor, and these activities shall be monitored by the project arborist. All roots unearthed shall be inspected and evaluated, and those roots greater than one inch in diameter shall be properly pruned by, or under the direction of the project arborist. The curb surrounding tree #1 shall be constructed on top of the new pavement, and no continuous excavation for a footing will be allowed. Excavation adjacent to the mature eucalyptus trees (#23 and #24) shall be monitored by the project arborist. Any roots unearthed will be evaluated and properly pruned by, or under the direction of the project arborist. Any trees lost or significantly damaged during construction, as determined by the project arborist, shall be replaced on-site at a 3:1 ratio.	
	BIO-7(b): Staging. Staging of job trailers, equipment, parking, and supplies shall be restricted to areas outside the critical root zone of retained trees.	
	BIO-7(c): Tree Protection Specification Handout. The Tree Protection Specifications outlined in Hamb (2013) shall be prepared into a handout format, and supplied to all contractors and subcontractors prior to entering the site.	
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impact CR-1. The proposed project would demolish two on-site cottages, which are eligible for designation as local historical resources. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> .	CR-1: Cottage Relocation. Cottage 1 and Cottage 2 shall be stabilized and relocated elsewhere on the project site, and shall be used for a purpose other than guest rooms (e.g. spa facilities). A probable location for the cottages is in the vicinity of the current outdoor deck, which is proposed to contain landscaping, pathways, and two fire pits (refer to Figure 2-3 in Section 2.0, <i>Project Description</i>). This location is shown in Figure 4.4-3, and would place the cottages outside of the 50-foot cliff setback. The relocation of the proposed new buildings. The applicant shall submit adequate funds to the Community Development Department to retain a qualified historical building mover to oversee relocation activities. The cottages shall each be	Less than significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts,
Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	the cottages shall be preserved and restored in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to ensure that the buildings retain their integrity and historical significance. The qualified historical building mover shall summarize the results of the relocation efforts in a letter report submitted to the Community Development Department.	
Impact CR-2. The temporary relocation, seismic retrofits, and reorientation of the Main House, as well as the construction of the Bayview Building, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the historic significance of the Main House. Therefore, project impacts on the Main House would be Class III, less than significant.	None required	Less than significant
Impact CR-3. There are no known prehistoric or archaeological resources in the proposed project area. Impacts to known archeological resources would therefore be Class III, <i>less than</i> <i>significant</i> .	None required	Less than significant
Impact CR-4. Construction of the proposed project would involve surface excavation. Although unlikely, construction activities have the potential to unearth or impact previously unidentified archaeological cultural resources. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> .	 CR-4(a): Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring. At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction or any site preparation activities, the project applicant shall deposit adequate funds with the Community Development Department to retain a qualified archaeological monitor. The archaeological monitor shall have the authority to stop work if archaeological resources are discovered. At least seven working days prior to the commencement of construction activities, a pre-construction meeting will be held. The archaeological monitor will attend the pre- construction meeting. In addition, the archaeological monitor will organize a meeting with all construction workers associated with earth disturbing activities. The meeting shall describe the potential of exposing archaeological resources, the types of cultural materials that may be encountered, and directions on the steps that shall be taken if such a find is encountered. A qualified archaeologist shall be present during all initial earth moving activities. In the event that unearthed prehistoric or archaeological cultural resources or human remains are encountered during project construction, mitigation measure CR-2(b) shall take effect. CR-4(b): Unearthed Prehistoric or archaeological cultural Remains. If prehistoric or archaeological cultural resource remains are encountered during construction or land modification activities, work shall stop and the City of Capitola shall be notified at once to assess the nature, extent. and potential 	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	significance of any prehistoric or archaeological cultural remains. A Phase II subsurface testing program shall be implemented to determine the resource boundaries within the project component/impact area, assess the integrity of the resource, and evaluate the site's significance through a study of its features and artifacts. The findings of the testing program along with mitigation recommendations, as applicable, shall be submitted to the City for review and approval.	
	require that the resource area be capped using culturally sterile and chemically neutral fill material. A qualified archaeologist shall be retained to monitor the placement of fill upon the site. If a significant site will not be capped, the results and recommendations of the Phase II study shall determine the need for a Phase III data recovery program designed to record and remove significant prehistoric or archaeological cultural materials that could otherwise be tampered with. If the site is determined insignificant, no capping and or further archaeological investigation shall be required. The results and recommendations of the Phase II study shall determine the need for construction monitoring.	
Impact CR-5. Construction of the proposed project would involve surface excavation, which has the potential to unearth or adversely impact previously unidentified human remains. Impacts would be Class III, <i>less than significant</i> .	None required	Less than significant
Impact CR-6. Construction of the proposed project would involve surface excavation. These activities have the potential to unearth and/or impact paleontological resources. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> .	CR-6(a): Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program. At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction or any site preparation activities, the project applicant shall deposit adequate funds with the Community Development Department to retain a qualified paleontological monitor. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to stop work if paleontological resources are discovered. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the qualified paleontological monitor shall prepare a Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program to be implemented during project ground disturbance activity. This program shall outline the procedures for construction staff Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training, paleontological monitoring extent and duration, salvage and preparation of fossils, the final mitigation and monitoring report, and paleontological staff qualifications. CR-6(b): Paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program. At least seven working days prior to the commencement of construction activities, the paleontological monitor shall attend the pre-	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	monitor shall conduct a meeting to inform all construction personnel about the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff.	
	CR-6(c): Paleontological Resource Construction Monitoring. Any excavations exceeding three feet in depth shall be monitored on a full-time basis by the qualified paleontological monitor. Ground disturbing activity that does not exceed three feet in depth shall not require paleontological monitoring. If no fossils are observed during the first 50% of excavations exceeding three feet in depth, paleontological monitoring may be reduced to weekly spot-checking if recommended by the qualified paleontologist and approved by the City.	
	CR-6(d): Salvage, Preparation, and Curation of Fossils . If fossils are discovered, the paleontological monitor shall recover them. Typically fossils can be safely salvaged quickly by a single paleontologist and not disrupt construction activity. In some cases larger fossils (such as complete skeletons or large mammal fossils) require more extensive excavation and longer salvage periods. In this case the paleontologist shall have the authority to temporarily direct, divert or halt construction activity to ensure that the fossil(s) can be removed in a safe and timely manner. Once salvaged, fossils shall be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection, along with all pertinent field notes, photos, data, and maps.	
	CR-6(e): Final Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Report . Upon completion of ground disturbing activity (and curation of fossils if necessary), the qualified paleontological monitor shall prepare a final mitigation and monitoring report outlining the results of the mitigation and monitoring program. The report shall include discussion of the location, duration and methods of the monitoring, stratigraphic sections, any recovered fossils, and the scientific significance of those fossils, and where fossils were curated.	
GEOLOGY		
Impact GEO-1. Seismically induced ground shaking could destroy or damage structures and infrastructure, resulting in loss of property or risk to human safety. However, mandatory compliance with applicable California Building Code requirements would reduce impacts to a Class III, <i>less than</i> <i>significant</i> , level.	None required	Less than significant

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts,
Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
Impact GEO-2. Construction of the	None required	Less than significant
proposed project could result in		Ŭ
erosion or loss of topsoil. However,		
compliance with recommendations		
contained in the site-specific		
Geotechnical Investigation would		
reduce impacts to a Class III, less		
than significant, level.		
Impact GEO-3. The project site is	None required	Less than significant
subject to ongoing coastal bluff		
erosion, and may be subject to		
landslides. However, project		
improvements would not be located		
within 50 feet of the bluff, and would		
not increase the rate of bluff		
erosion, nor increase the potential		
for landslides. Impacts would be		
Class III, less than significant.	Nama wany inad	Less then similiant
Impact GEO-4. The proposed	None required	Less than significant
that may be subject to shareline		
retreat and appalarated bluff areaion		
retreat and accelerated biun erosion		
Impacts would be Class III. Joss		
then significant		
Impact GEO-5 Construction and	Nono required	Loop than aignificant
operation of the proposed		Less than significant
underground parking garage could		
result in settling of the structure		
However, compliance with		
recommendations contained in the		
site-specific Geotechnical		
Investigation would reduce impacts		
relating to settling of the proposed		
parking structure to a Class III, less		
than significant, level		
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
Impact GHG-1. The proposed	None required	Less than significant
project would generate additional		-
GHG emissions beyond existing		
conditions. However, GHG		
emissions generated by the project		
would not exceed the significance		
threshold of 1,150 MT CO2 per		
year. Impacts would be Class III,		
less than significant.		
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALIT		
impact HVVQ-1. Site preparation,	None required	Less than significant
grading and construction activities		
the notential for arcsion and		
sedimentation However		
compliance with existing federal		
state and local requirements would		
ensure that impacts remain Class		
III, less than significant.		

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
Impact HWQ-2. The proposed	None required	Less than significant
project would increase stormwater		
runoff due to the increase in		
impervious surfaces in the project		
area, which could also degrade		
water quality. However, the		
proposed on-site stormwater		
detention facilities and compliance		
with federal, state, and local		
requirements would ensure historic		
water quality standards are met		
Impacts related to surface rupoff		
volumes and water quality would be		
Class III. less than significant.		
Impact HWQ-3. The proposed	None required	Less than significant
project would add to impervious		2000 than orginitoant
surfaces on the site. However, this		
would not interfere with groundwater		
recharge. Impacts would be Class		
III, less than significant.		
LAND USE AND PLANNING		
Impact LU-1. The proposed project	None required	Less than significant
would not conflict with any land use		
plan, policy, or regulation (including		
the City's General Plan, Zoning		
Ordinance, and Local Coastal		
Program), which were adopted for the		
environmental effect. Impacts related		
to policy consistency would be Class		
III. less than significant.		
NOISE		
Impact N-1. Project construction	N-1(a): Construction Noise Mitigation Program.	Less than significant
would intermittently generate noise	The applicant shall provide, to the satisfaction of the	· ·
on and adjacent to the site. The	Community Development Director, a Noise Mitigation	
project would be required to comply	and Monitoring Program that requires all of the	
with the City's regulations pertaining	following:	
to the timing of construction		
activities, and construction noise	Construction contracts that specify that all	
would not be expected to exceed	construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be	
typical levels associated with	equipped with properly operating and maintained	
construction, grading, and building	mumers and other State-required hoise	
deperating activity may occur as	Allenuation devices.	
close as 10 feet from sensitive	No blasting of pile driving shall be jeffilled. A public pational proceedure shall be identified	
receptors and may temporarily	 A public floticing procedure shall be identified that specifies how public potice shall be provided 	
generate noise levels which would	(e.g. by mail, public posting), when it will be	
result in adverse community	provided and who will be notified. The notice	
reaction. Impacts would be Class II,	shall be reviewed and approved by the	
significant but mitigable.	Community Development Director prior to the	
	mailing or posting and shall indicate the dates	
	and duration of construction activities, as well as	
	provide a contact name and telephone number	
	where residents can inquire about the	
	construction process and register complaints.	
	 During construction, stationary construction 	
	equipment shall be located the maximum	

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	 feasible distance from nearby receptors, and oriented such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers. During operations of grading and excavation equipment and cement pouring (which have been identified as the loudest components of construction), temporary noise barriers designed to provide 15 or greater dBA attenuation shall be used between the source of construction noise and adjacent sensitive receptors to ensure that noise levels do not exceed levels of adverse community reaction identified by the FTA. In addition, sound blankets shall be used on all stationary noise generating equipment. 	
	N-1(b): Construction Hour Restrictions. Construction activities which involve heavy equipment and noisy machinery, including but not limited to excavators, graders, backhoes, compactors, jack hammers, air compressors, generators, forklifts, and dump trucks, shall only be permitted between 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday. Dump trucks and other construction vehicles shall also not queue and/or idle at the project site or in the adjoining private/public rights-of-way during these hours.	
	N-1(c): Staging Areas . The construction contractor shall provide staging areas on-site to minimize off-site transportation of heavy construction equipment. These areas shall be located to maximize the distance between activity and sensitive receptors (neighboring residences). This would reduce noise levels associated with most types of idling construction equipment. Staging areas shall be located at the end of Escalona Drive and along the northwestern and western edge of the property, sited to avoid biological resources. All staging areas shall be located at a distance of at least 100 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors.	
	N 1(d): Diesel Equipment Mufflers. All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory recommended mufflers.	
	N 1(e): Electrically-Powered Tools and Facilities. No diesel powered compressors, generators, or power tools shall be permitted. Electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools and to power any temporary structures, such as construction trailers or caretaker facilities.	

Table ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts,
Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
Impact N-2. Project construction	Mitigation measure N-1(b) (see above).	Less than significant
activities could generate intermittent		C C
levels of groundborne vibration		
affecting residences and buildings		
adjacent to the project site.		
However, these impacts would be		
temporary in nature and would not		
result in damage to surrounding		
buildings. Impacts would be Class II,		
Significant but miligable.	None required	Loop then significant
troffic would incrementally increase	None required	Less than significant
noise lovels on area readways		
However, the increase in noise		
would not exceed significance		
thresholds and would therefore be		
Class III less than significant		
Impact N-4. Operation of the	None required	Less than significant
proposed project would generate		Looo than orginitoant
noise levels that may periodically be		
audible to existing uses near the		
project site. On-site noise sources		
would include deliveries and other		
service vehicles, hotel guests,		
weddings and events, and live		
acoustic music. However, the		
project would adhere to the site's		
existing Conditional Use Permit		
(CUP) and the City's Municipal		
Code standards for noise limits and		
use of amplified sound. Therefore,		
impacts would be Class III, less than		
Impact PS-1 Demand for fire	Nono required	Loce than significant
nolice and emergency medical		Less than significant
services generated by hotel		
operations would not result in an		
exceedance of acceptable response		
time goals. Therefore, the		
construction of new facilities would		
not be required and impacts would		
be Class III, less than significant.		
TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION		
Impact T-1. Traffic generated by the	T-1: Construction Management Plan. Prior to	Less than significant
construction of the proposed project	issuance of building or grading permits for the	C C
would increase traffic on local	project site, the project proponent shall prepare a	
streets, including trips to and from	Construction Management Plan for review and	
the site by construction trucks and	approval by City staff. The provisions of the plan	
equipment. Although temporary in	shall include, but not be limited to, the following:	
nature, the impact would be Class II,		
significant but mitigable.	 In order to minimize impacts from construction- 	
	related traffic, the project contractor shall ensure	
	that heavy vehicle traffic from the project site	
	only occur between the hours of 8:00 AM and	
	5:00 PM.	
	In project contractor shall identify and enforce truck haul routes deemed acceptable by the City	

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	 for construction trucks. Signs shall be posted along roads identifying construction traffic access or flow limitations due to single lane conditions during periods of truck traffic if needed. Construction equipment shall be stored on the project site and construction vehicles shall not be allowed to park within the residential neighborhood during the construction phase of the project. 	
Impact T-2. Traffic generated by the proposed project would increase traffic volumes and incrementally reduce levels of service at each of the 10 study intersections. However, the level of service impact caused by the proposed project under "existing plus project" conditions would not exceed City or Caltrans thresholds at these intersections. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, less than significant.	None required	Less than significant
Impact T-3. Traffic generated by the proposed project would increase traffic volumes and incrementally reduce levels of service at four of the six studied freeway segments. The level of service impact caused by the proposed project under "existing plus project" conditions at these four segments would exceed Caltrans thresholds. Therefore, impacts would be Class I, <i>significant</i> <i>and unavoidable</i> .	No feasible mitigation measures are available. Caltrans has identified improvements to Highway 1 via the Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane widening project, including the studied freeway segments. However, since it is not feasible for an individual development project to bear responsibility for implementing such extensive transportation system improvements due to constraints in acquisition and cost of right-of-way, and no comprehensive project to add the HOV lanes has been developed by Caltrans for individual projects to contribute to, the significant impacts on the directional freeway segments identified above must be considered significant and unavoidable.	Significant
Impact T-4. El Salto Drive and Escalona Drive would provide access to the proposed project. New driveways would also be constructed for internal site circulation. Traffic created by the proposed project and emergency services would be adequately served by these access points and driveways. Therefore, impacts to access and internal circulation would be Class III, <i>less than</i> <i>significant</i> .	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
Impact Impact T-5. The project would generate a small amount of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit trips. These trips would not exceed the capacity of the facilities in the area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, or transit service. Impacts would be Class III, <i>less than significant</i> . Impact T-6. The proposed project	Mitigation Measures None required. T-6: Fair Share Contribution. Prior to issuance of	Residual Impact Less than significant Less than significant
plus cumulative growth would add vehicle trips to local roads and intersections. At the intersection of Bay Avenue and Hill Street these impacts would be Class II, <i>less than</i> <i>significant with mitigation</i> .	final occupancy permits for the proposed project, the project proponent shall either pay into the City's Transportation Impact Fee Program, if adopted, or consult with the City of Capitola to determine the project's fair share of the improvements to the intersection of Bay Avenue of Hill Street. No feasible mitigation measures available.	Significant
plus cumulative growth would add vehicle trips to local roads and intersections. At the intersection of Porter Street and Highway 1 these impacts would be Class I, <i>significant</i> <i>and unavoidable</i> .	Improvements to the Porter Street/Bay Avenue interchange (the location of the Porter Street and Highway 1 NB ramps) as part of the Highway 1 HOV Lane widening project have been identified and are currently being studied. These improvements would include modifying the existing interchanges at 41st Avenue and Porter Street/Bay Avenue into a single interchange to improve safety and traffic operations. Environmental evaluation of the project is underway. However, no funding has been identified for the completion of the project. There is no mechanism in place for the project proponent to contribute to the funding of this improvement therefore no mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.	Cignilioant
Impact T-8. The proposed project plus cumulative growth would add vehicle trips to freeway segments in the area. These impacts would be Class I <i>significant and unavoidable</i> .	No feasible mitigation measures available. Caltrans has identified improvements to Highway 1 via the Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane widening project, including the studied freeway segments. However, since it is not feasible for an individual development project to bear responsibility for implementing such extensive transportation system improvements due to constraints in acquisition and cost of right-of-way, and no comprehensive project to add the HOV lanes has been developed by Caltrans for individual projects to contribute to, the significant impacts on the directional freeway segments identified above must be considered significant and unavoidable	Significant

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
UTILITIES		·
Impact U-1. The proposed project would result in an increase in water demand at the site over existing conditions. Despite current water supply deficiencies and uncertain future water supply sources, compliance with SqCWD retrofit requirements, included herein as mitigation, would reduce impacts to a Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> level.	U-1: Water Demand Offset. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a water demand offset plan to the satisfaction of the Soquel Creek Water District to ensure that proposed water demand offsets comply with District requirements. Following issuance of building permits but prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the project applicant shall achieve water offsets in accordance with SqCWD requirements. This shall be achieved through installation of off-site water-saving retrofits (including toilet retrofits and/or turf replacement). Installation of on-site water-saving retrofits that exceed the requirements of the Indoor and Landscape Water Use Efficiency Ordinances (including, but not limited to: ultra-high efficiency toilets, showerheads, and faucets; waterless urinals; hot-water recirculation systems; graywater plumbing or connections; and/or elimination of turf landscaping) may also be used to reduce on-site water demand at the site and thus the requirement for off-site retrofit measures. On-site measures shall be approved in advance of installation by the SqCWD and factored into the calculation of the off- site retrofit requirements. The final off-site offset amount shall be subject to review and approval by the SqCWD prior to implementation.	Less than significant
Impact U-2. The proposed project would include upgrades to drainage, water quality, and stormwater management systems on the project site. Impacts related to the need for additional facilities, the construction of which could have environmental impacts, would be Class III, <i>less</i> <i>than significant</i> .	None required	Less than significant

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that evaluates the Monarch Cove Hotel Project, located in the City of Capitola, County of Santa Cruz. The EIR was prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), published by the Resources Agency of the State of California (Title 14, California Code of Regulations 15000 et. seq.), and the City of Capitola's procedures for implementing CEQA. This report was prepared by professional planning consultants in conjunction with City of Capitola staff.

This section describes: (1) the general background of the project's EIR process; (2); the purpose and legal authority of the EIR (3) the scope and content of the EIR; (4) lead, responsible, and trustee agencies; and (5) the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT BACKGROUND

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an environmental impact report was prepared for the proposed project and distributed for agency and public review for the required 30-day review period on August 27, 2013. The intent of the NOP was to provide interested individuals, groups, public agencies and others a forum to provide input to the City regarding scope and focus of the EIR. Sixty-three written responses were received, including the State Clearinghouse letter confirming receipt of the NOP. Oral comments were received at a public meeting held on September 16, 2013. The NOP is presented in Appendix A, along with the Initial Study that was prepared for the project and the NOP response letters received. Table 1-1 lists the environmental issues that were raised in writing and at the public scoping meeting, and indicates where in the EIR the issues is addressed. The topics are presented generally in order of the number of comments received on a particular topic.

General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
Several commenters expressed concern regarding the compatability between existing residences and the proposed hotel.	The project's consistency with land use and planning regulations adopted for the purposes of preventing or mitigating environmental effects is addressed in Section 4.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> . The current use for the proposed project site is a hotel and this proposal would maintain this land use, although the scale of the project would increase.	
Companishity	Several commenters expressed concern over quality of life impacts of the project. Commenters specifically cited parking constraints during summer months and on weekends, effects on the park-like	The project's consistency with land use and planning regulations adopted for purposes of preventing or mitigation environment effects is addressed in Section 4.8, <i>Land Use and Planning.</i> Impacts related to the visual character of the neighborhood are addressed in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics.</i>

Table 1-1 Summary of Scoping Period Comments

General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
	nature of the existing neighborhood, effects on the pedestrian-friendly nature of the existing neighborhood, effects on rural character, intoxication of hotel guests, safety, and congestion.	Impacts related to traffic, including safety and congestion, are discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i> . Although parking is not specifically a CEQA issue, parking issues are discussed generally in Section 4.11 as well.
	A commenter raised concern regarding the proposed project's inconsistency with <i>General Plan</i> <i>Update Guiding Principles</i> and with zoning designations. The incompatability with the General Plan was cited in regards to allowing visitor-serving use access through a residential area. The question of percentage of total landscaped/open space area was also raised.	The project's consistency with General Plan policies and zoning designations, including landscaping requirements, is addressed in Section 4.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> .
Traffic	 Concern was raised over the following specific streets and intersections: General safety and congestion at the Escalona Drive/Monterey Avenue, Park Avenue/Monterey Avenue, and Fanmar Way/Monterey Avenue intersections Traffic congestion on Monterey Avenue General safety concerns at the Hollister Avenue/El Salto Drive intersection Conflicts between commercial vehicles and pedestrians at the El Salto Drive/Central Avenue intersection Parked cars restricting the flow of traffic at Central Avenue Hazards to children at the culde-sac at the end of Escalona Drive 	Impacts related to traffic, including the impact of additional vehicles trips and safety conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, are discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and</i> <i>Circulation.</i> It should be noted that parking is no longer identified as an environmental issue on the CEQA Appendix G checklist.
	Concern was expressed regarding the lack of sidewalks ¹ and potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles, especially vehicles traveling at high speeds. Commenters also	Impacts related to traffic, including safety conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles and vehicle speeds, are discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i> . Pedestrian safety is discussed qualitatively.

Table 1-1Summary of Scoping Period Comments

¹ However, some neighbors expressed the opinion that they preferred not having sidewalks, and would not want sidewalks to be added.

General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
	noted a potential for reduced visibility for oncoming traffic due to parked cars. A study on the number of existing pedestrians was suggested.	
	Concern was expressed regarding trip generation during project operation as well as trips from material hauling during excavation.	Trip generation during both construction and operation is discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i> .
	Concern was expressed regarding overflow parking from the proposed project.	Parking is discussed generally in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation.</i>
	A commenter suggested an alternative access to the project site via Park Avenue as mitigation for vehicle speeds, delivery trucks, and garbage trucks.	Refer to Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives</i> , for a discussion of alternative access to the site via Park Avenue. Impacts related to traffic, including vehicle speeds and the addition of truck trips, are also discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i> .
	A commenter noted that they saw a traffic monitoring device on El Salto Drive for a shorter period of time than other roadways.	Daily traffic volumes at El Salto Drive and Escalona Drive were taken from Thursday, August 8 through Saturday, August 10, 2013; counts at Central Avenue and Escalona Drive near Monterey Avenue were taken from Thursday, August 22 through Saturday, August 24, 2013. All counts were taken over a three-day period. The methodology used in the traffic analysis is described in detail in Appendix I and summarized in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and</i> <i>Circulation.</i>
	Concern was raised regarding conflicts between vehicles and children and pets.	Impacts related to traffic, including safety conflicts between pedestrians/pets and vehicles, are discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation.</i>
	Concern was expressed regarding safety during the construction phase of the proposed project, specifically caused by the hauling of excavated material.	Impacts related to traffic, including conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians, are discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and</i> <i>Circulation.</i> Emergency services are discussed in Section 4.10, <i>Public Services.</i>
	Commenters raised concern over whether Escalona Drive is a public street and feasible for providing project access.	This issue is outside the scope of CEQA, and is not analyzed in this EIR; however, Escalona Drive is a public street which allows access to street fronting properties.
	Concern was expressed regarding emergency access to the Depot Hill neighborhood during holidays.	Impacts related to emergency access are discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation.</i>
	Concern was expressed regarding roadway damage from construction-related traffic.	This issue is outside the scope of CEQA, and is not analyzed in this EIR. However, the project applicant would be responsible

Table 1-1Summary of Scoping Period Comments

General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
		for repairing any street damage caused by their construction equipment. Street maintenance is the responsibility of the City of Capitola Public Works Department.
	Commenters suggested that guests be transported by bus during weekend wedding events.	Project access and circulation are discussed in sections 2.0, <i>Project</i> <i>Description,</i> and 4.11, <i>Traffic and</i> <i>Circulation.</i>
	A request that a traffic study be done during peak season (summer) was made.	The traffic study for the proposed project included data gathering during the summer (August 2013).
	A non-residential access path to the proposed project site was suggested.	Refer to Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives,</i> for a discussion of alternative access to the site via Park Avenue.
	Concern for pedestrian safety exiting the Escalona Gulch Trail was expressed.	Impacts related to traffic, including pedestrian safety, are discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation.</i>
	Several commenters expressed concerns regarding the loss of trees and impacts to Monarch habitat in the proposed project vicinity. Concern regarding historical tree removal and impacts on butterfly habitat was also cited, as were the effects of noise and light on this habitat.	Biological impacts, including impacts to trees and Monarch butterfly habitat, are discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Biological</i> <i>Resources</i> . Impacts and mitigation requirements related to noise are discussed in Section 4.9, <i>Noise</i> .
Distantias	Several commenters suggested that a full study of Monarch butterflies be conducted, including creation of a habitat map by a monarch specialist and a full winter study on Escalona Gulch.	A Report on Overwintering Monarch Butterflies was prepared for the project by Entomological Consulting Services Ltd. (August 2013). This report was peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants biologists and incorporated in Section 4.3, <i>Biological</i> <i>Resources</i> .
Biological Resources	A commenter expressed specific concern over wind blocking and clearing of the ground as it relates to Monarch butterfly habitat.	Impacts of the project on Monarch butterfly habitat are discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources.</i>
	Commenters expressed concern over tree removal and canopy loss, and inquired as to the required tree replacement.	Impacts related to tree removal and tree replacement are addressed in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources.</i>
	Concern regarding the compatability with a local tree ordinance was cited.	Consistency with the City of Capitola tree ordinance is discussed in Section 4.8, <i>Land</i> <i>Use and Planning.</i> Impacts related to tree removal are also discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources.</i>
	Concern regarding environmentally sensitive habitat areas and invasive species was expressed.	Impacts to environmentally sensitive habitat, including the potential impact of adding invasive species, is discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> .

Table 1-1Summary of Scoping Period Comments

General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
	Concern was expressed for birds of prey and their habitat.	Impacts to nesting birds and tree removal are discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Biological</i> <i>Resources.</i>
	Concern was expressed regarding indirect impacts on surrounding cliffs and beaches.	Impacts to biological resources are discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Biological</i> <i>Resources,</i> and impacts related to erosion and runoff are addressed in Sections 4.5, <i>Geology,</i> and 4.7, <i>Hydrology and Water</i> <i>Quality.</i>
	Concern was expressed regarding the potential instability and erosion from excavation activities and the construction of parking structures.	Geological impacts, including those resulting from excavation and construction of the proposed parking structure, are addressed in Section 4.5, <i>Geology</i> .
Geology	Concern was expressed regarding liquefaction due to construction on the proposed project site.	Geological impacts, including liquefaction, are addressed in Section 4.5, <i>Geology.</i>
	Concern was expressed regarding erosion. The vulnerability of the Santa Cruz area to cliff erosion due to climate change and water use was noted.	Impacts related to cliff and bluff erosion, including from increased rates of erosion due to anticipated sea level rise, are addressed in Section 4.5, <i>Geology</i> .
	Concern regarding the hazard of tsunamis was expressed.	Refer to the Initial Study (Appendix A to this EIR). As discussed therein, according to the City's Local Hazards Mitigation Plan (2013), the project site is not located in an area at risk from tsunami, due to its location on a bluff top.
	A request for a geotechnical report on landslides and shoreline erosion, bluff setback, sea level rise was made.	A Geotechnical Investigation was prepared for the proposed project (refer to Appendix E). This report was peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants, Inc. and incorporated into Section 4.5, <i>Geology/Soils</i> .
	A commenter suggested consideration of Capitola City Code Section 12.42 (Depot Hill Bluff safety and protection), which protects cliffs and the people below.	Consistency with this code section is addressed in Section 4.8, <i>Land Use and Planning.</i>
	Concern was expressed regarding seismic stability as it relates to operation and construction of the proposed hotel.	Impacts related to seismicity are discussed in Section 4.5, <i>Geology/Soils</i> .

	, 13	
General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
	Concern was expressed regarding noise caused by hotel guests walking through residential areas at night. The commenters recommend analysis of alternative access to the proposed site via Park Avenue to mitigate this concern.	Impacts and mitigation requirements related to noise are discussed in Section 4.9, <i>Noise.</i> An alternative which includes site access via Park Avenue is analyzed in Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives</i> .
	Concern regarding noise on the weekends and late at night resulting from the proposed hotel traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, was expressed. The concern regarding traffic noise included the noise caused by hotel shuttle buses.	Impacts and mitigation requirements related to noise are discussed in Section 4.9, <i>Noise.</i> Impacts related to traffic are discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and</i> <i>Circulation.</i>
Noise	Concern was expressed regarding the noise level and it was noted that the neighborhood is currently noisy.	Impacts and mitigation requirements related to noise are discussed in Section 4.9, <i>Noise.</i>
	Concern regarding noise from traffic was noted.	Impacts related to noise, including those from vehicles during both construction and operation, are discussed in Section 4.9, <i>Noise.</i>
	Concern regarding noise from weddings and outdoor events was noted.	See Sections 2.0, <i>Project Description</i> , and 4.9, <i>Noise</i> . As noted therein, events at the proposed project site are currently regulated under an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP). While components of this CUP would change, most conditions placed on events are not anticipated to change.
	Concern was expressed regarding noise during the construction phase of the proposed project, specifically caused by the hauling of excavated material.	Construction-related noise impacts are discussed in Section 4.9, <i>Noise.</i>
Utilities and Public Services	Several commenters, including the water purveyor, expressed concern regarding groundwater scarcity, aquifer depletion, and salt water intrusion in the proposed project area.	Impacts related to groundwater usage and water supply are including in Section 4.12, <i>Utilities.</i> Impacts regarding groundwater recharge are included in Section 4.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality.</i>
	Concern was expressed regarding the use of the water credits the City received from the closing of the lower Pacific Cove mobile park.	This issue is outside the scope of CEQA, and is not analyzed in this EIR. However, City water credits obtained from closing the lower Pacific Cove mobile home park are not proposed to be sold or transferred to the project proponent. Impacts related to groundwater usage and water supply are included in Section 4.12, Utilities.

General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
	Concern was expressed regarding the lack of infrastructure in the Depot Hill neighborhood, including narrow streets and the lack of street lighting.	The existing conditions of the roadway network are accounted for in the analysis presented in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation.</i>
	A commenter noted a lack of existing parks in the City of Capitola.	Impacts to parks are addressed in the Initial Study (refer to Appendix A).
	One commenter suggested that Depot Hill currently serves as a "park," and requested that impacts to this park be considered.	The Depot Hill neighborhood is not a designated park; therefore, park and recreation impacts to Depot Hill were not considered. Project impacts to designated parks are addressed in the Initial Study (Appendix A).
	A commenter requested that the EIR include the number of existing calls for emergency services to the site.	Refer to Section 4.10, Public Services.
	A commenter requested that the EIR analyze the project's increased demands for community services.	This issue is outside the scope of CEQA, and is not analyzed in this EIR; however, increased demand for public services is addressed in Section 4.10, <i>Public Services</i> .
	Concerns regarding the sewer system (availability and improvement plans) and garbage collection were expressed. Domestic wastewater monitoring was also a noted issue.	Impacts related to wastewater and solid waste are discussed in Section 4.12, <i>Utilities</i> .
	A commenter expressed the opinion that the small green area on the proposed project site would not offset the impact to the neighborhood.	This issue is outside the scope of CEQA, and is not analyzed in this EIR. Impacts to parks are addressed in the Initial Study (refer to Appendix A). As noted therein, impacts to parks would be less than significant. The commenter's opinion is noted.
Size/Scale of	Several commenters expressed the opinion that the scope/size of the proposed project is too large, containing too many rooms and resulting in urban sprawl.	A reduced project alternative is analyzed in Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives.</i>
FIUJECE	Commenters suggested that a 15- unit and a 20-unit project be considered as alternatives to the 41-unit proposed project.	A reduced project alternative is discussed in Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives.</i>

Table 1-1Summary of Scoping Period Comments

General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
Hydrology	Concerns regarding runoff and an increase in the area of impervious area were expressed. The effect of mitigation measures on drainage toward site boundaries was questioned, as were the effects of the proposed project on stormwater released over the bluff.	Impacts and mitigation relating to hydrology, including increases in impervious surfaces, increased runoff, and erosion, are discussed in Section 4.7, <i>Hydrology and</i> <i>Water Quality</i> .
	Concern was expressed regarding construction runoff into Escalona Creek and the ocean.	Water quality impacts are discussed in Section 4.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality.</i>
Aesthetics	Commenters expressed concern regarding the aesthetic character of the Depot Hill neighborhood. This includes the current residential ambience and the impacts of light and glare.	Impacts relating to aesthetics, including to the character of the area and light and glare, are included in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> .
	Concern was expressed regarding the potential for additional litter in the neighborhood as a result of the project.	Impacts relating to visual character of the existing neighborhood, including litter, are included in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> .
	Concern was expressed regarding the effect of the proposed project on cultural resources and historic landmarks. The potential for middens to be on-site was noted.	Impacts related to historic and archaeological resources are discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources.</i>
Cultural Resources	Specific concerns regarding the evaluation of the historic significance of the cottages on the proposed property were cited.	Impacts related to historic resources, including the existing on-site cottages, are discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Cultural</i> <i>Resources.</i>
	Concern was expressed regarding the proposed project's impacts on an historic neighborhood.	The historic features of the proposed project site are discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>
Alternatives	Several commenters expressed preference for an alternative, including a No Project, a Reduced Project, and an alternative whereby the project applicant gives back to the community.	Alternatives, including the CEQA-required no project alternative and a reduced project alternative, are discussed in Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives.</i>
	Concern regarding neighborhood exposure to dirt, exhaust, and soot during construction activities was expressed.	Air quality impacts from construction activities are discussed in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> .
Air Quality	Concern regarding the associated emissions from the vehicles required to export materials for the proposed project was expressed.	Air quality impacts from construction activities are discussed in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> .

General Issue	Summary of Comments	Response/Reference to Location of Topic in EIR
Emergency Services	Photographs showing emergency access limitations and pedestrian use of streets were provided. Concerns including emergency access during high-usage times and the availability of police and fire services were expressed. Construction of another exit off Depot Hill for emergency access was suggested.	Emergency services are discussed in Section 4.10, <i>Public Services</i> , and emergency access is discussed in Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i> . Refer also to Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives</i> , for a discussion of alternative access to the site via Park Avenue.
Public Notification	Commenters at the public scoping meeting requested that all Depot Hill residents be notified of future opportunities to comment.	This issue is outside the scope of CEQA, and is not analyzed in this EIR.However, the City intends to comply with all legally- required noticing procedures, and welcomes public input on this and all development application projects. The City will send notices to all Depot Hill residents prior to the release of the draft EIR and all public hearings on the project.
Project Description	A commenter requested more information regarding the proposed changes to the existing CUP for the property.	The proposed changes to the existing CUP are described in Section 2.0, <i>Project Description</i> .
Revenue Generation	A commenter questions whether there is an alternate method for revenue generation for the City.	Revenue generation is outside the scope of CEQA, and is not analyzed in this EIR.
Cumulative Development	A commenter requested that other hotel projects in the City be considered.	Cumulative development in the City of Capitola is summarized in Section 3.0 Environmental Setting.Cumulative impacts are discussed in each environmental impact section.
Long-Term Maintenance	A commenter questioned who would be responsible for long- term monitoring of facility and maintenance.	Compliance with any adopted mitigation measures contained in this EIR would be the responsibility of the property owner and would be monitored by the City of Capitola in accordance with the required Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Maintenance of the facility would be the responsibility of the property owner.
1.2 PURPOSE AND LEGAL AUTHORITY

The proposed project requires the discretionary approval from the City of Capitola Planning Commission. Therefore, it is subject to the requirements of CEQA. In accordance with Section 15121 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the purpose of this EIR is to serve as an informational document that:

...will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

This EIR has been prepared as a Project EIR pursuant to Section 15161 of the *CEQA Guidelines*. A Project EIR is appropriate for a specific development project. As stated in the *CEQA Guidelines*:

This type of EIR should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all phases of the project, including planning, construction, and operation.

This EIR is to serve as an informational document for the public and City of Capitola decision-makers. The process will culminate with a Planning Commission hearing to consider certification of the Final EIR and action on the project. If the Planning Commission's decision is appealed to the City Council, the City Council would then consider certification of the Final EIR and action of the project.

1.3 SCOPE AND CONTENT/ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

This EIR addresses the issues determined to be potentially significant by the City of Capitola. The issues addressed in this EIR include:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Material
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems

This EIR addresses the issues referenced above and identifies the potentially significant environmental impacts, including site-specific and cumulative effects of the project, in accordance with the provisions set forth in the *CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, the EIR

recommends feasible mitigation measures, where possible, that would reduce or eliminate adverse environmental effects.

In preparing the EIR, use was made of pertinent City policies and guidelines, certified EIRs and adopted CEQA documents, and background documents prepared by the City. A full reference list is contained in Section 7.0, *References and Report Preparers*.

The Alternatives Section of the EIR (Section 6.0) was prepared in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*. The alternatives discussion evaluates the CEQA-required "no project" alternative and three alternative development scenarios for the site. It also identifies the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives assessed.

The level of detail contained throughout this EIR is consistent with the requirements of CEQA and applicable court decisions. The *CEQA Guidelines* provide the standard of adequacy on which this document is based. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15151 states:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of the proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection, but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

1.4 LEAD, RESPONSIBLE, AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

The *CEQA Guidelines* define lead, responsible and trustee agencies. The City of Capitola is the lead agency for the project because it holds principal responsibility for certifying the Final EIR and making a decision on the proposed project. The proposed project requires the certification of this EIR and the following discretionary approvals from the City of Capitola:

- Building Permit;
- *Conditional Use Permit;*
- Design Permit;
- Coastal Development Permit;
- Tree Permit;
- Excavation Permit and
- Encroachment Permit.

A responsible agency refers to a public agency other than the lead agency that has discretionary approval over the project. A trustee agency refers to a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project. Approval from these responsible or trustee agencies may be required prior to project construction:

- California Regional Water Quality Control Board: Review Notice of Intent and Storm Water Pollution Prevent Plan;
- California Coastal Commission: Coastal Development Permit;

- Santa Cruz County Sanitation District: Review Sewer Connection Plans;
- Santa Cruz County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Zone 5: Approval of Drainage Plan;
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: General Construction Permit; and
- Soquel Creek Water District: Water Service Commitment.

1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The major steps in the environmental review process, as required under CEQA, are outlined below and illustrated on Figure 1-1. The steps are presented in sequential order.

- 1. Notice of Preparation (NOP). After deciding that an EIR is required, the lead agency must file an NOP soliciting input on the EIR scope to the State Clearinghouse, other concerned agencies, and parties previously requesting notice in writing (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15082; Public Resources Code Section 21092.2). The NOP must be posted in the County Clerk's office for 30 days. The NOP may be accompanied by an Initial Study that identifies the issue areas for which the proposed project could create significant environmental impacts.
- 2. **Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) Prepared.** The DEIR must contain: a) table of contents or index; b) summary; c) project description; d) environmental setting; e) discussion of significant impacts (direct, indirect, cumulative, growth-inducing and unavoidable impacts); f) a discussion of alternatives; g) mitigation measures; and, h) discussion of irreversible changes.
- 3. Notice of Completion and Notice of Availability. A lead agency must file a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse when it completes a Draft EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15085) and prepare a Public Notice of Availability of a Draft EIR. The lead agency must file the Notice of Availability with the County Clerk's office for a 30 day posting period and send a copy of the Notice of Availability to anyone requesting it (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15087). Additionally, public notice of DEIR availability must be given through at least one of the following procedures: a) publication in a newspaper of general circulation; b) posting on and off the project site; and c) direct mailing to owners and occupants of contiguous properties. The lead agency must solicit input from other agencies and the public, and respond in writing to all comments received (PRC Sections 21104 and 21153). The minimum public review period for a DEIR is 30 days. When a Draft EIR is sent to the State Clearinghouse for review, the public review period must be 45 days unless the Clearinghouse (Public Resources Code Section 21091) approves a shorter period.
- 4. **Final EIR.** A Final EIR (FEIR) must include: a) the Draft EIR; b) copies of comments received during public review; c) list of persons and entities commenting; and, d) responses to comments.
- 5. **Certification of FEIR.** Prior to making a decision on a proposed project, the lead agency must certify that: a) the FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; b) the FEIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency; and, c) the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the FEIR prior to approving a project (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15090).
- 6. **Lead Agency Project Decision.** A lead agency may: a) disapprove a project because of its significant environmental effects; b) require changes to a project to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects; or, c) approve a project despite its significant environmental effects, if

THE EIR PROCESS



CEQA Environmental Review Process

the proper findings and statement of overriding considerations are adopted (*CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15042 and 15043).

- 7. **Findings/Statement of Overriding Considerations.** For each significant impact of the project identified in the EIR, the lead or responsible agency must find, based on substantial evidence, that either: a) the project has been changed to avoid or substantially reduce the magnitude of the impact; b) changes to the project are within another agency's jurisdiction and such changes have or should be adopted; or c) specific economic, social, or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091). If an agency approves a project with unavoidable significant environmental effects, it must prepare a written Statement of Overriding Considerations that sets forth the specific social, economic, or other reasons supporting the agency's decision.
- 8. **Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program.** When an agency makes findings on significant effects identified in the EIR, it must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of project approval to mitigate significant effects.
- 9. Notice of Determination. An agency must file a Notice of Determination within five working days after deciding to approve a project for which an EIR is prepared (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15094). A local agency must file the Notice with the County Clerk. The Notice must be posted for 30 days and sent to anyone previously requesting notice. Posting of the Notice starts a 30-day statute of limitations on CEQA legal challenges [Public Resources Code Section 21167(c)].

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is an expansion of the existing 11-room Monarch Cove Inn to 41 rooms and associated hotel and event facilities. The project involves construction of two new buildings, demolition of three existing buildings and an outside deck, and renovation of an existing building at the Monarch Cove Inn property on Depot Hill in the City of Capitola. The project would add 30 hotel rooms, bringing the total number of hotel rooms from 11 to 41. The project also includes construction of a two-level below-grade parking garage and the addition of a new access point, among other site modifications. This section describes the project location, major characteristics of the site and the proposed development, project objectives, and approvals needed to implement the project.

2.1 **PROJECT APPLICANT and REPRESENTATIVE**

2.1.1 Project Applicant

Robert Blodgett PO Box 1697 Capitola, California 95010

2.1.2 Project Representative

Hamilton Swift Associates, Inc. 500 Chestnut Street, Suite 100 Santa Cruz, California 95060

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is an irregularly-shaped, 1.4-acre property at 620 El Salto Drive on Depot Hill in the City of Capitola. The property encompasses four assessor's parcels: APNs 036-142-27, 036-142-28 (partial), 036-143-31, and 036-143-36. The project also includes landscaping and access improvements in the adjacent Escalona Drive right of way. Site access is currently taken from the eastern terminus of El Salto Drive, just east of its intersection with Livermore Avenue. The site is regionally accessible from State Highway 1 (the Cabrillo Highway, or SR 1). As shown in Figure 2-1, the project site is located along the coast in eastern Capitola, with the southern eastern edge of the site located along blufftops of the Pacific Ocean. Figure 2-2 presents an aerial view of the project site and surrounding land uses.

2.3 CURRENT LAND USE AND SETTING

The project site is located on a 1.4-acre property along the Capitola coastline atop a coastal bluff. The site is partially paved and landscaped with four existing buildings and an outdoor deck. The site exhibits gently rolling topography, and is partially paved, partially landscaped, and developed with the existing structures of the Monarch Cove Inn, including a Victorian-era structure. A number of native and non-native trees, including eucalyptus, pine, Cypress, and

Monarch Cove Hotel EIR Section 2.0 Project Description



Regional Location Map



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013.

Aerial View of Project Site and Surrounding Uses

Figure 2-2

City of Capitola

oak trees, grow on the project site. The trees are dispersed across the site and along the periphery.

The property is currently occupied by the 11-room Monarch Cove Inn, which includes nine rooms in the Victorian structure, two guest cottages, an L-shaped garage building, and an outdoor deck, used to host special events. The 0.41–acre northern parcel is developed with the two small guest cottages and the L-shaped garage building, and the 0.55-acre southern parcel is developed with the Victorian structure and deck. The southernmost 0.18-acre parcel and the 0.26-acre easternmost parcel are currently vacant with some dispersed coastal bluff vegetation and trees. The lodging facility operates under an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The CUP includes numerous conditions controlling operations, including:

- Limitation of events to a maximum of 40 guests Monday through Thursday and 75 guests Friday through Sunday;
- Use of shuttles from an off-site parking area for larger events;
- Limitation of weddings or events to no more than one per day, two per week, and six per month;
- Adherence to the City Municipal Code standards for noise limits and use of amplified sound; and
- Requiring a security guard to be present on-site during all events to control traffic, parking, and guests.

2.4 LAND USE AND REGULATORY SETTING

Table 2-1 summarizes existing characteristics of the project site, which are also described below.

Address:	620 El Salto Drive		
Assessor's Parcel Numbers:	036-142-27, 036-142-28 (partial), 036-143-31, and 036- 143-36		
Site Size:	1.4 acres		
General Plan Land Use Designations:	Visitor Serving		
Zoning Designations:	Visitor Serving (APNs 036-142-27, 036-142-28 (partial), and 036-143-31), Parks/Open Space (APN 036-143- 36)		
Current Use and Development:	Guest Cottage #1, one guest room, 810 square feet Guest Cottage #2, one guest room, 290 square feet Victorian Building, 9 guest rooms, 3,887 square feet L-shaped building, 2,862 square feet Event deck with gazebo, 1,765 square feet		
Surrounding Land Use Designations:	South/Southwest/West: Visitor Serving/ Residential Low-Medium Density Northwest: Residential Low-Medium-Density North/Northeast: Residential Low-Low Density East/Southeast: Visitor Serving		
Surrounding Zoning Designations	South/Southwest/West: Visitor Serving, Single Family Residential, Automatic Review Northwest/North: Single Family Residential Northeast/East: Planned Development		

Table 2-1 Existing Site Characteristics

Regional Access:	State Route 1 (Cabrillo Highway)
Local Access:	El Salto Drive
Public Services:	Water: Soquel Creek Water District Sewer: Santa Cruz County Sanitation District Fire Protection: Central Fire Protection District Police Protection: Capitola Police Department

Table 2-1 Existing Site Characteristics

2.4.1 Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is surrounded by single-family residences to the north and west, and the Pacific Ocean (Soquel Cove) to the south. Directly to the northeast and east is the Escalona Gulch Monarch Butterfly Grove Habitat Reserve and a single family residence. The Escalona Drive right of way is located on the eastern edge of the project site. The Escalona Drive right of way is an unimproved roadway beginning at the end of the pavement across from 714 Escalona and continuing as a dirt "road" to where it ends at the top of the cliff. This 60 foot wide right of way was originally shown as connecting Railroad Avenue (now known as Escalona Drive) to Grand Avenue in the 1888 subdivision map for Depot Hill. Over the years, Grand Avenue adjacent to the project site has eroded away and the Escalona Drive right of way remains a dirt strip which is now used as a pedestrian accessway.

2.4.2 Land Use Regulatory Overview

All four parcels that make up the project site have a General Plan Land Use designation of Visitor Serving. The Capitola General Plan (1989) describes this designation as allowing "for land uses which serve visitor-related activities." The project site is also subject to the Local Coastal Program (certified by the California Coastal Commission in 1981) and Shoreline Access Plan, which contains general guidelines and standards for blufftop development within the planning area. As discussed in Section 4.8, *Land Use and Planning*, the General Plan and Local Coastal Program have a number of goals and policies that are applicable to the proposed project, including policies specifically applicable to visitor-serving uses.

Parcels 036-142-27, 036-142-28 (partial), and 036-143-31 have a corresponding zoning designation of Visitor Serving (V-S), while parcel 036-143-36 is zoned Parks and Open Space (P/OS). No development is proposed for the P/OS parcel. As described in the Capitola Municipal Code in Section 17.30.020, the purpose of the V-S District "is to accommodate the visiting public with a range of opportunities to enjoy the city of Capitola's coastal location." As described in Section 17.29.020, the P/OS District is intended for areas that:

- *A.* Are to be set aside or have been previously set aside as permanent scenic easements, forest preserves, riparian corridors, public waterfront or beach areas, public parks, or similar public open space; or
- *B.* Are to be set aside by the owners as buffer areas separating district from recreational, open space/scenic or natural resource areas; or
- *C.* Should be retained in their existing and undeveloped open character because of excessive danger *from flood, fire and erosion.*

2.5 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

2.5.1 Proposed Land Uses and Development

The proposed project would involve demolition of two existing small cottages, an existing Lshaped building (consisting of garage spaces and the hotel office), and the outdoor deck.¹ These structures would be replaced by a proposed new hotel that would include three buildings: two new buildings, and an existing building to remain, as described further below and shown in Figure 2-3. A two-level, below grade parking garage (8,322 square feet on each level) with 56 parking stalls and 27 bicycle parking spaces is also proposed. A separate bicycle entrance would be included to the below grade parking garage. Four additional surface parking spaces would be included near the entrance to the main building.

The proposed main building would be a 16,729 square foot, two-story building containing 22 guest rooms, two meeting rooms, kitchen facilities for catering and internal use, and a courtyard. The second building would be a two-story, 5,894 square foot building with 10 guest rooms, located along the western property line. The heights of the proposed new buildings would be a maximum of 30 feet above average grade. The proposed project also includes renovation of an existing Victorian building on the site, including seismic improvements, construction of a new foundation and a slight reorientation of the structure. The existing nine rooms in the Victorian house would be retained as guest rooms. In total, the proposed hotel would include 41 guest rooms (nine existing guest rooms and 32 new guest rooms), an increase of 30 rooms. Building elevations and project renderings are shown in Figures 2-4(a) through 2-4(e) and 2-5. The proposed building program is summarized in Table 2-2.

Structure	Use	Proposed Building Area (square feet)		Proposed <u>New</u> Building Area (square feet)	Building Height
Existing Victorian Building	9 hotel rooms	1 st Floor: 2 nd Floor:	2,383 1,504		28 feet
Main Building	22 hotel rooms, kitchen, and 2 meeting rooms	1 st Floor: 2 nd Floor:	9,484 7,245	9,484 7,245	30 feet
Bayview Building	10 hotel rooms	1 st Floor: 2 nd Floor:	2,761 3,133	2,761 3,133	26 feet
Parking Structure	Access and parking for vehicles and bicycles	1 st Floor: 2 nd Floor:	8,322 8,322		Below grade
TOTALS			43,154	22,623	-

Table 2-2Project Development Program Summary

¹ It should be noted that although the project applicant has proposed to demolish the two existing guest cottages, mitigation contained in this EIR would require the cottages to be preserved and relocated within the project site (refer to Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*).



Site Plan



Proposed Elevations Main and Historic Buildings West and East Elevations

Figure 2-4a *City of Capitola*



MAIN BUILDING NORTH ELEVATION

Source: Thatcher and Thompson Architects, 2013

Proposed Elevations Main Building South and North Elevations

Figure 2-4b *City of Capitola*





Proposed Elevations Bayview and Historic Buildings South and North Elevations



Proposed Elevations Bayview Building East and West Elevations

Figure 2-4d **City of Capitola**



Proposed Elevations Neighborhood Composite Elevations *Hotel /Services*. Hotel operations would be similar to the current operation of the Inn, with accommodation of overnight guests as the primary function. Guests would typically arrive over a five- to six-hour period beginning at 3:00 PM, with stays varying in length. Guest check-out time would be late morning, typically by noon. Occupancy of the hotel would likely be higher on weekends and in the summer, with an annual overall occupancy rate projected by the applicant at 60% initially and rising to 68% by Year 10.

The hotel would not include a restaurant on site. However, a self-service breakfast would be available to guests. Both the prep kitchen and meeting rooms would accommodate those eating breakfast.

The hotel is expected to have five to eight full-time staff, augmented with temporary staff as needed for events. The reception desk would operate 24 hours per day, and additional security would be provided for six to eight hours at night, and as needed for events. The hotel would be required to adhere to the City Municipal Code standards for noise limits and use of amplified sound.

Events. Because the proposed project would involve the demolition of the outdoor event deck, weddings and large events would occur inside hotel buildings. The proposed Main Building would include two rooms to accommodate events of various kinds. One would accommodate social events such as weddings, reunions and family events, and may also be used for corporate retreats, small association events, and events sponsored by charitable organizations, local service clubs, non-profits, educational or religious organizations. This room would accommodate 40 to 75 guests, with events occurring primarily on weekends. Events typically would run three to four hours in duration. Large events in the Pavilion Room would occur consistent with the current maximum use restrictions of one per day, two per week, and six per month. Social events such as weddings may involve overnight stays.

The second room would also accommodate smaller events hosting up to 25 guests. These events would typically occur during the day, between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM, primarily on weekdays. In some cases, a catered breakfast or lunch may be provided. Some events may also involve overnight stays. Over the course of a year, an average of approximately one event per week is expected.

Occasionally some portions of the outdoor gardens and grounds may be used in conjunction with scheduled events for photographs and other low intensity activities, although this would be somewhat limited given the proposed demolition of the existing outside deck. Any such activities would maintain a minimum 20-foot setback from the western property line.

The project applicant is proposing that the conditions in the existing CUP fundamentally remain the same in a new CUP, although some conditions may be removed or reworded in the permit review process. These **existing** conditions include:

1. Lodging and weddings/events shall be limited to a maximum of 18 parking spaces utilizing onsite parking facilities. Events scheduled on Mondays through Thursdays shall be limited to a maximum of 40 guests if remote parking and a guest shuttle service are utilized. All service vehicles are to shuttle from parking area. Neighborhood events specifically given for local neighborhood residents who do not drive to the site shall not be limited in size.

- 2. Weddings/events shall be limited to no more than one per day, two per week and six per month. The monthly schedule of events indicating the number of guests planned at each event shall be submitted to the Community Development Director at least 30 days in advance and shall be posted on the gates of the resort at least 30 days in advance. Neighborhood events specifically given for local neighborhood residents shall not be counted in the limitations on the number of allowed events.
- 3. Weddings shall be scheduled to occur only between the hours of 12:00 noon and 6:00 PM. Other types of events may be scheduled to occur between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM.
- 4. All wedding/event parking at the resort shall take place within the revised gates of the resort. No guest or shuttle parking shall be allowed on Escalona Drive, El Salto Drive, Livermore Avenue or other surrounding streets in the residential neighborhood.
- 5. Evidence of contracts and agreements for use of off-site parking facilities and shuttle services shall be submitted to the Community Development Director at least 30 days in advance of events utilizing such parking facilities and shuttle services. The use of remote parking facilities at the Christian Fellowship Church in Soquel and the Crossroads Center at 820 Bay Avenue are approved as part of this permit. Other remote parking facilities may be approved at the discretion of the Community Development Director if submitted at least 45 days in advance of events utilizing such facilities.
- 6. Noise levels during events shall not exceed 70 decibels as measured at the sound monitoring location shown on the site plan. A noise monitoring device shall be placed at the edge of the residential property. No public address system shall be used for events and no amplification of live music shall be allowed. The applicants shall be responsible for ensuring that decibel readings are taken, are recorded in writing, every half hour during live entertainment to ensure compliance with this condition.
- 7. Only live acoustic music shall be allowed at events. Use of karaoke machines, disc jockey, or amplified music shall not be allowed.
- 8. A security guard shall be present on site during all events to control traffic, parking and guests. The security guard shall carry a cellular phone, and the name and phone number of the security guard shall be provided at least one week in advance of events to the City Police Department and Community Development Director, and shall be posted on the resort gates. The security guard shall maintain a log of any complaints received that shall be available to the City staff upon request.
- 9 Facility rental agreements for events shall include an attachment containing the Conditional Use Permit conditions. Contracts for events not utilizing guest shuttle service shall contain a clause requiring the event invitation contain written instructions directing all guests to park within the resort gates and prohibiting parking on the surrounding neighborhood streets. Contracts for events utilizing guest shuttle services shall contain a clause requiring that all event invitations contain a map and written instructions directing guests to the remote parking and shuttle, directing that all guests arrive at the remote parking at least 30 minutes in advance of the event, and prohibiting parking at the resort or on local neighborhood streets.
- 10. A fence along the resort's western property line and relocation of the resort entrance gates shall be completed. The applicant shall have reports by an architectural historian and an arborist prepared, as well as a design consistent with those recommendations. Those matters will be brought directly to the Council for review and determination. The fence must be completed ninety (90) days from the Council's decision.
- 11. This permit does not include authorization for any tree removal. Any future tree removal shall be approved in advance by the Community Development Director, who may require that such work be performed by or under the direction of a qualified arborist and with the possible requirement for a biotic report.

- 12. Conditional use permit will end at such time as the holder of the permit ceases to have a valid entertainment permit for the subject property.
- 13. All wedding/events activities shall take place 20 feet from the western property line.
- 14. The subject property (APN 36-142-27, 36-142-28 and 36-143-31) must remain under single ownership during the term of this conditional use permit and no portion of said property may be sub-leased for a term of (30) days or more (unless an explicit amendment to this permit is obtained). If the ownership of the business contemplated by the use permit is fractionalized, this conditional use permit will remain.
- 15. The permit is for three years. This permit shall be subject to review and reconsideration at the discretion of the City Council if permit conditions are violated or any changes to the property are made.

Of the above existing conditions, several may require revision upon project approval. This may include the following:

- Condition 1 requires that lodging and weddings/events be limited to maximum of 18 parking spaces; this would likely increase, given the proposed increase of on-site parking to 60 spaces.
- Condition 7 requires that only live acoustic music be allowed at events; however, the proposed project would hold all future events indoors. Pursuant to compliance with the City of Capitola Noise Ordinance, this condition may no longer be necessary.
- Condition 10 requires installation of a fence along the western property line and relocation of the resort gates. This condition is no longer relevant since the fence was built and this condition has been met.
- Condition 15 states that the permit is for three years. This would be revised upon re-approval of the new CUP.

Access and Parking. Access to the proposed project would be taken from both El Salto Drive and Escalona Drive, with the primary entrance from El Salto Drive, which flows into the proposed entry and reception area (see Figure 2-5 for project renderings from these entrances). The upper level of the parking structure would be accessed from the west side of the proposed main building, while the lower level would be accessed from the north side along Escalona Drive. Neighborhood access would be incorporated to and through the site via ADA-accessible pathways and benches for scenic overlooks.

Parking would be managed by the hotel through a combination of self-parking and valet parking, depending on occupancy. The project applicant proposes that the 60 spaces on site would accommodate all hotel guests (41 is the maximum guest parking needed based on Section 17.51.130 of the City's Municipal Code requiring one space per guest room) as well as up to eight employees. Self-parking would be utilized at lower occupancy times when there is no need for tandem parking and each space can be utilized for one car only. At higher occupancy times when tandem parking is needed, hotel staff would valet park vehicles. On average, the project applicant estimates that about 60 to 70% of the parking would be utilized by hotel guests, with the remainder (18 to 24 spaces) available for event use. Hotel management and staff would anticipate and coordinate the hotel occupancy parking needs with planned events such that either all parking would occur on site, or, if additional capacity is needed, shuttle services would be provided for off-site remote parking.

The project applicant indicates that hotel staff would work closely with guests and event sponsors regarding parking and attendance expectations and manage accordingly. In addition, hotel guests would be notified that the site is limited to one parking space per room, and that parking would not be permitted in the surrounding neighborhood. The hotel would also encourage alternative transportation such as walking and biking, and is considering the provision of a shuttle service for guests travelling to and from the hotel.

2.5.2 Site Preparation and Construction

As described above, the project proposal would involve the demolition of the two existing cottages,² the L-shaped building (housing a garage and the hotel office), and the outdoor deck in order to prepare the site for the proposed development and roadway extension of Escalona Drive to the back side of the property. Excavation and cut and fill would be required, resulting in grading of approximately 6,950 net cubic yards to be exported from the site. The proposed grading plan as well as project site profiles and sections are shown in Figures 2-6 and 2-7. Excavation for the below-grade parking structure would be accomplished with conventional excavating equipment with a maximum excavation depth of approximately 20 feet. Project construction would follow recommended procedures specified by the project's geotechnical engineer including construction of a 1.5:1 slope and establishing setbacks for safe excavation and construction. No piers or pile driving would be required. Approximately 14 trees and large shrubs would also be removed from the property. Most tree removal would occur near the southwest project boundary, south of El Salto Drive.

The project would also involve seismic improvements and construction of a new foundation for the Victorian structure, which would be slightly adjusted in orientation from its existing location. The new foundation would be constructed of reinforced concrete with pressure treated sill plates. The existing lattice skirting between the first floor and the foundation would be preserved, however, new plywood shear panels would be constructed behind the existing skirting to attach the first floor diaphragm to the new foundation walls. To facilitate site preparation and construction of the new foundation, the Victorian structure would be temporarily relocated 15 to 20 feet south of its existing location. Relocation of the Victorian structure would employ conventional techniques including use of hydraulic jacks, cribbing, and mover's dollies. Specifically, a series of hydraulic jacks would be used to raise the existing building, while keeping the structure uniformly level. Cribbing would be used in conjunction with steel beams to create a temporary lattice sub-structure under the first floor, with the existing crawl space providing necessary construction access. The hydraulic jacks would lower the building to the point where existing floor joists and girders would be supported by the temporary sub-structure. House mover's dollies would then be placed under the main beams in the sub-structure and the building would be moved to its temporary location. The Victorian structure would remain in its temporary location for approximately six months, until the parking structure and all permanent grading has been completed, at which point the permanent new site would be prepared. While the building remains supported by the temporary substructure, the new concrete foundation would be constructed. Upon completion of the new foundation, the Victorian structure would be lowered with hydraulic jacks onto its new

² Although the project applicant has proposed to demolish the two existing guest cottages, mitigation contained in this EIR would require the cottages to be preserved and relocated within the project site (refer to Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*).



VIEW LOOKING EAST ON EL SALTO DRIVE



VIEW LOOKING EAST ON ESCALONA DRIVE



Source: Bowman & Williams, October 2013



foundation and securely attached. Due to the short distance of movement and maintenance of a level building posture, no temporary bracing would be required.

The proposed project would increase the site's impervious area from 15,878 square feet to 23,550 square feet. To manage stormwater runoff, the project would include low impact development (LID) elements, including porous paving, perforated sub-drain pipes on the paved entry drive, and a 450 square foot water detention "rain garden" (refer to Figure 2-8). In addition, the project would include 1,133 cubic feet of detention and proposes to meet the County of Santa Cruz Design Criteria for stormwater detention basins. The project also proposes to comply with the Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region (Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB] Resolution No. R3-2012-0025, September 6, 2012). In accordance with these requirements, a combination of LID treatments and the proposed detention system would provide 48 hour extended detention for water quality treatment for the 85th percentile 24-hour rainfall event.

Other site preparation activities would include:

- Biotic protection measures and enhancement of Monarch butterfly habitat through improvements to the woodland edge and Monarch-supportive landscaping (see Figure 2-9, Proposed Planting Plan).
- New landscaping including new gardens, the construction of new ADA-accessible pathways and overlook seating areas, and landscape screening of adjacent properties (see Figures 2-9, Proposed Planting Plan, and 2-10, Proposed Landscape Plan).
- Neighborhood access to and through the site including an ADA accessible pathway (see Figure 2-10).

Figures 2-8 through 2-10 show the proposed stormwater management plan, planting plan, and landscape plan, respectively. Construction is anticipated to begin in January 2015 and would extend for approximately 12 to 16 months. The Inn would remain closed to guests for the duration of site preparation and construction.

2.6 **PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The project applicant's objective is to expand the capacity of the Monarch Cove Inn from its current occupancy of 11 guest rooms into a 41-room boutique hotel providing attractive overnight accommodations and special-purpose event space serving families and organizations locally and from outside the area who are seeking a quiet retreat-type atmosphere.

Monarch Cove Hotel EIR Section 2.0 Project Description



Source: Bowman & Williams, October 2013



Source: Bellinger, Foster, Steinmetz, 2013



Source: Bellinger, Foster, Steinmetz, October 2013

Proposed Landscape Plan

This page intentionally left blank.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 LOCATION

The project site is located in the City of Capitola, in Santa Cruz County, on the northeast shore of Monterey Bay (refer to Figure 2-1 and Figure 2-2 in Section 2.0, *Project Description*). Capitola is approximately four miles east of the City of Santa Cruz and is located adjacent to the Pacific Ocean. The total area of the City is approximately 1,018 acres (1.59 square miles). The population of the City is approximately 9,988 residents (Department of Finance, May 2013).

The project site is an irregularly-shaped, 1.4-acre property at 620 El Salto Drive on Depot Hill in the City of Capitola. The property encompasses four assessor's parcels: APNs 036-142-27, 036-142-28 (partial), 036-143-31, and 036-143-36. Site access is currently taken from the eastern terminus of El Salto Drive, just east of its intersection with Livermore Avenue. The site is regionally accessible from Highway 1 (the Cabrillo Highway). As shown in Figure 2-1 in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, the project site is located along the coast in eastern Capitola, with the southernmost boundary of the site on the bluffs above the Pacific Ocean. Figure 2-2 in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, presents an aerial view of the project site and surrounding land uses.

3.1.1 Current Land Use and Setting

The project site is located on a 1.4-acre property along the Capitola coastline adjacent to the coastal bluff. The site is partially paved and landscaped with four existing buildings and an outside deck. The site has gently rolling topography, and is partially paved, partially landscaped, and developed with the existing structures of the Monarch Cove Inn, including a Victorian structure. A number of native and non-native trees, including eucalyptus, pine, Cypress, and oak trees, are located on the project site. The trees are dispersed across the site and along the periphery.

The property is currently occupied by the 11-room Monarch Cove Inn, which consists of nine rooms in the Victorian structure, two guest cottages and an outside deck, which is used to host special events. The site is currently accessed via El Salto Drive. The 0.41–acre northern parcel is developed with the two small guest cottages and an L-shaped garage, and the 0.55-acre southern parcel is developed with the Victorian structure and event deck. The southernmost 0.18-acre parcel is currently vacant with some dispersed coastal bluff vegetation and trees. The existing use operates under an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP); conditions include, but are not limited to: limiting events to a maximum of 40 guests Monday through Thursday and 75 guests Friday through Sunday; using shuttles from an off-site parking area for larger events; limiting weddings or events to no more than one per day, two per week, and six per month; adhering to the City Municipal Code standards for noise limits and use of amplified sound; and requiring a security guard to be present on-site during all events to control traffic, parking, and guests.

The project site is located on a bluff top directly adjacent to the Pacific Ocean. It is surrounded by single-family residences to the north and west, and the Pacific Ocean (Soquel Cove) to the south. Directly to the northeast and east is the Escalona Gulch Monarch Butterfly Grove Habitat Reserve and a single family residence. The Escalona Drive right of way is located on the eastern edge of the project site.

3.2 PHYSIOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE

The land within the City of Capitola is considered a marine terrace, a flat section of coastline that is terraced, like a staircase. Coastal streams, such as Soquel Creek, carve the landscape. Siltstone and sandstone make up the underlying geologic formation, with outcrops of severely weathered, soft, light grayish-brown sandstone in coastal bluff areas.

The project site is relatively flat with bluffs along the southern portion of the site. The general project site subsurface profile consists of 25 to 28 feet of marine or alluvium terrace deposits overlying sandstone bedrock of the Purisima Formation. The blufftop terrace deposits consists of near surface, medium dense silty and clayey sands over medium dense to dense, sands and gravels. The sandstone bedrock was found to be dense to very dense. The testing samples from both the deeper terrace deposits and the underlying sandstone exhibited little to no cementation. Historic fill soil wedges, two to seven feet thick were found along the northern perimeter of the project site. Stormwater from the project site drains into the Escalona Gulch and out into Monterey Bay.

The Mediterranean climate of the region and coastal influence produce moderate temperatures year round, with dry summers and rainfall concentrated in the winter months. Annual rainfall averages 31.55 inches per year with most rainfall occurring from November to April. During the summer months there is frequently fog due to the City's coastal location. Average temperatures range from about 68 degrees Fahrenheit (F°) in summer to 47 F° in the winter. The region is subject to various natural hazards, including earthquakes, tsunami and flooding. The regional faults of significance potentially affecting Capitola include the San Andreas Fault (nine miles northeast of Capitola), the Zayante Fault (five miles northeast of Capitola), and the Palo Colorado-San Gregorio Fault (14 miles southwest of Capitola).

3.3 NATURAL RESOURCES

The project site has been moderately disturbed by historic residential development and existing use as a hotel. The grounds consist of a mix of native and non-native species, dominated by landscaped ornamental plants. The site is immediately adjacent to the Escalona Gulch Monarch Butterfly Grove (EGMBG). The EGMBG is situated within a deeply incised ravine with a small intermittent stream. The monarch butterfly is considered a sensitive species by the City of Capitola, and Escalona Gulch has been designated as environmentally sensitive habitat under the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP). Vegetation in the surrounding developed areas includes a mix of native and non-native species similar to that on the project site, dominated by ornamental species and residential landscaping. Vegetation along the eastern portion of the project site and the adjacent Escalona Gulch consist of densely wooded areas. The project site is bounded on the south by a steep vegetated coastal bluff and waters of the Monterey Bay.

The project site consists of a hotel on predominantly landscaped and regularly maintained grounds. The grounds include lawns, gardens and woodlands. The main property and gardens consist of a variety of ornamental annual plants and shrubs and abundant English ivy (*Hedera helix*) and have been mapped as landscape/ruderal. The eastern portion of the project site extends into eucalyptus woodlands that have not been landscaped or maintained. This area is dominated by eucalyptus and pine, with non-native shrubs (predominately French broom

[*Genista monspessulana*]) forming the understory. This portion of the project area forms the northern extent of Escalona Gulch adjacent to the EGMBG.

Additional natural resources setting information is described in Section 4.3, Biological Resources.

3.4 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The City of Capitola is in the Monterey Bay area, a cultural-historical geographic region which spans the central California coastline from Big Sur northward to just south of the San Francisco Bay. This region generally corresponds to southern Costanoan language groups. According to the Santa Cruz County General Plan, much of Santa Cruz County is potentially archaeological sensitive, especially undeveloped coastal areas, valleys, slopes, and drainages. The project site itself is located in an archaeological/paleontological sensitivity area as designated by the City of Capitola General Plan (1989). Furthermore, based on the proximity of previously recorded cultural resource sites, the project area is considered sensitive for archaeological resources (Northwestern Information Center, [NWIC], 2013)).

The project site was part of a larger private estate known as the English Cottages in the 1890s. The history of the project site and its immediate surroundings are best understood with reference to four historical eras:

- <u>English Cottages Era (1895-1910)</u>. The Robertson and Rawlins families developed the portion of Depot Hill south of El Salto Drive and east of Livermore Avenue with four houses, including the Main House extant on the project site today. The property was used as a private estate by the two families.
- <u>El Salto Estate Era (1911-1946)</u>. Lewis Hanchett and his family substantially expanded the property and constructed several new buildings and structures, including the two cottages extant on the project site. The property continued to function as a private family estate.
- <u>El Salto Resort Era (1946-1961</u>). Mary and Joseph Tabacchini converted the Hanchett-era cottages including the two extant on the project site into individual rental units with kitchenettes. They also added a wing onto the Hanchett-era garage, creating the L-shaped building present on the site today.
- <u>Blodgett Era (1962-present)</u>. Elizabeth Blodgett subdivided the former El Salto Resort property into multiple lots. Her son Robert Blodgett acquired the portion of the site corresponding to the current project site in 1989.

The on-site Victorian building appears to be an historical resource under the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and the City of Capitola historic feature criteria. The two on-site cottages are potentially significant for their association with the Hanchett family's build out of the El Salto estate, and thus appear eligible for listing in the Capitola Register of Historic Features.

Additional cultural and historical context is provided in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources.

3.5 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS SETTING

3.5.1 CEQA Requirements

According to the *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15130(a)(1), "a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the environmental impact report (EIR) together with other projects causing related impacts." In addition, an EIR must discuss cumulative impacts if the incremental effect of a project, combined with the effects of other projects is "cumulatively considerable" [Section 15130(a)]. Such incremental effects are to be "viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects" [Section 15164(b)(1)]. Together, these projects comprise the cumulative scenario which forms the basis of the cumulative impact analysis. A cumulative impact analysis should highlight past actions that are closely related (either in time or location) to the project being considered, catalogue past projects and discuss how past projects have harmed the environment, and discuss past actions, even if they were undertaken by another agency or another person.

Both the severity of impacts and the likelihood of their occurrence are to be reflected in the discussion, "but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion of cumulative impacts shall be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness, and shall focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact" [Section 15130(b)]. However, the analysis must be in sufficient detail to be useful to decision makers in deciding whether, or how, to alter the program to lessen cumulative impacts.

There are two commonly used approaches, or methodologies, for establishing the cumulative impact setting or scenario. One approach is to use a "list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts" [Section 15130(b)(1)(A)]. The other is to use a "summary of projects contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact" [Section 15130(b)(1)(B)]. Because the Capitola General Plan was adopted in 1989, this EIR uses the list approach to provide a tangible understanding and context for analysing the potential cumulative effects of a project.

3.5.2 Proposed Development in the Project Vicinity

According to the City of Capitola Community Development Department, approved and pending projects in the City generally consist of minor additions to existing single-family residences; construction, demolition and replacement of existing single-family residences and associated accessory structures; or alterations of small multi-family dwellings. However, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014. These are described below:

• *Villa Capitola*. Villa Capitola is a 23-unit senior residential development proposed at 1575 38th Avenue, approximately 1.3 miles west of the project site. This project was approved

by the City Council on June 27, 2013. As of February 2014, construction on the project had not begun.

• *McGregor Park*. McGregor Park is a proposed City-owned recreational park that was approved in concept by the City Council in November 2013. The park would be located on McGregor Drive, approximately 0.7 miles northeast of the project site and east of the Park Avenue/Highway 1 interchange. The park is projected to include a 7,000 square foot pump track, kids play area, 9,000 square foot skateboard park, 10,800 square foot dog park, and parking for 30 vehicles. The final plan for the park is scheduled for Planning Commission consideration and final review/approval by the City Council in spring 2014.

Cumulative impacts are discussed within each of the specific impact analysis discussions in Section 4.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis*.

This page intentionally left blank.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

This section discusses the possible environmental effects of the proposed project for the specific issue areas that were identified through the Initial Study and NOP process as having the potential to experience significant impacts. "Significant effect" is defined by the *State CEQA Guidelines* §15382 as "a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance." An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment, but may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

The assessment of each issue area begins with a discussion of the setting relevant to that issue area. Following the setting is a discussion of the project's impacts relative to the issue area. Within the impact analysis, the first subsection identifies the methodologies used and the "significance thresholds," which are those criteria adopted by the City, other agencies, universally recognized, or developed specifically for this analysis to determine whether potential impacts are significant. The next subsection describes each impact of the proposed project, mitigation measures for significant impacts, and the level of significance after mitigation. Each impact under consideration for an issue area is separately listed in bold text, with the discussion of the impact and its significance following. Each bolded impact listing also contains a statement of the significance determination for the environmental impact as follows:

Class I, Significant and Unavoidable: An impact that cannot be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued if the project is approved.

Class II, Significant but Mitigable: An impact that can be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires findings to be made.

Class III, Not Significant: An impact that may be adverse, but does not exceed the threshold levels and does not require mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures that could further lessen the environmental effect may be suggested if readily available and easily achievable.

Class IV, Beneficial: An impact that would reduce existing environmental problems or hazards.

Following each environmental impact discussion is a listing of recommended mitigation measures (if required) and the residual effects or level of significance remaining after the implementation of the measures. In those cases where the mitigation measure for an impact could have a significant environmental impact in another issue area, this impact is discussed as a residual effect.

The impact analysis concludes with a discussion of cumulative effects, which evaluates the impacts associated with the proposed project in conjunction with other future development in the area
This page intentionally left blank.

4.1 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES

4.1.1 Setting

a. Visual Character of the Project Vicinity. The project site is located on a 1.4 acre property in a residential area, known as the Depot Hill neighborhood, along the City of Capitola coastline adjacent to the City's coastal bluff. The site is surrounded by single-family residences to the north and west, and the Pacific Ocean (Soquel Cove) to the south. Directly to the east is the Escalona Gulch Monarch Butterfly Grove Habitat Reserve, and residential development beyond the gulch area. Escalona Gulch is a steep sided, deeply incised ravine with a small intermittent stream. A dense stand of eucalyptus trees with some Monterey pines and Monterey cypress inhabits the ravine. The Escalona Drive right of way is located on the eastern edge of the project site.

The surrounding residences are developed as one- and two-story structures on relatively small lots. According to the draft City of Capitola General Plan Update, the Depot Hill neighborhood contains a high concentration of historic single-family homes developed along narrow streets with no sidewalks. Homes in the neighborhood reflect a variety of architectural styles, and include Craftsman and Victorian influences. There is moderate urban canopy distributed through the neighborhood. Ocean views are prominent from residences located on the coastal bluff, as well as from a blufftop trail located in the northwestern portion of the neighborhood. However, there is not a designated scenic corridor within the neighborhood, and residences and the existing Monarch Cove Inn buildings generally obstruct ocean views from the public streets.

b. Visual Character of the Project Site. The property is currently occupied by the 11room Monarch Cove Inn, which consists of nine rooms in an historic two-story Victorian structure (known as the "main house"); two single-story guest cottages; an outside deck structure with a covered bar area; and an L-shaped garage and administrative building. While definitive dates of construction are not available, the main house appears to date from the late 1890s, while the other three buildings originally date from the 1930s or 1940s. Modifications to structures and grounds have been carried out (refer to Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*).

In addition to the buildings, the site also features gravel paths, wood fences, planted flower beds, and grass lawns. The site occupies a gently rolling topography. A number of mature trees, including eucalyptus, pine, Cypress, and oak trees, grow throughout the site. Figure 4.1-1 shows photographs of existing conditions on the project site and Figure 4.1-2 shows views from the project site.

The site is generally semi-circular and oriented on a slight northwest-southeast axis. It is bounded by Escalona Drive to the north, private properties to the west, Escalona Gulch Monarch Butterfly Grove Habitat reserve to the northeast and east, and Soquel Cove to the south. The project site is visible from El Salto Drive and Escalona Drive, both of which are public roadways which end adjacent to the project site. The project site is not visible from the Depot Hill coastal blufftop trail or other public viewpoints. Existing structures and vegetation on the project site do not allow views of scenic resources, such as the ocean or coastline, through the project site from either public viewpoint.





El Salto Drive Site Entrance



L-Shaped Building (with Garage and Hotel Offices)



Outside Event Deck



Cottage 1



Cottage 2

Project Site Photos





View from the site facing northeast, toward Escalona Gulch



View from the outside event deck facing southeast, toward Monterey Bay



View from the site facing west, toward neighboring residences

Views from Project Site

c. Regulatory Setting. The community aesthetic standards in Capitola are generally applied through policies and design standards from the City of Capitola's General Plan and the City of Capitola's Local Coastal Plan. It should be noted that while the City of Capitola General Plan is currently being updated, as of December 2013, this updated General Plan is in public draft review and comment form and has not been adopted by the City of Capitola to supersede its existing 1989 General Plan. Therefore, only policies from the 1989 City of Capitola General Plan are included in regulatory setting considered by this EIR.

This section primarily focuses on those requirements most applicable to the design of the proposed project for the purpose of assessing impacts on the City's visual resources and aethetic quality. The ultimate determination of whether the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance resides exclusively with local regulatory bodies, including the Planning Commission and City Council. The City also has the regulatory authority to issue a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) for the project; however, the California Coastal Commission is the decision making entity for CDP appeals.

The General Plan policies most applicable to the proposed project regarding aesthetics and visual resources are listed below.

<u>Goal</u>	Maintain Capitola's existing small town scale, character and flavor.
<u>Goal</u>	<i>Ensure that all new construction or reconstruction is compatible with existing uses.</i>

The Local Coastal Plan policies most applicable to the proposed project regarding aesthetics and visual resources are listed below.

<u>Policy III-4</u>	It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to require the planting of trees in new development and to protect existing trees by allowing removal only in accordance with the City's Tree Ordinance. The City should encourage new developments to be designed to preserve significant vegetation.
<u>Policy III-5</u>	<i>Permitted development shall not block or detract from public views to and along Capitola's shoreline.</i>
<u>Policy III-6</u>	It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to maintain the special character of Depot Hill. New development on Depot Hill shall be permitted only where designed to be compatible with the scale and architectural character of the area.

4.1.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. The assessment of aesthetic impacts involves qualitative analysis that is inherently subjective in nature. Different viewers react to viewsheds and aesthetic conditions differently. This evaluation measures the existing visual resource against the proposed project, analyzing the nature of the anticipated change to the

project site and its surrounding vicinity, if found applicable. The project site and surroundings were observed and photographically documented to establish a context for the analysis.

In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, an impact is considered significant if it can be demonstrably argued that the project would:

- 1) Adversely affect a viewshed from a public viewing area (such as a park, scenic highway, roadway, or other scenic vista);
- 2) Substantially damage an existing visual or scenic resource, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- 3) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; and/or,
- 4) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

As discussed in the Initial Study (Appendix A), project implementation would not substantially damage scenic resources located within a state scenic highway (the second threshold listed above). As such, the potential for this impact to occur is not further discussed in this section. The Initial Study determined that the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts with regard to scenic resources, visual character or quality, and creation of new sources of light or glare (the first, third and fourth thresholds listed above). For that reason, the EIR analyzes the potential impacts to scenic resources and the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings under Impacts AES-1 and AES-2. Potential impacts from the creation of new sources of light or glare are considered under the discussion for Impact AES-3.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact AES-1 The proposed project would not affect views of the ocean and coastline from a public viewing area. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

Existing structures on the project site include two cottages, an L-shaped garage and office building, a main Victorian building, and an outdoor deck structure. Structures, trees, and landscaping on the project site are visible from two public roadways in the project site's vicinity: Escalona Drive and El Salto Drive. Existing public views from these locations are limited to existing development and vegetation on the site; there are no existing views of the ocean, coastal bluff, or coastline through the site from public viewpoints. The top center photograph in Figure 4.1-1 shows a view from El Salto Drive into the project site. The neighborhood's coastal bluff trail does not extend to within view of the site.

Future development as proposed for the site would be visible from El Salto and Escalona Drives, near their termini. Proposed development would be greater in scale than the existing development, but would not introduce new impediments to views of scenic vistas compared to existing conditions, nor impede any existing scenic views. Furthermore, the proposed project includes improved public access to the project site through establishing ADA-accessible pathways that would provide enhanced access to scenic vista points of the Monterey Bay coastline and the Pacific Ocean. The project site is not located within a designated scenic vista. New Brighton State Beach is located approximately 0.25 miles northeast of the project site. However, the project site is not visible from this vista point. Based on existing topography and vegetation, the increase in building size from the existing facilities to the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on scenic views from this public viewing location.

Summarizing the viewshed impact topic, the proposed project would not substantially affect a scenic vista or cause scenic views from public vantage points to be obscured or eliminated. By proposing enhanced public access at the subject site, the project would enhance public viewing opportunities of important scenic resources.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed project that would reduce impacts related to ocean and coastline views.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Impacts would be less than significant, and therefore no mitigation is required.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact AES-2 The proposed project would involve tree removal and changes to site landscaping, hardscaping, and layout, and would result in an increased intensity and scale of development on the project site. Impacts to the visual character and quality of the project site would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

As noted above, the proposed project would alter the visual condition and aesthetic character of the project site through the demolition of existing and construction of new structures. Vegetation and landscaping at the site would be altered with implementation of the proposed project, including the removal of existing trees and landscaping and replacement with new trees and landscaping. Approximately 14 trees and large shrubs would be removed. Most of the trees proposed for removal are located near the southwest project boundary, south of El Salto Drive.

From public viewpoints, including the terminus of El Salto Drive and the informal trails that traverse the project site, the larger scale of structural development would be evident and would represent a marked change from current conditions. The proposed main building would be placed directly into the line of vision from El Salto Drive into the site, replacing the existing view of smaller and more distant and dispersed buildings. The current background view of trees (refer to the top center photograph in Figure 4.1-1) would be replaced with foreground views of building and fewer trees. Although this change could be considered adverse to some observers, the proposed new buildings, although larger than the existing buildings, would be similar in height to the existing residences in the neighborhood. The background view of tall eucalyptus trees within Escalona Gulch would remain, maintaining the most prominent visual feature of views into and through the site.

The proposed project would be subject to architectural and site review pursuant to Chapter 17.63 of the Capitola Municipal Code. This review, conducted by the City's architectural and site review committee, includes consideration of landscaping, site layout, and architectural character.

The removal of 14 trees from the site represents a potentially significant impact to the site's visual character and quality, much of which is defined by tree cover in views from public areas. Mitigation measure BIO-1(b) in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, requires replacement of all 14 trees at a ratio of 3:1, which exceeds existing City requirements of a minimum of 2:1 for 12 of the trees.¹ This measure would result in the planting of 42 trees on the site. Remaining trees on-site would be avoided and protected in accordance with mitigation measures BIO-7(a) through BIO-7(c) (for additional detail, refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*.)

During the scoping process, the participants raised a concern that the proposed project would result in an increase in the amount of litter in the surrounding neighborhood. While the potential for increased litter in association with increased visitors exists, due to the nature of the proposed use as a hotel (where visitors would congregate on the site itself), the majority of the potential increase would be limited to the project property itself. In addition, this analysis generally assumes reasonable compliance with existing laws, including laws prohibiting littering. Observations of the neighborhood made during summer and fall of 2013 indicated that visual conditions were not marred by litter along El Salto Drive.

Although the project would alter the visual character of the project site, and this change may be perceived as adverse by some viewers, this change in visual character and quality would not be significantly adverse given the scale of proposed new construction and the tree replacement requirements incorporated into this EIR. In addition, views of the site would be limited due to intervening topography, intervening and proposed landscape screening, and setbacks; and the proposed hotel would retain the architectural style of the current hotel.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As noted above, the proposed project would be subject to full architectural and site review pursuant to Chapter 17.63 of the Capitola Municipal Code.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Mitigation measures BIO-1(b) and BIO-7(a) through BIO-7(c) in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, would be required.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1(b) and BIO-7(a) through BIO-7(c).

Impact AES-3 The proposed project would involve an increase in structural development, hardscape, and intensity of use on the project site, including new and increased night lighting and the potential for increased daytime glare. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

¹ Chapter 12.12 of the Capitola Municipal Code requires replacement of all non-fruit bearing trees on public and private property at a 2:1 ratio. Two of the 14 trees proposed for removal are fruit-bearing, and therefore not subject to this requirement. However, replacement of all 14 trees at a 3:1 ratio is required as mitigation for impacts to Monarch butterflies.



The proposed project would add new sources of structural and landscaping lighting to the project site associated with the proposed increase in structural development, intensity of use, and hardscaping. The additional new sources of light could result in an adverse change to nighttime views of the project site, adjacent areas, and night sky, and could result in a light spillover into the immediately surrounding residential neighborhood and the Escalona Gulch habitat.

Capitola Municipal Code Section 17.30.140 requires that "All exterior lighting shall be unobtrusive, harmonious with the local area and constructed or located so that only the area intended is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled. The location, type and wattage of the exterior lighting must be approved by the community development director prior to the issuance of building permits or the establishment of the use." Due to the sensitivity of surrounding residential and habitat areas, additional specificity is required to further ensure that lighting impacts are reduced to less than significant levels.

Glare impacts are typically associated with increases in surface parking or highly reflective building materials and windows. The proposed project would not substantially increase the amount of surface parking on the site (four surface spaces are proposed, and the rest of the parking would be accommodated in an underground structure). Building materials proposed would be wood and stucco, similar to existing surrounding development, with standard windows and window treatments. No significant increases in daytime glare are anticipated.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As noted above, the proposed project would be required to comply with Capitola Municipal Code Section 17.30.140. Although compliance with this existing requirement would partially reduce impacts, additional specificity is required to further confirm that lighting impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. The following mitigation measure is required to reduce impacts associated with nighttime lighting.

AES-3 Photometric Plans and Specifications. Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall submit photometric plans for review and approval by the City's Community Development Director. The plans shall demonstrate that proposed lighting prevents light trespass and complies with the provisions of the Capitola Municipal Code intended to ensure that only the area intended is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled. Compliance shall be confirmed through post-construction light level analysis performed by a qualified professional confirming that lighting impacts have been minimized through shielding, downward-directed fixtures, wattage control and other methods. Lighting shall not exceed 0.5 foot-candles at the property lines.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-3.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As discussed in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park.

Neither of these projects is located within the viewshed of the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel Project, and would therefore not influence the visual setting or character of the project area. Cumulative development associated with other ongoing activities (minor additions to existing single-family residences; construction, demolition and replacement of existing single-family residences and associated accessory structures; or alterations of small multi-family dwellings) may alter the visual character of the Depot Hill area. Such projects would only be expected to change the character of the area incrementally, and all future projects in the City of Capitola will be required to adhere to specific development standards in the City's Zoning Ordinance and General Plan designed to protect and enhance the area's aesthetic and visual resources. The limited effects of the project, as described above, would limit the potential for a significant contribution to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the project's contribution to the overall visual effect of cumulative development in the area would be considered less than significant. This page intentionally left blank.

4.2 AIR QUALITY

4.2.1 Setting

a. Climate and Meteorology. The project site is located in the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB) (Basin), which covers an area of 5,159 square miles and consists of the counties of Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey. The semi-permanent high pressure cell in the eastern Pacific is the basic controlling factor in the climate of the Basin. In the summer, the high pressure cell is dominant and causes persistent west and northwest winds over the entire California coast. Air descends in the Pacific High forming a stable temperature inversion of hot air over a cool coastal layer of air. The onshore air currents pass over cool ocean waters to bring fog and relatively cool air into the coastal valleys. The warmer air loft acts as a lid to inhibit vertical air movement (Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District [MBUAPCD], February 2008).

The generally northwest-southeast orientation of mountainous ridges tends to restrict and channel the summer onshore air currents. Surface heating in the interior portion of the Salinas and San Benito Valleys creates a weak low pressure which intensifies the onshore air flow during the afternoon and evening. In the fall, the surface winds become weak, and the marine layer grows shallow, dissipating altogether on some days. The air flow is occasionally reversed in a weak offshore movement, and the relatively stationary air mass is held in place by the Pacific High pressure cell, which allows pollutants to build up over a period of a few days. It is most often during this season that the north or east winds develop to transport pollutants from either the San Francisco Bay area or the Central Valley into the NCCAB (MBUAPCD, February 2008).

During the winter, the Pacific High migrates southward and has less influence on the air basin. Air frequently flows in a southeasterly direction out of the Salinas and San Benito Valleys, especially during night and morning hours. Northwest winds are nevertheless still dominant in winter, but easterly flow is more frequent. The general absence of deep, persistent inversions and the occasional storm systems usually result in good air quality for the Basin as a whole in winter and early spring (MBUAPCD, February 2008).

In the project vicinity, marine breezes from Monterey Bay dominate the climate. These westerly winds predominate in all seasons, but are strongest and most persistent during the spring and summer months. In general, the air pollution potential of the coastal portion of the NCCAB, including Capitola, is relatively low due to these persistent winds (Capitola Draft General Plan, 2013).

b. Air Pollution Regulation. The federal and state Clean Air Acts regulate the emission of airborne pollutants from various mobile and stationary sources. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is the federal agency designated to administer air quality regulation, while the California Air Resources Board (CARB) is the state equivalent in the California Environmental Protection Agency. These agencies have established ambient air quality standards for the protection of public health. Local air quality management control and planning is provided through regional Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs) established by the CARB for the 14 statewide air basins. The CARB is responsible for control of mobile

emission sources, while the local APCDs are responsible for control of stationary sources and enforcing regulations. Capitola is located within the NCCAB, which is under the jurisdiction of the MBUAPCD.

Federal and state standards have been established for six criteria pollutants, including ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulates less than 10 and 2.5 microns in diameter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and lead (Pb) (see Table 4.2-1). California has also set standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, and visibility-reducing particles. The local air quality management agency is required to monitor air pollutant levels to assure that air quality standards are met and, in the event they are not, to develop strategies to meet these standards. Depending on whether the standards are met or exceeded, the local air basin is classified as being in "attainment" or "nonattainment."

Pollutant	Federal Standard	California Standard
Ozone	0.075 ppm (8-hr avg)	0.09 ppm (1-hr avg) 0.07 ppm (8-hr avg)
Carbon Monoxide	35.0 ppm (1-hr avg) 9.0 ppm (8-hr avg)	20.0 ppm (1-hr avg) 9.0 ppm (8-hr avg)
Nitrogen Dioxide	0.10 ppm (1-hr avg) 0.053 ppm (annual avg)	0.18 ppm (1-hr avg) 0.030 ppm (annual avg)
Sulfur Dioxide	0.075 ppm (1-hr avg) 0.14 ppm (24-hr avg)	0.25 ppm (1-hr avg) 0.04 ppm (24-hr avg)
Lead	1.5 μg/m ³ (3-month avg)	1.5 μg/m ³ (30-day avg)
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	150 μg/m ³ (24-hr avg)	50 μg/m ³ (24-hr avg) 20 μg/m ³ (annual avg)
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	35 μg/m ³ (24-hr avg) 12 μg/m ³ (annual avg)	12 μg/m³ (annual avg)

Table 4.2-1Current Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards

ppm= parts per million

 $\mu g/m^3 = micrograms$ per cubic meter

Source: California Air Resources Board, www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf, June 4, 2013.

The general characteristics of the six criteria pollutants regulated by the Federal Clean Air Act and California Clean Air Act are described below.

<u>Ozone</u>. Ozone is produced by a photochemical reaction (triggered by sunlight) between nitrogen oxides (NO_X) and reactive organic gasses (ROG). Nitrogen oxides are formed during the combustion of fuels, while ROG's are formed during combustion and evaporation of organic solvents. Because ozone requires sunlight to form, it mostly occurs in concentrations considered serious between the months of April and October. Ozone is a pungent, colorless, toxic gas with direct health effects on humans including respiratory and eye irritation and possible changes in lung functions. Groups most sensitive to ozone include children, the elderly, persons with respiratory disorders, and people who exercise strenuously outdoors.

<u>Carbon Monoxide</u>. Carbon monoxide is a local pollutant that is found in high concentrations only near the source. The major source of carbon monoxide, a colorless, odorless,

poisonous gas, is automobile traffic. Elevated concentrations, therefore, are usually only found near areas of high traffic volumes. Carbon monoxide's health effects are related to its affinity for hemoglobin in the blood. At high concentrations, carbon monoxide reduces the amount of oxygen in the blood, causing heart difficulties in people with chronic diseases, reduced lung capacity and impaired mental abilities.

<u>Nitrogen Dioxide</u>. Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) is a by-product of fuel combustion, with the primary source being motor vehicles and industrial boilers and furnaces. The principal form of nitrogen oxide produced by combustion is nitric oxide (NO), but NO reacts rapidly to form NO₂, creating the mixture of NO and NO₂ commonly called NO_X. Nitrogen dioxide is an acute irritant. A relationship between NO₂ and chronic pulmonary fibrosis may exist, and an increase in bronchitis in young children at concentrations below 0.3 parts per million (ppm) may occur. Nitrogen dioxide absorbs blue light and causes a reddish brown cast to the atmosphere and reduced visibility. It can also contribute to the formation of PM₁₀ and acid rain.

Suspended Particulates. PM₁₀ is particulate matter measuring no more than 10 microns in diameter, while PM_{2.5} is fine particulate matter measuring no more than 2.5 microns in diameter. Suspended particulates are mostly dust particles, nitrates and sulfates. Both PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} are by-products of fuel combustion and wind erosion of soil and unpaved roads, and are directly emitted into the atmosphere through these processes. Suspended particulates are also created in the atmosphere through chemical reactions. The characteristics, sources, and potential health effects associated with the small particulates (those between 2.5 and 10 microns in diameter) and fine particulates (PM_{2.5}) can be very different. The small particulates generally come from windblown dust and dust kicked up from mobile sources. The fine particulates are generally associated with combustion processes as well as being formed in the atmosphere as a secondary pollutant through chemical reactions. Fine particulate matter is more likely to penetrate deeply into the lungs and poses a health threat to all groups, but particularly to the elderly, children, and those with respiratory problems. More than half of the small and fine particulate matter that is inhaled into the lungs remains there. These materials can damage health by interfering with the body's mechanisms for clearing the respiratory tract or by acting as carriers of an absorbed toxic substance.

<u>Sulfur Dioxide</u>. Sulfur dioxide (SO₂) is one of a group of highly reactive gasses known as "oxides of sulfur." The largest sources of SO₂ emissions are from fossil fuel combustion at power plants (73%) and other industrial facilities (20%). Smaller sources of SO₂ emissions include industrial processes such as extracting metal from ore, and the burning of high sulfur containing fuels by locomotives, large ships, and non-road equipment. SO₂ is linked with a number of adverse effects on the respiratory system.

<u>Lead</u>. Lead is a toxic metal that can be emitted from industrial sources, leaded aviation gasoline, and lead-based paint. Lead may cause a range of health effects, from behavioral problems and learning disabilities, to seizures and death.

c. Current Ambient Air Quality. As of January 2013, the NCCAB is in attainment or unclassifiable of all federal ambient air quality standards (AAQS), it is designated as non-attainment with respect to the more stringent state PM₁₀ standard and the state's eight-hour ozone standard. Vehicles are a significant source of these pollutants, both directly by

combustion and indirectly by the interaction of combustion byproducts with one another and with ultraviolet (UV) light (Capitola Draft General Plan, 2013).

The MBUAPCD monitors air pollutant concentrations throughout the basin at various monitoring stations. The closest NCCAB monitoring station to the project area is the 2544 Soquel Avenue Monitoring Station in Santa Cruz, located approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the project site, which measures exceedances of ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} ambient air quality standards. The Davenport Monitoring Station, located approximately 14 miles northwest of the project site, measures exceedances of CO and N₂O. Ambient air quality obtained from these stations characterizes the air quality representative of the ambient air quality in the project area. As indicated in Table 4.2-2, no exceedances of ozone, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, or N₂O occurred at the nearest NCCAB monitoring stations in 2010, 2011, or 2012.

Pollutant	Year	Maximum concentration (NCCAB) ²	Days (Samples) State/Federal Std. Exceeded
0	2010	0.077 ppm	0/0
Ozone (O_3)	2011	0.071	0/0
	2012	0.071	0/0
	2010	0.059 ppm	0/0
$Ozone (O_3)^*$	2011	0.065	0/0
(8-11601)	2012	0.053	0/0
	2010	0.64 ppm	0/0
(8-bour)	2011	NM	NM/NM
(8-11601)	2012	NM	NM/NM
	2010	28.0 ppm	0/NA
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2)	2011	NM	NM/NA
	2012	NM	NM/NA
	2010	32.8 μg/m ³	NA/0
(PMa c)	2011	17.2	NA/0
(1 1012.5)	2012	13.8	NA/0
	2010	31.0 μg/m ³	0/0
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) ¹	2011	22.0	NM/NM
	2012	NM	NM/NM

Table 4.2-2 Ambient Air Quality Data

Source: Aerometric Data Analysis and Measurement System (ADAM), summaries from 2010 to 2012, <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam</u>. $ppm = parts per million; PM_{10} - particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or less; NM = not measured or not available; <math>\mu g/m^3 = micrograms$ per cubic meter; $PM_{2.5} = particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or less; NA = not applicable.$

Notes: (1) Maximum concentration is measured over the same period as the California Standards. (2) O_3 , $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} data from the Santa Cruz monitoring station located at 2544 Soquel Avenue, Santa Cruz, California. CO and N_2O data from the Davenport monitoring station located at Marine View and Center Ave, Davenport, California.

d. Air Quality Management. Under state law, the MBUAPCD is required to prepare a plan for air quality improvement for pollutants for which the District is in non-compliance. The MBUAPCD has adopted an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) that provides a strategy for the attainment of state and federal air quality standards. MBUAPCD updates the AQMP every three years. Each iteration of the plan is an update of the previous plan and has a 20-year horizon. In April 2013, the District Board of Directors adopted the 2009-2011 Triennial Plan Revision, which is an update to the 2008 AQMP. The primary elements from the 2008 AQMP updated in the triennial revision include the air quality trends analysis, emission inventory, and mobile source programs.

The 2009-2011 Triennial Plan Revision was prepared to ensure continued progress towards clean air and comply with state and federal requirements. This AQMP builds upon the approaches taken in the 2008 AQMP, but only addresses attainment of the State ozone air quality standard since the NCCAB was designated by the EPA as attainment of the current national 8-hour ozone standard in 2012. This AQMP highlights the ozone precursor (NOx and ROG) emissions inventory trend over time compared to the 2008 AQMP inventory. The data show an overall decline in emissions of both NOx and ROG. This decrease corresponds to the general improvement in ambient ozone levels in the NCCAB as a result of key programs and rules regulating cleaner exhaust standards for automobiles and improving new technologies to reduce vehicle fuel consumption. The decrease is most pronounced for NOx, while the decrease in ROG is not as rapid and is projected to flatten out after 2020. The 1990 to 2035 reduction in ROG is expected to be about 55 tons per day or about a 47% reduction, while the corresponding reduction in NOx is expected to be about 93 tons per day or approximately a 74% reduction.

e. Sensitive Receptors in the Project Area. Ambient air quality standards have been established to represent the levels of air quality considered sufficient, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect public health and welfare. They are designed to protect that segment of the public most susceptible to respiratory distress, such as children under 14; the people over 65 years of age; persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise; and acutely ill and chronically ill persons, especially those with cardio-respiratory diseases. MBUAPCD generally defines a sensitive receptor as any residence including private homes, condominiums, apartments, and living quarters; education resources such as preschools and kindergarten through grade twelve (k-12) schools; daycare centers; and health care facilities such as hospitals or retirement and nursing homes. The project site is located within a developed area of the City of Capitola and is surrounded by single-family residences to the north and west, and multi-family residential buildings beyond at the terminus of Grove Lane. The majority of surrounding residential buildings are located at least 50 feet from the project boundary, with residential buildings to the north located more than 300 feet from the site. Two residential buildings are located within 50 feet of the project site. Specifically, a multi-family 4-plex is located approximately 10 feet southwest of the project boundary, and a three-bedroom cottage is located approximately 35 feet west of the project boundary.

4.2.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds.

<u>Methodology</u>. The analysis of air quality impacts conforms to the methodologies recommended in the MBUAPCD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (2008). The handbook includes thresholds for emissions associated with both construction and operation of proposed projects.

The construction emissions associated with development of the proposed project were calculated using the CalEEModVersion 2013.2 (2013) computer model by estimating the types and number of pieces of equipment that would be used onsite during construction. These construction emissions are analyzed using the regional thresholds established by the MBUAPCD and published in the *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*. The construction activities associated with development would generate diesel emissions and dust. Construction equipment that would generate criteria air pollutants includes excavators, graders, dump trucks, and loaders. Some of

this equipment would be used during both grading and construction. It is assumed that all of the construction equipment used would be diesel-powered.

Operational emissions associated with on-site development were estimated using the CalEEMod computer model and the information provided in the traffic study prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. (October 2013). Operational emissions would be comprised of mobile source emissions, energy emissions, and area source emissions. Mobile source emissions are generated by the increase in motor vehicle trips to and from the project site as a result of the proposed development. Emissions attributed to energy use include electricity and natural gas consumption for lighting and space and water heating and cooling. Area source emissions are generated by landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products, and architectural coating.

To determine whether a significant regional air quality impact would occur, the increase in emissions generated by the proposed project was compared with the MBUAPCD's recommended regional thresholds for both construction and operational emissions.

<u>Significance Thresholds</u>. In accordance with Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines*, impacts created by the project would be significant if project implementation would:

- 1) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- 2) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- 3) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);
- 4) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; and/or
- 5) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

As discussed in the Initial Study (see Appendix A), the proposed project would not result in new population growth (refer to Section XIII, *Population and Housing*), and is therefore accommodated within (and consistent with) the AQMP. In addition, compliance with state requirements would reduce the potential of exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and diesel emissions. Furthermore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not generate any long-term objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. These impacts were determined to be less than significant and are not discussed further below.

Construction Impacts. Emissions from construction activities represent temporary impacts that are typically short in duration, depending on the size, phasing, and type of project. Air quality impacts can nevertheless be acute during construction periods, resulting in significant localized impacts to air quality. In accordance with the MBUAPCD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, construction activities (e.g., excavation, grading, on-site vehicles) which directly generate 82 pounds per day or more of PM₁₀ would have a significant impact on local air quality when they are located nearby and upwind of sensitive receptors. In addition, construction projects which may cause or substantially contribute to the violation of other State or national AAQS or that could emit toxic air contaminants could result in temporary significant impacts. Use of

equipment that is not typical construction equipment¹ as specified in Section 5.3 of the MBUAPCD *CEQA Guidelines* may also result in significant air quality impacts, specifically related to ROG and NOx. However, the proposed project would use typical construction equipment, and as such would not emit significant ROG or NOx emissions during construction.

Operational Impacts. Emissions from long-term operations generally represent a project's most substantial air quality impact. Table 4.2-3 summarizes MBUAPCD's project-level thresholds of significance for operational impacts by pollutant. An exceedance of any threshold would represent a significant impact on local or regional air quality.

Table 4.2-3
MBUAPCD Air Quality Significance Thresholds for Criteria Pollutants of
Concern - Operational Impacts*

Pollutant Source	Threshold(s) of Significance
NO _x , as NO ₂	137 lbs/day (direct + indirect)
ROG	137 lbs/day (direct + indirect)
PM ₁₀	82 lbs/day (on-site)**
SO _x , as SO ₂	150 lbs/day (direct)***
СО	550 lbs/day (direct)***

Source: MBUAPCD, 2008

* Projects that emit other criteria pollutant emissions would have a significant impact if emissions would cause or substantially contribute to the violation of State or national ambient air quality standard. Criteria pollutant emissions could also have a significant impact if they would alter air movement, moisture, temperature, climate, or create objectionable odors in substantial concentrations. When estimating project emissions, local or project-specific conditions should be considered.

** The District's 82 lb/day operational phase threshold of significance applies only to onsite emissions and projectrelated exceedances along unpaved roads. These impacts are generally less than significant. On large development projects, almost all travel is on paved roads (0% unpaved), and entrained road dust from vehicular travel can exceed the significance threshold. Please contact the Air District to discuss estimating emissions from vehicular travel on paved roads. District-approved dispersion modeling can be used to refute (or validate) a determination of significance if modeling shows that emissions would not cause or substantially contribute to an exceedance of State and national ambient air quality standard.

*** Modeling should be undertaken to determine if the project would cause or substantially contribute (550 lb/day) to exceedance of CO ambient air quality standard. If not, the project would not have a significant impact.

MBUAPCD recommends that a local CO hotspot analysis be conducted if any of the following scenarios would occur:

- 1) Intersections or road segments that operate at LOS D or better would operate at LOS E or F with the project's traffic,
- 2) Intersections or road segments that operate at LOS E or F where the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio would increase 0.05 or more with the project's traffic,
- 3) Intersections that operate at LOS E or F where delay would increase by 10 seconds or more with the project's traffic,
- 4) Unsignalized intersections which operate at LOS E or F where the reserve capacity would decrease by 50 or more with the project's traffic,
- 5) The project would generate substantial heavy duty truck traffic or generate substantial traffic along urban street canyons or near a major stationary source of CO.

¹ Typical construction equipment includes dump trucks, scrappers, bulldozers, compactors and front-end loaders that temporarily emit precursors of ozone (i.e., ROG or NOx). Non-typical equipment includes grinders and portable equipment (MBUAPCD, 2008).

The proposed project would not result in any of the above scenarios. Therefore, a quantitative CO hotspot analysis is not required, and the project's impact to CO levels during construction and operation would be less than significant.

In addition to criteria pollutants, the MBUAPCD regulates TACs from new or modified sources under Rule 1000. Rule 1000 applies to any source which requires a permit to construct or operate pursuant to District Regulation II (Permits) and has the potential to emit carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic TACs. The District also implements Rule 1003, Air Toxic Emissions Inventory and Risk Assessments, which establishes and implements the Air Toxics Hot Spots Act, and Rule 424, which applies to demolition and/or renovation activities which are subject to the asbestos NESHAP in Rule 306. The proposed project would not result in significant TAC impacts as it would be required to comply with Rules 1000, 1003, and 424, as applicable.

Cumulative Impacts. The criteria for assessing cumulative impacts on localized air quality (i.e., carbon monoxide, PM₁₀) are the same as those for assessing project impacts (listed in Table 4.2-3 above). Projects that do not exceed MBUAPCD's construction or operational thresholds are considered consistent with the AQMP (personal communication with Amy Clymo, Supervising Air Quality Planner, MBUAPCD, October 29, 2013).

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact AQ-1 Construction activity would generate on- and off-site air pollutant emissions. However, construction emissions would not exceed MBUAPCD thresholds. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

During construction, grading and excavation could result in generation of dust and PM₁₀ emissions as well as VOCs and ozone from construction equipment. According to the MBUAPCD *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, up to 2.2 acres per day could be graded and excavated without exceeding the MBUAPCD's direct emissions threshold of 82 lbs/day of PM₁₀. The project site is 1.4 acres. Therefore, proposed grading activities would be less than the MBUAPCD threshold of significance direct emissions threshold of 82 lbs/day of PM₁₀. Per the MBUAPCD *CEQA Guidelines*, since the project would involve the use of typical construction equipment, ozone emissions from construction would be accommodated in the emission inventories of State- and federally-required air plans and would not have a significant impact on the attainment and maintenance of ozone ambient air quality standards. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's grading ordinance and the project permit, which would require implementation of dust suppression measures (e.g., covering stockpiles, wetting exposed surfaces, etc.) during grading.

Quantitative construction emissions estimates of CO, SO₂, and PM_{2.5} were generated for the proposed project using CalEEMod software. Scheduling for the various construction phases was based on CalEEMod default values and it was assumed that construction would be completed by the end of year 2015, i.e. over a span of approximately 12 to 16 months. While actual construction timing may vary, the emissions model conservatively assumes a 12 month construction phase to demonstrate worst case scenario emissions. As discussed in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, excavation and cut and fill would result in grading of approximately 6,950 net cubic yards exported from the site. Construction equipment would include, but is not

limited to: pavers, forklifts, graders, tractors, loaders, backhoes, dozers, and saws. Table 4.2-4 shows the estimated maximum daily on and off-site construction emissions for each pollutant.

Table 4.2-4 Maximum Daily Unmitigated On-Site and Off-Site Construction Air Pollutant Emissions

	Emissions (lbs/day)		
	СО	SO ₂	PM _{2.5}
Maximum lbs/day ¹	99.11	0.17	5.67

1 Maximum daily on and off-site emissions based on highest in any season, i.e. Winter or Summer. Source: MBUAPCD, 2008, <u>http://www.mbuapcd.org/mbuapcd/pdf/mbuapcd/pdf/CEQA_full.pdf</u> and CalEEMod; see Appendix B for calculations.

The NCCAB is currently in attainment for CO, SO₂, and PM_{2.5}. As shown in Table 4.2-4, construction emissions from the proposed project would be minimal and would not have a significant impact on the attainment and maintenance of ozone ambient air quality standards. Therefore, impacts related to construction emissions would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. The MBUAPCD Rule Book contains various rules regulating construction air pollutant emissions, including building materials, asphalt, and demolition. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable MBUAPCD rules which would further reduce project-generated air pollutant emissions.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts related to construction emissions would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact AQ-2 Operation of the proposed project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions. However, emissions would not exceed MBUAPCD operational significance thresholds. Therefore, operational impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

Long-term operational emissions associated with the proposed project are those attributed to vehicle trips (mobile emissions), the use of natural gas and electricity (energy emissions), and consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscape maintenance equipment (area emissions). According to the MBUAPCD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, the proposed number of hotel rooms (41) is below the District's screening level of 880 rooms for potential significant ozone impacts for hotels, which includes increases in vehicular trips and daily operational activities. Therefore, the project would not violate current air quality standards related to ozone.

To calculate non-ozone precursor emissions, CalEEMod was used to calculate emissions based on the land uses for the proposed project and the number of vehicle trips generated by the development. The trip generation rates calculated in the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. (October 2013) were used as inputs for the hotel land use in CalEEMod.

Emission Source	СО	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area	<0.01	0.00	<0.01	<0.01
Energy	0.19	<0.01	0.02	0.02
Mobile	16.55	0.02	1.59	0.44
Total Emissions	16.74	0.02	1.61	0.46
MBUAPCD Thresholds	550	150	82	AAQS ²
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Table 4.2-5 Operational Emissions (lbs/day)

1. Operational emissions based on highest in any season, i.e. Winter or Summer.

2. The project would have a significant impact if emissions would cause or substantially contribute to the violation of State or national ambient air quality standard.

Source: CalEEMod calculations, see Appendix B for calculations.

As shown in Table 4.2-5, overall emissions would not exceed MBUAPCD thresholds. Therefore, operational impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed project pertaining to operational air pollution emissions.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

<u>Level of Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts related to operational emissions would be less than significant without mitigation.

c. Cumulative Impacts. The NCCAB is a non-attainment area for the State standards for ozone and PM₁₀. Any growth within the Monterey Bay area would contribute to existing exceedances of ambient air quality standards when taken as a whole with existing development. As discussed in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. These projects are not anticipated to contribute to an exceedance of ambient air quality standards.

Cumulative impacts to air quality are evaluated under two sets of thresholds for CEQA and MBUAPCD. Consistency with the AQMP is used to determine whether a project would substantially contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. As demonstrated in Table 4.2-3 and Table 4.2-4, the proposed project would not generate emissions exceeding MBUAPCD thresholds. Projects that do not exceed MBUAPCD's construction or operational thresholds are considered consistent with the AQMP. Therefore, because the project does not exceed these thresholds, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to air quality impacts.

4.3 **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

4.3.1 Setting

a. Site Setting. The approximately 1.42-acre project site is a polygonal parcel of land located within the City of Capitola on the northern side of Monterey Bay adjacent to Escalona Gulch (refer to Figures 2-1 and 2-2 in Section 2.0, Project Description). The site is situated on a 95foot high coastal bluff in an area consisting of mostly residential development, with some visitor-serving commercial development (the project site) and natural habitat. The Escalona Drive right of way is located on the eastern edge of the project site. The site has been moderately disturbed by historic residential development and existing use as a hotel. The grounds consist of a mix of native and non-native species, dominated by landscaped ornamental plants. The site is immediately adjacent to the Escalona Gulch Monarch Butterfly Grove (EGMBG). The EGMBG is situated within a deeply incised ravine with a small intermittent stream. The monarch butterfly is considered a sensitive species by the City of Capitola, and Escalona Gulch has been designated as environmentally sensitive habitat under the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP). Vegetation in the surrounding developed areas includes a mix of native and non-native species similar to that on the project site, dominated by ornamental species and residential landscaping. Vegetation along the eastern portion of the project site and the adjacent Escalona Gulch consist of densely wooded areas. The project site is bounded on the south by a steep vegetated coastal bluff and waters of the Monterey Bay.

Topography of the project site is generally flat, sloping slightly to the east toward Escalona Gulch, with elevations ranging from approximately 80 to 95 feet above mean sea level (msl). The Mediterranean climate of the region and the coastal influence produce moderate temperatures throughout the year (average annual low of 45° F, and of high 68° F), with rainfall concentrated in the winter months. Average annual precipitation for the project region is 30.6" with an average of 26" falling between November and March (Western Regional Climate Center, 2013). The sea breeze is a dominant climatic factor in the region that typically flows from the west-southwest in a day-night cycle, with wind speeds generally ranging from 5 to 15 miles per hour. No drainages are located on the project site. Surface runoff from the site drains north and east into Escalona Gulch. Areas surrounding the project site drain towards the Pacific Ocean via Escalona Gulch, or directly into the Pacific off the coastal bluff.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (2013), the soils within the study area consist of Elkhorn sandy loam, 2 to 9% slopes, and Elkhorn-Pfeiffer complex, 30-50% slopes (refer to Figure 4.5-1 in Section 4.5, *Geology*). These soils are well-drained, gravelly fine to coarse loam soils largely weathered in place from sedimentary rocks of marine origin. Hydric soil characteristics were not observed in any of the soils at the project site.

b. Vegetation. The project site consists of a hotel on predominantly landscaped and regularly maintained grounds. The grounds include lawns, gardens and woodlands. The main property and gardens consist of a variety of ornamental annual plants and shrubs and abundant English ivy (*Hedera helix*) and have been mapped as landscape/ruderal. The eastern portion of the project site extends into eucalyptus woodlands that have not been landscaped or maintained. This area is dominated by eucalyptus and pine, with non-native shrubs

(predominately French broom [*Genista monspessulana*]) forming the understory. This portion of the project area forms the northern extent of Escalona Gulch adjacent to the EGMBG. A map showing habitat/vegetation communities on the project site, and the project's relation to the EGMBG is presented in Figure 4.3-1.

The landscaped/ruderal vegetation consists of a variety of ornamental garden species and a number of ornamental and native trees including: blue gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*), Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*), Monterey cypress (*Hesperocyparis macrocarpa*), western red cedar (*Thuja plicata*), cherry (*Prunus* sp.), Yucca (*Yucca* sp.), California fan palm (*Washingtonia filifera*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), big leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), privet (*Ligustrum* sp.), and magnolia (*Magnolia* sp.). The woodland on the east portion of the project site consists of *Eucalyptus globulus* Semi-Natural Woodland Stand (Sawyer et al. 2009), dominated by a dense grove of mature blue gum with some mature Monterey pine. The adjacent woodland within Escalona Gulch consists of a dense stand of blue gum interspersed with some Monterey pine and Monterey cypress. The understory within Escalona Gulch is open with little native vegetation other than poison oak, but within the project site this woodland community includes a denser understory, consisting of willow [*Salix* sp.] and a number of non-native species (blackberry [*Rubus* sp.], acacia [*Acacia* sp.], English ivy, pampas grass [*Cortaderia* sp.], and French broom) that have become naturalized along the margins of the property and on the bluff to the south.

c. Wildlife. The regularly disturbed and maintained, ornamentally landscaped nature of the project site consists of predominantly non-native vegetation, and generally provides poor habitat for wildlife species. Nonetheless, the disturbed and ruderal vegetation on-site does provide habitat for a variety of rural-tolerant species, and the adjacent Escalona Gulch provides wintering habitat for the monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*). Species observed during a site survey conducted by a Rincon Consultants, Inc. biologist in September 2013 included brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis*), western gull (*Larus occidentalis*), Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*), western scrub-jay (*Aphelocoma californica*), chestnutbacked chickadee (*Poecile rufescens*), pigmy nuthatch (*Sitta pygmaea*), Townsand's warbler (*Dendroica townsendi*), and song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*). Monarch butterfly winter roost trees are present in Escalona Gulch adjacent to the project site, but no monarch butterfly roost trees were documented within the project site (ECS, 2013). Four areas on the project site were identified as existing monarch foraging and sunning sites. The project site contains an abundance of English ivy that provides a source of nectar for the monarchs (ECS, 2013).



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013.

Habitat Map

Figure 4.3-1

City of Capitola

d. Special Status Species.

<u>Special Status Plant Species</u>. Based on a review of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB), thirteen special status plant species are known to occur in the vicinity of the project site (within approximately five miles), although none are tracked within the project site. Special status plants included twelve (12) vascular plants and one (1) non-vascular plant as listed below.

- Anderson's manzanita
- Dudley's lousewort
- Loma Prieta hoita
- *maple-leaved checkerbloom*
- marsh microseris
- Monterey spineflower
- robust spineflower

- San Francisco popcornflower
- Santa Cruz clover
- Santa Cruz tarplant
- white-rayed pantachaeta
- woodland woolythreads
- minute pocket moss

Of these species, Monterey spineflower is federally listed as threatened, robust spineflower is federally listed as endangered, San Francisco popcornflower is state listed as endangered, Santa Cruz tarplant is state listed as endangered and federally listed as threatened, and the whiterayed pentachaeta is state and federally listed as endangered (refer to Section 4.3.1[f] [Regulatory Setting] for a description of state and federal species' listing criteria). The remaining species are listed in the California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) as CRPR 1B.1-3, or CRPR 4 species. Species habitat requirement and the assessment for potential to occur on the project site are presented in Table 4.3-1. Due to the disturbed nature of the site, regular landscape maintenance, and non-native woodland vegetation on and adjacent to the project site, the site does not contain suitable habitat for special status plant species. No special status plant species were observed on site during the September 2013 field survey. The potential for special status species to become established is low due to the lack of native vegetation communities on the project site, and regular disturbance (lawn and garden maintenance). Therefore, all special status plant species are considered absent from the site. The site does include special status tree species including Monterey pine and Monterey cypress (Hamb, 2013). However, these trees are only considered special status when occurring as a natural woodland, not as individual trees as they occur on the project site.

Table 4.3-1 Special Status Species	Table 4.3-1	Special Statu	is Species
------------------------------------	-------------	---------------	------------

Scientific Name	Status Fed/State ESA G-Rank/S-Rank CRPR	Habitat Requirements	Potential for Impact	Rationale
Plants				
Arctostaphylos andersonii Anderson's manzanita	1B.2	Broadleaved upland forest, chaparral, north coast coniferous forest. Open sites, redwood forest. 180-800m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Chorizanthe pungens var. pungens Monterey spineflower	1B.2	Coastal dunes, chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub. Sandy soils in coastal dunes or more inland within chaparral or other habitats. 0-150m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Chorizanthe robusta var. robusta robust spineflower	FE 1B.1	Cismontane woodland, coastal dunes, coastal scrub sandy terraces and bluffs or in loose sand. 3-120m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Fissidens pauperculus</i> minute pocket moss	1B.2	Bare gravelly soil in dried stream beds and on banks, sometimes found with <i>F. crispus</i> , often associated with the Coast Redwood Forest	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Hoita strobilina</i> Loma Prieta hoita	1B.1	Chaparral, cismontane woodland, riparian woodland. Serpentine; mesic sites.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Holocarpha macradenia</i> Santa Cruz tarplant	FE/SE/ 1B.1	Coastal prairie, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland. Light, sandy soil or sandy clay; often with nonnatives. 10-220 m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Monolopia gracilens</i> woodland woolythreads	1B.2	Chaparral, valley and foothill grasslands (serpentine), cismontane woodland, broadleafed upland forests, grassy sites, in openings; sandy to rocky soils. Often seen on serpentine after burns.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Microseris paludosa</i> marsh microseris	1B.2	Closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub valley and foothill grassland.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Pedicularis dudleyi</i> Dudley's lousewort	SR/1B.2	Chaparral, north coast coniferous forest, valley and foothill grassland. Deep shady woods of older coast redwood forests; also in maritime chaparral. 60-900 m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Pentachaeta bellidiflora white-rayed pantachaeta	FE/SE/ 1B.1	Valley and foothill grassland, cismontane woodland. Open dry rocky slopes and grassy areas, often on soils derived from serpentine bedrock. 35-620 m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site

Scientific Name	Status Fed/State ESA G-Rank/S-Rank CRPR	Habitat Requirements	Potential for Impact	Rationale
<i>Plagiobothrys diffusus</i> San Francisco popcornflower	1B.2	Chaparral, coastal scrub, coastal prairie. Mesic sites from 15-100m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Sidalcea malachroides maple-leaved checkerbloom	4.2	Broadleafed upland forest, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, north coast coniferous forest. Woodlands and clearings near coast; often in disturbed areas. 2-760m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Trifolium buckwestiorum</i> Santa Cruz clover	1B.1	Coastal prairie, broadleafed upland forest, cismontane woodland. Moist grassland. Gravelly margins. 105-610 m.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Invertebrates				
<i>Cicindela ohlone</i> Ohlone tiger beetle	FE/S1	Remnant native grasslands with California oatgrass and purple needlegrass in Santa Cruz County. Substrate is poorly-drained clay or sandy clay soil over bedrock of Santa Cruz mudstone.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Coelus globosus</i> globose dune beetle	S1	Inhabitant of coastal sand dune habitat; erratically distributed from ten mile creek in Mendocino county south to Ensena. Inhabits fore-dunes and sand hummocks; it burrows beneath the sand surface and is most common beneath dune vegetation.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Danaus plexippus</i> Monarch butterfly	S3	Winter roost sites extend along the coast from northern Mendocino to Baja California, Mexico. Roosts located in wind-protected tree groves (eucalyptus, Monterey pine, cypress), with nectar and water sources nearby.	High	The project site is adjacent to a known winter roosting site, and the species has been recorded feeding and sunning on the project site.
<i>Linderiella occidentalis</i> Claifonria linderiella	S2S3	Seasonal pools in unplowed grasslands with old alluvial soils underlain by hardpan or in sandstone depressions.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Lytta moesta</i> moestan blister beetle	\$2	Adult meloids are often found on flowers. There is no published information on habitat or floral visitation records for <i>Lytta moesta</i> .	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site

Table 4.3-1 Spe	cial Status Species
-----------------	---------------------

Scientific Name	Status Fed/State ESA G-Rank/S-Rank CRPR	Habitat Requirements	Potential for Impact	Rationale
<i>Trimerotropis infantilis</i> Zayante band-winged grasshopper	FE	Isolated sandstone deposits in the Santa Cruz Mountains (the Zayante Sand Hills ecosystem) Mostly on sand parkland habitat but also in areas with well-developed ground cover and in sparse chaparral with grass.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Tryonia imitator</i> California brackish-water snail	S2S3	Inhabits coastal lagoons, estuaries and salt marshes, from Sonoma County south to San Diego county. Found only in permanently submerged areas in a variety of sediment types; able to withstand a wide range of salinities.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Fish				
<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i> coho salmon	FE/SE	Federal listing for populations between Punta Gorda and San Lorenzo River. State listing for populations south of Punta Gorda. Require beds of loose, silt-free, coarse gravel for spawning. Also need cover, cool water and sufficient dissolved oxygen.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus steelhead	FT/SSC	Federal listing refers to runs in coastal basins from the Pajaro River south to, but not including, the Santa Maria River.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i> tidewater goby	FE/SSC	Brackish water habitats along the California coast from Agua Hedionda Lagoon, San Diego Co. to the mouth of the Smith River. Found in shallow lagoons and lower stream reaches, they need fairly still but not stagnant water & high oxygen levels.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Amphibians				
Ambystoma macrodactylum croceum Santa Cruz long-toed salamander	FE/SE	Wet meadows near sea level in a few restricted locales in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties. Aquatic larvae prefer shallow (<12 inches) water, using clumps of vegetation or debris for cover. Adults use mammal burrows	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Rana boylii foothill yellow-legged frog	SSC	Partly-shaded, shallow streams & riffles with a rocky substrate in a variety of habitats. Need at least some cobble-sized substrate for egg-laying.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site

Table 4.3-1 Special Status Specie

Scientific Name	Status Fed/State ESA G-Rank/S-Rank CRPR	Habitat Requirements	Potential for Impact	Rationale
<i>Rana draytonii</i> California red-legged frog	FT/SSC	Lowlands & foothills in or near permanent sources of deep water with dense, shrubby or emergent riparian vegetation. Requires 11-20 weeks of permanent water for larval development. Must have access to estivation habitat.	Low	There is no suitable breeding habitat on the project site; however the species could disperse across the site during and immediately following precipitation event.
Reptiles				
Anniella pulchra nigra black legless lizard	SSC	Sand dunes and sandy soils in the Monterey Bay and Morro Bay regions. Inhabit sandy soil/dune areas with bush lupine and mock heather as dominant plants. Moist soil is essential.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Emys marmorata</i> western pond turtle	SSC	A thoroughly aquatic turtle of ponds, marshes, rivers, streams and irrigation ditches, usually with aquatic vegetation. Requires basking sites and suitable (sandy banks or grassy open fields) upland habitat up to 0.5 km from water for egg-laying.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Birds				
Agelaius tricolor tricolored blackbird	SSC	Highly colonial species, most numerous in Central Valley and vicinity. Largely endemic to California. Requires open water, protected nesting substrate, and foraging area with insect prey within a few km of the colony.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Ardea Herodias</i> great blue heron	S4	Colonial nester in tall trees, cliffsides, and sequestered spots on marshes. Rookery sites in close proximity to foraging areas: marshes, lake margins, tide-flats, rivers and streams, wet meadows.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus western snowy plover	FE/SSC	Sandy beaches, salt pond levees & shores of large alkali lakes. Needs sandy, gravelly or friable soils for nesting.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site

Table 4.3-1	Special Status	Species
-------------	----------------	---------

Scientific Name	Status Fed/State ESA G-Rank/S-Rank CRPR	Habitat Requirements	Potential for Impact	Rationale
<i>Cypseloides niger</i> black swift	SSC	Coastal belt of Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, central & southern Sierra Nevada; San Bernardino and San Jacinto Mountains. Breeds in small colonies on cliffs behind or adjacent to waterfalls in deep canyons and sea- bluffs above the surf.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
<i>Riparia riparia</i> bank swallow	SE	Colonial nester; nests primarily in riparian and other lowland habitats west of the desert. Requires vertical banks/cliffs with fine- textured/sandy soils near streams, rivers, lakes, ocean to dig nesting hole.	None	There is no suitable natural habitat present on the project site
Mammals				
<i>Antrozous pallidus</i> pallid bat	SSC	Deserts, grasslands, shrublands, woodlands & forests. Most common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting. Roosts must protect bats from high temperatures.	Low	No suitable roosting habitat is present on site. There is a single occurrence of this species from 1928 recorded in the CNDDB from within five miles of the project site. The project site could be used for foraging.
<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i> hoary bat	S4?	Prefers open habitats or habitat mosaics, with access to trees for cover & open areas or habitat edges for feeding. Roosts in dense foliage of medium to large trees.	Low	There is a single occurrence of this species from 1940 recorded in the CNDDB from within 5 miles of the project site. The site contains marginal roosting habitat, and the species could forage on the site.

Regional Vicinity refers to within a 5 mile radius of site. FE = Federally Endangered; FT = Federally Threatened; SE = State Endangered; ST = State Threatened; SR = State Rare; G-Rank/S-Rank = Global Rank and State Rank as per NatureServe and CDFW's CNDDB RareFind3; SSC = CDFW California Species of Special Concern CRPR (CNPS California Rare Plant Rank): 1A=Presumed Extinct in California; 1B=Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and elsewhere; 2=Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California, but more common elsewhere; 3=Need more information (a Review List); 4=Plants of Limited Distribution (a Watch List) CRPR Threat Code Extension: .1=Seriously endangered in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat); .2=Fairly endangered in California (20-80% occurrences threatened).

<u>Special Status Wildlife Species</u>. Based on the CNDDB review (see Figure 4.3-2), twenty one (21) special status wildlife species have been recorded in the vicinity of the project site (within approximately five miles), although none are tracked within the project site. These species include seven invertebrates, three fish, two amphibians, two reptiles, five birds, and two mammals as listed below and shown in Table 4.3-1:

- globose dune beetle
- California brackish-water snail
- Claifonria linderiella
- moestan blister beetle
- monarch butterfly,
- Ohlone tiger beetle
- Zayante band-winged grasshopper
- coho salmon
- steelhead tidewater goby
- Santa Cruz long-toed salamander,

- foothill yellow-legged frog
- black legless lizard
- western pond turtle
- bank swallow
- black swift
- great blue heron
- tricolored blackbird
- western snowy plover
- hoary bat
- pallid bat

Of these 21 species, eight are federally and/or state listed as threatened or endangered (Zayante band-winged grasshopper, Ohlone tiger beetle, tidewater goby, coho salmon, steelhead, Santa Cruz long-toed salamander, western snowy plover and bank swallow). Species habitat requirement and the assessment for potential to occur on the project site are presented in Table 4.1-1. Based on the lack of suitable habitat, except for the California red-legged frog, none of these federally and/or state listed species would be expected to occur on the project site, and the project site is not located within critical habitat for any listed species. Although there are no occurrences within five miles of the project site, the federally threatened California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*) is known to occur in riparian areas similar to Escalona Gulch within the region, and this species is further evaluated below. Because of the disturbed nature of the project site, lack of native and/or suitable habitat, and lack of native vegetation on the project site, nine of the remaining twelve species are not expected to occur on the project site. However, there are known occurrences or potential for monarch butterfly, pallid bat, and hoary bat to occur on the site and these species are further evaluated below. The potential for birds to nest and breed on the project is also discussed.

Special Status Bats. Two special status bat species (hoary and pallid) have been recorded within five miles of the project site; however, both records are from 1940 or earlier.

The hoary bat is the most widespread North American bat, and may be found at any location in California. This common, solitary species winters along the coast and in southern California, breeding inland and north of the winter range. During migration in southern California, males are found in foothills, deserts and mountains; females in lowlands and coastal valleys. The species generally roosts in dense foliage of medium to large trees. Preferred sites are hidden from above, with few branches below, and have ground cover of low reflectivity. Females and young tend to roost at higher sites in trees. The species prefers open habitats or habitat mosaics, with access to trees for cover and open areas or habitat edges for feeding. Individuals wintering in cold climates hibernate, but may be active on warm winter days, and the species tolerates a



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013. California Natural Diversity Database, October, 2012. Additional suppressed records reported by the CNNDB known to occur or potentially occur within this search radius include: Monarch Butterfly.



- 1 Anderson's manzanita
- 2 bank swallow
- 3 black legless lizard
- 4 black swift
- 5 California linderiella
- coast ESU
- 7 Dudley's lousewort8 foothill yellow-legged frog
- 0 globace dure beetle
- 9 globose dune beetle
- 10 great blue heron
- 11 hoary bat
- 12 Loma Prieta hoita

- 13 maple-leaved checkerbloom 14 - marsh microseris
- 15 mimic tryonia (=California brackishwater snail)
- 16 minute pocket moss
- 6 coho salmon central California 17 moestan blister beetle
 - 18 monarch butterfly
 - 19 Monterey spineflower
 - 20 North Central Coast Drainage
 - Sacramento Sucker/Roach River
 - 21 Ohlone tiger beetle 34
 - 22 pallid bat
 - 23 robust spineflower

- 24 San Francisco popcornflower
- 25 Santa Cruz clover
- 26 Santa Cruz long-toed salamander
- 27 Santa Cruz tarplant
- 28 steelhead central California
- coast DPS
- 29 tidewater goby 30 - tricolored blackbird
- 31 western pond turtle
- 32 western snowy plover
- 33 white-rayed pentachaeta
- 34 woodland woollythreads
- 35 Zayante band-winged
- grasshopper

CNDDB Occurances Within 5 Miles

Figure 4.3-2



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013.

Monarch Butterfly Map

Figure 4.3-3

City of Capitola

wide range of air temperatures, having been found foraging at temperatures of 32-72 degrees Fahrenheit (° F) (Harris, 1988-1990a).

The pallid bat is a locally common species of low elevations in California. It occurs throughout California except for the high Sierra Nevada from Shasta to Kern counties, and the northwestern corner of the state from Del Norte and western Siskiyou counties to northern Mendocino County. A wide variety of habitats are occupied, including grasslands, shrublands, woodlands, and forests from sea level up through mixed conifer forests. The species is most common in open, dry habitats with rocky areas for roosting, and is a yearlong resident in most of the range. Day roosts are in caves, crevices, mines, and occasionally in hollow trees and buildings. Roosts must protect bats from high temperatures, and bats move deeper into cover if temperatures rise. Night roosts may be in more open sites, such as porches and open buildings. Few hibernation sites are known, but the species probably uses rock crevices. Foraging is generally around rocky outcrops, cliffs, and crevices with access to open habitats (Harris, 1988-1990b).

Both species could use the site for foraging, although the project site and surrounding area consist of marginal habitat for the pallid bat. The dense stands of blue gum within the adjacent Escalona Gulch may provide suitable winter roosting habitat for the hoary bat, but the project site does not contain suitable breeding or maternity roosting habitat for either species.

Migratory Birds. Bird nesting activity typically occurs between February 15 and August 31, but varies depending upon the species and climatic conditions. Larger animals, such as raptors, may begin breeding earlier in the year (January) and frequently have young that are dependent on the nest as late as mid-September. Hummingbirds have been recorded to nest year-round in more temperate coastal environments. In good years, many birds species may breed more than once in a season, and second nesting attempts can begin in June or July, further extending the breeding period. Nesting birds and particularly raptor nests are protected by FGC Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3511, 3513 and 3800. Most birds are also regulated under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA). Bird activity was moderate during the site visit in September 2013, and no bird species were observed nesting or breeding on-site. However, nesting this late in the season is rare. The project site does not contain suitable nesting habitat for any of the five special status bird species recorded within five miles of the project site; however, the project site does include an abundance of trees and vegetative cover that could provide nesting and perch locations for a variety of other bird species that would be protected under the MBTA and Fish and Game Code.

<u>Protected Trees.</u> All trees on public and private property in the city of Capitola (with the exception of fruit-bearing trees) are provided protections under the Capitola Municipal Code (Ord. 863 § 2, 2004).

<u>Sensitive Plant Communities/Habitats</u>. The CNDDB identified one sensitive community within a five-mile radius of the project site: North Central Coast Drainage Sacramento Sucker/River Roach, which occurs as a drainage into the Pacific Ocean approximately 3.85 miles west of the project site. This sensitive community does not occur on the project site.

e. Wildlife Movement. Wildlife movement corridors, or habitat linkages, are generally defined as connections between habitat patches that allow for physical and genetic exchange between otherwise isolated animal populations. Such linkages may serve a local purpose, such as providing a linkage between foraging and denning areas, or they may be regional in nature. Some habitat linkages may serve as migration corridors, wherein animals periodically move away from an area and then subsequently return. Others may be important as dispersal corridors for young animals. A group of habitat linkages in an area can form a wildlife corridor network. These features are important for native wildlife that depend on connectivity between and among larger areas of natural habitat that are or have become fragmented at some geographic level.

Smaller areas surrounded primarily by development, such as the subject property, do not generally contain major wildlife movement corridors within their boundaries. Rather, they may lie along or within such a corridor, or they may only contain smaller, secondary movement pathways or trail systems. Movement pathways provide routes of travel for highly mobile species, such as mule deer, coyote, mountain lion, black bear, bobcat, and some bird species, but by themselves rarely serve to maintain individual population vigor or support the species on a broad geographic scale. Pathways may become well established, but may be altered should obstructions occur, depending on availability of alternative routes. Movement pathways occur at a small scale, typically in terms of a few feet wide to a few hundred feet wide, such as the width of a stream or riparian cover can be important to local species survival, especially when alternative routes are lacking.

The project site and Escalona Gulch have become relatively isolated by residential development in the surrounding area. Wildlife movement that may occur between Escalona Gulch and more natural lands to the north would occur along a narrow corridor of coast to the east and then north along existing riparian corridors. The degree of disturbance and human activity at the project site and the extent of residential development surrounding the area would preclude substantial wildlife movement for most terrestrial species within or through the Monarch Cove Inn project site itself. However, this site is adjacent to the EGMBG, a known area for monarch winter roosting, and winter roosting locations are critical aspects of the monarchs' migratory activity, making this an important site for monarch migration. Disruption of wintering habitat would result in a disruption to monarch migratory patterns, and could have a significant impact to the species.

f. Regulatory Setting. Special-status habitats are vegetation types, associations, or subassociations that support concentrations of special-status plant or wildlife species, are of relatively limited distribution, or are of particular value to wildlife.

Listed species are those taxa that are formally listed as endangered or threatened by the federal government (e.g. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS]), pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) or as endangered, threatened, or rare (for plants only) by the State of California (i.e. California Fish and Game Commission), pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act or the California Native Plant Protection Act. Some species are considered rare (but not formally listed) by resource agencies, organizations with biological interests/expertise (e.g. Audubon Society, California Native Plant Society [CNPS], The Wildlife Society), and the scientific community.

The following is a brief summary of the regulatory context under which biological resources are managed at the federal, state, and local levels. A number of federal and state statutes provide a regulatory structure that guides the protection of biological resources. Agencies with the responsibility for protection of biological resources within the project site include:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (federally listed species and migratory birds);
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (wetlands and other waters of the United States);
- California Department Fish and Wildlife (riparian areas and other waters of the State, state-listed species);
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (waters of the State);
- City of Capitola General Plan
- City of Capitola Local Coastal Program
- *City of Capitola Municipal Ordinance*

Federal.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The USFWS implements the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 United States Code [USC] Section 703-711) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) (16 USC Section 668). The USFWS and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) share responsibility for implementing the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) (16 USC § 153 et seq.). The USFWS generally implements the FESA for terrestrial and freshwater species, while the NMFS implements the FESA for marine and anadramous species. Projects that would result in "take" of any federally listed threatened or endangered species are required to obtain permits from the USFWS or NMFS through either Section 7 (interagency consultation with a federal nexus) or Section 10 (Habitat Conservation Plan) of FESA, depending on the involvement by the federal government in permitting and/or funding of the project. The permitting process is used to determine if a project would jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species and what measures would be required to avoid jeopardizing the species. "Take" under federal definition means to harass, harm (which includes habitat modification), pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Proposed or candidate species do not have the full protection of FESA; however, the USFWS and NMFS advise project applicants that they could be elevated to listed status at any time.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has authority to regulate activities that could discharge fill of material or otherwise adversely modify wetlands or other "waters of the United States." Perennial and intermittent creeks are considered waters of the United States if they are hydrologically connected to other jurisdictional waters. The USACE also implements the federal policy embodied in Executive Order 11990, which is intended to result in no net loss of wetland value or acres. In achieving the goals of the Clean Water Act, the USACE seeks to avoid adverse impacts and offset unavoidable adverse impacts on existing aquatic resources. Any fill or adverse modification of wetlands that are hydrologically connected to jurisdictional waters would require a permit from the USACE prior to the start of work. Typically, when a project involves impacts to waters of the United States, the goal of no net loss of wetland acres or values is met through compensatory mitigation involving creation or enhancement of similar habitats.
State.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) derives its authority from the Fish and Game Code of California (FGC). The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (FGC Section 2050 et. seq.) prohibits take of state listed threatened, endangered or fully protected species. Take under CESA is restricted to direct mortality of a listed species and does not prohibit indirect harm by way of habitat modification. The CDFW also prohibits take for species designated as Fully Protected under the Code.

California Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3511 describe unlawful take, possession, or destruction of birds, nests, and eggs. Fully protected birds (Section 3511) may not be taken or possessed except under specific permit. Section 3503.5 of the Code protects all birds-of-prey and their eggs and nests against take, possession, or destruction of nests or eggs.

Species of Special Concern (SSC) is a category used by the CDFW for those species which are considered to be indicators of regional habitat changes or are considered to be potential future protected species. Species of Special Concern do not have any special legal status except that which may be afforded by the Fish and Game Code as noted above. The SSC category is intended by the CDFW for use as a management tool to include these species into special consideration when decisions are made concerning the development of natural lands. The CDFW also has authority to administer the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) (Fish and Game Code Section 1900 et seq.). The NPPA requires the CDFW to establish criteria for determining if a species, subspecies, or variety of native plant is endangered or rare. Under Section 1913(c) of the NPPA, the owner of land where a rare or endangered native plant is growing is required to notify the department at least 10 days in advance of changing the land use to allow for salvage of plant.

Perennial and intermittent streams and associated riparian vegetation, when present, also fall under the jurisdiction of the CDFW. Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code (Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements) gives the CDFW regulatory authority over work within the stream zone (which could extend to the 100-year flood plain) consisting of, but not limited to, the diversion or obstruction of the natural flow or changes in the channel, bed, or bank of any river, stream or lake.

Regional Water Quality Control Board. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the local Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) have jurisdiction over "waters of the State," pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, which are defined as any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the State. The SWRCB has issued general Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) regarding discharges to "isolated" waters of the State (Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ, Statewide General Waste Discharge Requirements for Dredged or Fill Discharges to Waters Deemed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to be Outside of Federal Jurisdiction). The Central Coast RWQCB enforces actions under this general order for isolated waters not subject to federal jurisdiction, and is also responsible for the issuance of water quality certifications pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act for waters subject to federal jurisdiction.

Coastal Act. One Coastal Act policy is directly relevant to this project as presented here (Section 30240):

- a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on such resources shall be allowed within such areas.
- b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.

Local.

City of Capitola General Plan. The City of Capitola General Plan is currently being updated. As of December 2013, this updated General Plan is in public draft review and comment form and has not been adopted by the City of Capitola to supersede its existing 1989 General Plan. Therefore, only policies from the 1989 City of Capitola General Plan are included in regulatory setting considered by this EIR. The 1989 General Plan Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element outlines goals that include the preservation of significant natural resources including creeks, gulches and major tree cover, and identifies the area of Escalona Gulch as existing open space (Capitola General Plan Open Space Map, p. 31). The General Plan presents policies from the Local Coastal Program (LCP) to protect natural areas, and these are presented in more detail below. The General Plan Conservation Element includes a single goal to "Protect and preserve the natural resources within the Capitola area." The Conservation Element identifies natural resources areas within the City, including the EGMBG located adjacent to the project site (Capitola General Plan Location of Monarch Butterfly Groves map, p. 43), and identifies and describes the importance of monarch butterfly wintering habitats. The General Plan refers readers to the LCP for an in-depth examination of the natural resources in the Capitola community, a discussion of management concerns, and the discussion of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Regulations and Guidelines. This information is discussed in more detail in the following section.

City of Capitola Local Coastal Program. The LCP includes a local government's land use plans, zoning ordinance, zoning district maps and other implementing actions, which, when taken together, meet the requirements of, and implement the provisions and policies of the Coastal Act. The City of Capitola has adopted the policies of the Coastal Act (State Law- Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 30200-30264) as the guiding policies of the LCP Land Use Plan, and the LCP has been adopted as an amendment to the Capitola General Plan. Section VI (Natural Systems) of the LCP outlines the definitions of Environmentally Sensitive Areas and wetlands (including EGMBG), as defined by the Coastal Act, and provides the relevant Coastal Act policies that are pertinent to these habitats (see Coastal Act section above). The City of Capitola LCP also outlines locally unique wildlife habitats and existing policies and regulations designed to protect these habitats and associated biological resources as presented below:

<u>Policy VI-2</u> It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to protect, maintain and, where possible, enhance the environmentally sensitive and locally unique habitats within its coastal zone, including dedication and/or acquisition of scenic conservation easements for protection of the natural environment. All

developments approved by the City within or adjacent to these areas must be found to be protective of the long-term maintenances of these habitats.

Policy VI-10
a) It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to protect the winter resting sites of the Monarch Butterfly in the eucalyptus groves of Escalona Gulch, New Brighton Gulch, and Soquel Creek as designated on Map VI-2 by requiring detailed analysis of the impacts of development on the habitat.
b) It is the goal of the City to preserve the monarch butterfly overwintering site in the area known as Escalona Gulch. Preservation, based on the information presented in the Environmental Impact Report dated March 1991 prepared for the site, requires that development be limited to 6,000 square feet and does not have a total footprint of more than 4,000 square feet. The building(s) shall be located and designed so that they do not have a significant adverse impact on the monarch butterfly habitat. The habitat, and area around it necessary to preserve the habitat, shall be placed in a conservation easement at the time of development.¹

Any significant change in the site conditions, relevant new scientific information, or change in proposal shall be reviewed through a supplemental environmental evaluation and could require an amendment to this policy.

City of Capitola Municipal Code. The City of Capitola Municipal Code includes provisions and regulations for development in and adjacent to established Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) (including EGMBG) and within the Coastal Zone as established in the LCP. According to Section 17.95.060 and 17.95.061 of the Capitola Municipal Code, any development within and adjacent to Escalona Gulch and the EGMBG must adhere to a number of regulations to prevent impacts to the monarch butterfly, or impacts that would significantly degrade the area. Capitola Municipal Code 17.46.090 (Coastal Zone) includes additional conditions to protect biological resources and monarch butterflies. These regulations outline measures to protect monarch butterflies and ESHAs including, but not limited to, required studies for documenting the extent and distribution of monarch roosts and foraging areas, prohibition of construction activity on and adjacent to the EGMBG during fall and winter months when butterflies are present, development of landscaping plans that maintain and enhance monarch habitats, prohibition of the development and removal of trees in specific areas through conservation easements, special protection for trees within the ESH, identification of specific types of plants to provide forage for butterflies to be used in landscaping, and identification of construction BMPs to prevent impacts to butterflies during construction.

The City's Municipal Code includes provisions to protect trees within the City with a policy "to protect the locally significant, scenic and mature trees as listed in the heritage tree list." A "heritage" tree is any locally significant, scenic and mature tree growing on public or private property that is listed on the city's adopted heritage tree list. The trees on the project site are not considered "heritage" trees under City of Capitola regulations (Chapter 12.12 – Community Tree and Forest Management) as they are not on an adopted list. However, removal of non-heritage trees requires a permit pursuant to section 12.12.160 of the City's Municipal Code.

¹ It should be noted that section (b) of this policy pertains to a specific land division application (Escalona Woods) and does not apply to the proposed project.

All non-fruit bearing trees on public and private property in the City of Capitola are provided protections under the Capitola Municipal Code through provisions for the protection, management and maintenance of trees within the City of Capitola (Section 12.12.130), provisions for tree permits (12.12.180) and provisions tree replacement (Section 12.12.190).

4.3.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. The following analysis is based on a site survey by a Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) biologist in September 2013, review of existing literature and sensitive species occurrence databases, a *Report on Overwintering Monarch Butterflies* prepared for the project (Entomological Consulting Services, Ltd. [ECS], 2013), and a *Tree Resource Evaluation* prepared for the project site (Hamb, 2013). The *Report on Overwintering Monarch* Butterflies and *Tree Resources Evaluation* were peer reviewed by Rincon biologists and are included as Appendix C to this EIR. Special status species databases and lists reviewed during this analysis include the CNDDB (CDFW, 2003), the CNPS Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS, 2013), the Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS; CDFW 2013a), the USFWS Critical Habitat Portal (USFWS 2013), the CDFW Special Animals List (CDFG 2011), and the Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List (CDFW 2013b).

Chapter 1, Section 21001(c) of CEQA states that it is the policy of the state of California to: "Prevent the elimination of fish and wildlife species due to man's activities, ensure that fish and wildlife populations do not drop below self-perpetuating levels, and preserve for future generations representations of all plant and animal communities." Environmental impacts relative to biological resources may be assessed using Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines* and federal, state, and local plans, regulations, and ordinances. Project impacts to flora and fauna may be determined to be significant even if they do not directly affect rare, threatened, or endangered species. The project would have a significant impact if it were found to:

- 1) 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;
- 2) 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
- 3) 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;
- 4) 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;
- 5) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and/or
- 6) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

As noted in the Initial Study prepared for the project (refer to Appendix A), the project site is not within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan area. Therefore, this issue is not further addressed in this section.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact BIO-1 The proposed project may result in the loss of monarch foraging and sunning areas on the project site, and have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications on monarch butterfly. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

The project site provides suitable foraging and sunning habitat for the monarch butterfly and project development would directly and indirectly impact the monarch butterfly. The project site is located immediately adjacent to the EGMBG, and the site includes monarch foraging and sunning habitat as mapped by ECS (2013) in four areas of the project site (see areas one through four on Figure 4.3-3). These areas all have southern exposures and receive full sunlight at midday, providing foraging areas, sunning areas, or both (ECS, 2013). The project design avoids removal of most large trees on the project site, and no monarch roost trees would be removed. The proposed new Main Building and Bayview Building would both provide some additional wind protection to the roost trees, as they would be 26 and 30 feet tall, respectively. Most of the trees that the wintering monarch utilized for sunning, as well as much of the ivy used for foraging at areas one and three grow at or just beyond the property boundaries of the Monarch Cove Inn. Shadows from the proposed new building would be cast upon portions of the current sunning and foraging areas one, two, and four during daytime as described in ECS (2013) (also see Figure 4.3-3 for mid-day shade at winter solstice resulting from proposed development). Area three would be completely lost by development of the proposed new Main Building and its courtyard. The shading study of the planned new structures (see figure 4.3-3) illustrates that much of the currently utilized foraging and sunning areas at the property would be shaded by the proposed new buildings at the height of the overwintering period of the monarch (i.e., at the winter solstice).

Smoke from wood burning fireplaces (or when items are burned in gas fireplaces) can cause adverse problems for the wintering monarch butterfly (ECS, 2013). The proposed guest room fireplaces and outdoor fire pits (even if powered with gas) have the potential to impact wintering monarchs, as smoke from open fires or items placed in gas-powered fires irritates butterflies potentially causing them to abandon their wintering roosts (ECS, 2013).

Thus, without mitigation, the project would result in a reduction of foraging and sunning areas that are currently used by the monarch, and would create smoke that may cause monarchs to avoid all or parts of the EGMBG. Adult monarchs need a minimum temperature of about 58° F to become active. On many days during the wintering period, the daily high temperature may exceed this threshold by only a few degrees. Thus, the presence of sheltered foraging and sunning areas near the EGMBG and its associated roost trees is likely an important factor in maintaining Escalona Gulch as a viable overwintering site for the monarch butterfly. Mitigation measures are therefore required to protect monarch butterflies and the EGMBG and reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> The Conservation Element of the City of Capitola General Plan and the City of Capitola LCP identify the EGMBG as an ESH area. Section 30240 of the Coastal Act include policies designed to protect Environmentally Sensitive habitats such as monarch butterfly wintering habitat, and Policies VI-2 and VI-10 of the LCP provide specifically for the protection of EGMBG. Section 17.95.060 and 17.95.061 of the Capitola Municipal Code require any development within and adjacent to Escalona Gulch and the EGMBG must adhere to a number of regulations to prevent impacts to the monarch butterfly. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable city and state regulations and policies related to ESHAs, which would reduce project impacts to sensitive habitats.

Mitigation Measures. The following mitigation measures are required.

- BIO-1(a) **Preconstruction Surveys and Construction Timing.** At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction or any site preparation activities, the applicant shall deposit adequate funds to the Community Development Department to retain a qualified monarch butterfly biologist. A pre-construction meeting shall be held at least 7 working days prior to initiation of any construction or site disturbance. The biological monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting. Construction activities shall not be allowed during the wintering period of the monarch butterfly (the exact timing of monarch arrival and departure may vary from year to year but the wintering period is generally October 1 to March 1) unless absence of monarchs within the EGMBG has been determined by a monarch butterfly survey conducted by the qualified monarch butterfly biologist. Construction can only occur during the wintering period if monarchs are not present at the site or within the adjacent EGMBG. Prior to any construction scheduled during the wintering period, a survey for monarch butterfly aggregation sites or individuals shall be conducted within the project area and adjacent EGMBH. The survey shall be conducted by the qualified monarch biologist to confirm whether butterflies are still present or have left the roost site. If wintering monarchs are present no construction activity will be allowed until after the wintering period.
- **BIO-1(b) Revegetation Plan.** A revegetation plan shall be developed for the project site. The plan shall be prepared by a habitat restoration specialist with input from a monarch butterfly expert, and shall identify and quantify impacts to existing trees and to existing monarch butterfly habitat, identify suitable species for tree replacement and landscaping, identify locations for plantings associated with new tree windbreak areas and monarch foraging habitat, and develop a plan for the long-term replacement of invasive English Ivy on the project site with suitable native species. The plan shall be developed prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, and shall include planting and irrigation specifications, and define success criteria and remedial measures if success criteria are

not met. The plan shall ensure that monarch butterfly habitat is replaced at a minimum ratio of 1:1 and that trees are replaced at a minimum ratio of 3:1, or at a sufficient level determined by a qualified biologist to provide equal or greater monarch butterfly habitat functions and values, and that the new landscape meets the requirement to mitigate for the loss of existing foraging and sunning habitat from project development. The plan shall include at a minimum the following details:

Tree Replacement. Any trees (including fruit-bearing trees) that are removed to accommodate the project shall be replaced at a 3:1 ratio. Figure 4.3-3 provides recommended areas (labeled "Proposed Wind Buffer Planting Areas") for landscaping trees to provide additional windbreak at the project site. Prior to issuance of grading and tree removal permits, a revised landscaping plan shall be prepared to include the replacement of all trees at a 3:1 ratio, and the plan shall be reviewed by a monarch butterfly expert to ensure consistency with required monarch butterfly habitat improvement measures. Trees that are removed shall be replaced with similar-sized mitigation trees if possible, to maintain secondary wind protection function for the main roost site at Escalona Gulch. Smaller trees can be used for replacement when similar sized trees are not available. Evergreen tree species that provide good windscreen function include Coast redwood (Sequoia sempervirens), Monterey Cypress, Swamp mahogany (Eucalyptus robusta), Sydney blue gum (Eucalyptus saligna), Coolibah (Eucalyptus *microthecd*).

Tree and Shrub Protection. Trees, shrubs, and vines that would not be removed during construction shall be protected by construction fencing and all workers shall be advised of the need to avoid damage to these areas and the plants in them. Warning signs shall be placed on the construction fencing to ensure all vegetation is protected. Project biologist shall supervise all staking and fencing installation.

New Shrub Plantings. The revegetation plan shall incorporate additional plantings of preferred nectar plants to enable monarchs to continue to forage in the remaining sunlit portions of currently utilized foraging areas. These additional plantings shall include a mixture of flowering vines and shrubs. Vines such as California blackberry (*Rubus* sp.), and Lauraltinus (*Viburnum tinus*) shall be placed to grow on selected retained trees and shrubs, as well as fences or other structures such as trellises. Shrubs, such as Bottlebrush (*Callistemon citrinus*), California lilac (*Ceanothus cuneatus* var. *cuneatus*), Pride of Madeira (*Echium candicans*), Escalonia (*Escalonia* spp.), would be suitable. The use of low-growing nectar plants shall be avoided in these areas so foraging areas are not shaded by taller vegetation or nearby structures. *Long-Term Plan for English Ivy.* Even though it is an invasive, existing stands of English Ivy shall be retained to the extent practical at the Monarch Cove Inn during construction and landscaping. In addition, it shall be planted at other locations on the grounds of the Monarch Cove Inn as an interim source of nectar until other non-invasive species have fully developed. Ivy shall be planted prior to construction in portions of the grounds where construction activities would not occur and be available to wintering monarchs before the project begins. Other nectar plants would require a period of years to mature and provide adequate, substitute sources of nectar for wintering monarchs. During this interim period, ivy would remain an important nectar source for the monarch. A phased plan to remove English ivy from the project site shall be developed, and as the other species of nectar plants mature and flower, the amount of ivy shall be gradually reduced and ultimately removed from the grounds of the Monarch Cove Inn. Annual post-construction monitoring shall occur for a period of 5 to 10 years to document that the other nectar plants survive, mature, and fulfill their function as substitute nectar sources for the butterfly before all ivy is removed. The period of monitoring shall be determined by a qualified restoration ecologist with support from a monarch butterfly expert. The extent of monitoring shall depend on the time needed for native nectar plants to become established, and shall ensure that natural foraging habitat is sufficiently developed so as to support wintering monarch butterfly, prior to the final removal of all English ivy.

Long-Term Monitoring. The Revegetation Plan shall include specifications for a long-term monitoring effort (up to 5 years or until success criteria is met) by a habitat restoration specialist. If success has not been documented after five years of monitoring, the remedial methods shall be initiated. Annual reports shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review.

Financial Responsibility. The applicant shall be required to deposit adequate funds to Community Development Department to retain a habitat restoration specialist, and submit a deposit to the City to cover the costs of ongoing revegetation monitoring and reporting.

BIO-1(c) Fireplaces. In-room fireplaces shall be gas- or electric-powered and shall include fixed doors, thereby prohibiting guests from placing items in the fireplaces that may generate smoke. Barbeques, fire pits, or other exterior fire features (whether wood or gas powered) shall not be permitted.

Significance After Mitigation. Pursuant to implementation of the above mitigation measures, all wintering monarch butterfly roost trees would be avoided, and tree replacement at a ratio of 3:1 would result in a greater number of trees on the site, and an increase in tree windbreaks over what exists now on the site. Furthermore, all foraging and sunning areas

would be either avoided or replaced at a ratio greater than 1:1 and over the long-term, and English Ivy would be replaced by higher quality native vegetation suitable for monarch foraging. This mitigation would result in an overall increase in the total monarch butterfly foraging habitat on the project site, and an enhancement of habitat function and value from current conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact BIO-2 The proposed project may result in direct impacts to nesting birds by causing injury, death, or nest failure. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Suitable nesting habitat for a variety of bird species protected under the MBTA and Fish and Game Code is present on and immediately adjacent to the project site. Project construction would remove 14 trees and result in disturbance to a number of shrubs and bushes on the project site. Removal of vegetation that contains nesting birds would potentially conflict with existing MBTA and Fish and Game Code regulations and this effect is considered potentially significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> The MBTA and the FGC (3503, 3503.5, 3511, 3513 and 3800) protect almost all native nesting birds, and prohibit take of birds, nest, and eggs. CEQA compliance would require the project to incorporate avoidance measure or other mitigation for impacts to nesting birds.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. The following mitigation measures are required.

BIO-2 Nesting Bird Surveys and Avoidance. Initial site disturbance shall be prohibited during the general avian nesting season (February 1 -August 30), if feasible; however, limitations to construction activity outlined in measure BIO-1(a) the monarch wintering season takes precedence, as there are no alternate measures for mitigating impacts to monarchs during the winter roosting period. If breeding season avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall deposit adequate funds with the Community Development Department to retain a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey to determine the presence/absence, location, and status of any active nests on or adjacent to the project site. The extent of the survey buffer area surrounding the site shall be established by the qualified biologist to ensure that direct and indirect effects to nesting birds are avoided. To avoid the destruction of active nests and to protect the reproductive success of birds protected by MBTA and the FGC, nesting bird surveys shall be performed not more than 14 days prior to the scheduled vegetation clearance. In the event that active nests are discovered, a suitable buffer should be established around such active nests and no construction within the buffer allowed until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (e.g. the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest). No ground disturbing activities shall occur within this buffer until the qualified biologist has confirmed that breeding/nesting is completed and the young have fledged the nest. Survey results shall be

presented in a letter report and submitted to the Community Development Department. Nesting bird surveys are not required for construction activities occurring between August 30 and February 1.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the above mitigation.

Impact BIO-3 The proposed project may directly impact California redlegged frog and other special status species by causing injury or death resulting from construction activity. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Although there are no recorded occurrences in the CNDDB for the California red-legged frog within five miles of the project site, the species is known to occur in the region, and the CNDDB included recorded occurrence of this species on the two adjoining quads to the east and west of the project site. The project site does not contain any suitable breeding habitat for this species and the species is not expected to breed on the project site. However, this species is known to travel as much as two miles from permanent breeding habitat during dispersal (typically during or immediately following precipitation events), and suitable breeding habitat is present within two miles of the project site. Therefore, project development could result in the death of individual California red-legged frogs if individuals were to be dispersing through the project site during project construction activity, and this would be considered "take" under the ESA.

Other special status species that have a low potential for occurrence on the project site include hoary bat and pallid bat. Pallid bats would only be expected to forage over the project site, and project construction activity would not be expected to result in direct or indirect impacts to this species. However, hoary bats roost in trees, and it is possible that this species could roost on, or adjacent to the project site. The hoary bat would be directly impacted if a tree with roosting bats were to be cut down and individuals were killed as a result. This impact would conflict with Fish and Game Code regulations, and be considered significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> The California red-legged frog is federally listed as threatened, and under Section 9 of the ESA take (harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect) of this species is prohibited. CEQA compliance would require the project to incorporate measures to avoid impacts to California red-legged frog. If avoidance was not possible, an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) and development of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) would be required.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. The following mitigation measures are required.

BIO-3 Pre-construction Surveys for Special Status Species. Prior to issuance of a grading permit and initiation of any site preparation activities, the applicant shall deposit adequate funds to the Community Development Department to retain a qualified biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys for special status species. A pre-construction meeting shall be held at least 7 working days prior to initiation of any construction or site disturbance. The biological monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting. Preconstruction

surveys for special status species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist not more than 14 days prior to construction. Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted across the entire project site. If species are observed on the project site during pre-construction surveys, the individuals shall be monitored by the qualified biologists, and no construction shall be allowed until the individuals have left the project site. Survey results shall be presented in a letter report and submitted to the Community Development Department.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the above mitigation.

Impact BIO-4 The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

The proposed project would involve removal of ruderal vegetation on the project site and subsequent grading, demolition of three existing buildings and an outside deck, temporary relocation of the existing Victorian structure, and development of two new buildings on the site. The CNDDB identified one sensitive plant community within a five-mile radius of the project site: North Central Coast Drainage Sacramento Sucker/Roach River, which occurs approximately four miles west of the project site. This sensitive community does not occur on the project site. Riparian habitats do not occur on-site. The project is located adjacent to the EGMBHR, and the project as proposed is consistent with the regulations outlined in Sections 17.95.005, 17.95.010, 17.95.060, and 17.95.061 of the Capitola Municipal Code regarding development within and adjacent to the Escalona Gulch ESHA. Therefore, project impacts are considered less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> Section 17.95.060 and 17.95.061 of the Capitola Municipal Code require any development within and adjacent to Escalona Gulch must adhere to a number of regulations to prevent impacts that would significantly degrade the area. Capitola Municipal Code 17.46.090 (Coastal Zone) includes additional conditions to protect biological resources and these regulations outline measures to protect ESHAs. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable city regulations and policies related to ESHAs, which would reduce project impacts to sensitive habitats.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact BIO-5 The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

No federally protected wetlands are present on the project site and the project is not expected to directly impact federally protected wetlands; however, the project site is adjacent to Escalona Gulch which contains an intermittent stream, and the project is situated on a coastal bluff overlooking Monterey Bay. Construction runoff, stormwater pollution, and construction site spills have the potential to wash into Monterey Bay directly, or via the intermittent stream within Escalona Gulch. As described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, the project would comply with the Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region (RWQCB Resolution No. R3-2012-0025, September 6, 2012). In addition, as described in Section 4.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, because project construction would disturb one or more acres of soil, the project applicant would be required to obtain a Construction General Permit which includes the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which in turn would require implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs). Compliance with these requirements would ensure that impacts to federally protected wetlands remain less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> The project would be required to adhere to the Porter Cologne Act, which requires the preparation of a SWPPP, and Section 13.16 of the City of Capitola Municipal Code which regulates water runoff.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact BIO-6 The proposed project may interfere with the movement of monarch butterflies. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Smaller project areas, such as the subject property, do not generally contain major wildlife movement corridors within their boundaries. Rather, they may lie along or within such a corridor, or they may only contain smaller, secondary movement pathways or trail systems. The project site and Escalona Gulch have become relatively isolated by residential development in the surrounding area. Wildlife movement that may occur between Escalona Gulch and more natural lands to the north has already become restricted along a narrow corridor of relatively less disturbed coast to the east and along existing riparian corridors between the coast and hills to the north. The degree of disturbance and human activity at the project site and the extent of residential development surrounding the area have already disturbed wildlife movement and corridors in the area precluding significant wildlife movement within or through the Monarch Cove Inn Project site itself, and project development would not result in significant changes to the existing conditions. Wildlife movement corridors are less important for common urban adapted species such as raccoons, skunks, and opossums, which are able to move throughout developed and urban areas with little impedance. However, the EGMBG does represent an important winter roosting spot within the monarch's migration route, and as such direct and/or indirect impacts to the monarchs wintering in EGMBG could result in significant impacts to this migratory corridor.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> Chapter 12.12 of the City of Capitola Municipal Code provides regulations designed to protect and enhance tree cover in the City of Capitola. This

includes goals, policies guidelines and regulations for planting, approved species, tree removal, tree trimming, tree protection, management, maintenance and tree permits to ensure trees and tree cover in the City are protected.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Mitigation measures BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(c) would reduce impacts to monarch butterflies, including impacts related to their migration. No additional mitigation is required.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(c).

Impact BIO-7 Construction activities may damage trees not proposed for removal. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

The project proposes to remove 14 trees from the project site including one Monterey pine, one cedar (Thuja plicata), three privets (Ligustrum sp.), two cherry trees (Prunus sp.), two blue gum (Eucalyptus globulus), two yucca (Yucca ap.), one palm (Phoenix canariensis), one magnolia (Magnolia sp.) and one maple (Acer macrophyllum) (Hamb, 2013). None of these trees are considered a heritage tree; however, all of these trees except the two cherry trees are explicitly protected by Chapter 12.12 of the Capitola Municipal Ordinance.² Adherence to the regulations and policies outlined in the Capitola Municipal Ordinance Chapter 12.12 would reduce the potential impacts to most of the trees on the project site. Although the City ordinance would only require replacement of 12 trees (all trees proposed for removal other than the two fruitbearing trees), replacement of all 14 trees at a 3:1 ratio is required to mitigate for impacts to monarch butterflies (see mitigation measure BIO-1[b] above). This mitigation exceeds the compensatory mitigation requirements outlined in the Capitola Municipal Ordinance; however, construction activity, including trenching for footings, retaining walls, foundations and underground supply lines, soil compaction, and installation of irrigation systems has the potential to damage trees by impacting roots. Mitigation measures are required to protect onsite trees that are not proposed for removal.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> Chapter 12.12 of the City of Capitola Municipal Code provides regulations designed to protect and enhance tree cover in the City of Capitola. This includes goals, policies guidelines and regulations for planting, approved species, tree removal, tree trimming, tree protection, management, maintenance and tree permits to ensure trees and tree cover in the City are protected.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Mitigation measure BIO-1(b) requires tree replacement at a ratio of 3:1. In addition, the following mitigation measures are required.

BIO-7(a) Tree Protection during Construction. When possible, the root zone of retained trees shall remain undisturbed during development, eliminating the opportunity for damage and the resulting decline of the trees.

² Fruit-bearing trees are exempted from the provisions of Chapter 12.12 of the Capitola Municipal Code.

The applicant shall deposit funds to CDD prior to issuance of grading permit to retain qualified arborist and arborist to prepare a letter report following completion of site preparation to document findings.

The project arborist shall be on-site to attend the preconstruction meeting and to oversee all root-zone staking.

Avoidance fencing shall be placed around all trees encroached on by construction activity. Fencing shall be supported by metal posts embedded in the ground to create a long-term physical and visual barrier between the trees, the construction workers and their equipment. Straw bales shall be held in place with stakes and designed to prevent any excess grading soil or other debris from passing into the tree buffer zone. The barricade shall be designed so that it also diverts any excess moisture that can develop when natural drainage patterns are altered.

Where root zone avoidance is not possible, root pruning and monitoring shall be conducted during both demolition and excavation adjacent to any such trees, and specifically when working adjacent to trees #1, #23 and #24 of the Arborist Report (Hamb, 2013; see also Figure 4.3-2). The existing planting area for tree #1 shall remain undisturbed except for the removal of ivy growth. The demolition of the asphalt driveway and curb surrounding tree #1 shall be completed using small equipment and manual labor, and these activities shall be monitored by the project arborist. All roots unearthed shall be inspected and evaluated, and those roots greater than one inch in diameter shall be properly pruned by, or under the direction of the project arborist. The curb surrounding tree #1 shall be constructed on top of the new pavement, and no continuous excavation for a footing will be allowed. Excavation adjacent to the mature eucalyptus trees (#23 and #24) shall be monitored by the project arborist. Any roots unearthed will be evaluated and properly pruned by, or under the direction of the project arborist. Any trees lost or significantly damaged during construction, as determined by the project arborist, shall be replaced on-site at a 3:1 ratio.

- **BIO-7(b)** Staging. Staging of job trailers, equipment, parking, and supplies shall be restricted to areas outside the critical root zone of retained trees.
- **BIO-7(c)** Tree Protection Specification Handout. The Tree Protection Specifications outlined in Hamb (2013) shall be prepared into a handout format, and supplied to all contractors and subcontractors prior to entering the site.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Pursuant to compliance with existing local policies pertaining to tree removal and implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As discussed in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. Neither of these projects is located within the Depot Hill area, and both are outside the EGMBG. These and other projects proposed in the future would increase ground disturbance and structural development within the City. Such development would have the potential to impact biological resources. The project site is situated within a rural residential area with generally low habitat values on the main project site. The project site does provide high habitat value for monarch butterfly; however that habitat would be enhanced under the proposed project design. The project site is adjacent to a City of Capitola EGMBG. The City of Capitola Municipal Code includes provisions and regulations for development in and adjacent to established ESHAs (including EGMBG), within the Coastal Zone, and for protection of the monarch butterfly. The Monarch Cove Hotel project must adhere to all municipal regulations related to development within and adjacent to an ESHA and the EGMBG that would prevent the loss of any natural habitat and mitigate for any tree removal with replacement plantings. The project would not result in any losses of native habitat or in significant alterations to the biological conditions, and once completed, the project would be essentially identical to the existing conditions in regards biological resources. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to contribute to these cumulative impacts. Furthermore, development projects would be subject to City review on a case-by-case basis, and subject to applicable CEQA review. The City of Capitola would require that all proposed projects comply with the regulations outlined in this section to protect biological resources. Potential impacts from future development would be addressed on a caseby-case basis and appropriate mitigation would be designed to mitigate impacts resulting from individual projects. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.4.1 Setting

a. Historical Background.

<u>Prehistory.</u> The City of Capitola is in the Monterey Bay area, a cultural-historical geographic region which spans the central California coastline from Big Sur northward to just south of the San Francisco Bay. This region generally corresponds to southern Costanoan language groups.

The prehistory of the Monterey Bay area is categorized according to temporal "periods," which refer to the general social, economic, and environmental adaptations of Native California populations during a given time in prehistory. David A. Fredrickson's Paleo-Archaic-Emergent cultural sequence (1974) is commonly used to interpret the prehistoric occupation of Central California and is broken into three broad periods: the Paleoindian Period (10,000-6000 B.C.); the three-staged Archaic Period, consisting of the Lower Archaic (6000-3000 B.C.), Middle Archaic (3000-500 B.C.), and Upper Archaic (500 B.C.-A.D. 1000); and the Emergent Period (A.D. 1000-1800). T. Jones' (1993) updated period sequence, which integrates data from the central California coast, consists of the Paleoindian (9000-6500 B.C.), Millingstone (6500-3500 B.C.), Early (3500-1000 B.C.), Early/Middle Transition (1000-600 B.C.), Middle (600 B.C.-A.D. 1000), Middle/Late Transition (A.D. 1000-1200), Late (A.D. 1200-1500), Protohistoric (A.D. 1500-1769), and Historic (post A.D. 1769) periods.

Archaeological sites dating to the Paleoindian and Millingstone periods (3500 B.C. or earlier) in the Monterey Bay Area are rare, and the components are poorly defined. Sites from these periods, however, have been identified north of Capitola in Scotts Valley and at Elkhorn Slough, and include crescent-shaped flaked tools, long-stemmed projectile points, cobble/core tools, and milling slabs and handstones. Archaeological evidence of the Late and Protohistoric periods (A.D. 1200-1769) is poorly represented in the Monterey Bay area, although sites dating to this period have been identified in the Santa Cruz Mountains and along the County of Santa Cruz coast. Sites dating to these periods include schist, clamshell, and abalone disc beads; small side-notched projectile points; hopper and bedrock mortars; milling slabs; pestles; and handstones.

For over a quarter century, Native American settlement and subsistence patterns in the Monterey Bay Area have been understood in terms of a forager-collector model (Breschini and Haversat, 1980; Dietz and Jackson, 1981) that suggests that before 2,000 years ago, small mobile foraging groups characterized Monterey Bay area settlement. These foraging groups established temporary residential bases near seasonally available resource patches and gathered food daily, with no storage of food. Foragers were eventually displaced by "collectors" who occupied year round or semi-permanent residential sites and did not relocate residential sites to seasonal resource patches. More recently, however, the validity of the forager-collector model for understanding the subsistence and settlement practices from the Monterey Bay area has been questioned (D. Jones, 1992), and Native American settlement-subsistence patterns in the region are a research issue that future archaeological research may help to clarify.

<u>Ethnography.</u> Penutian groups settled around Monterey Bay at approximately 500 B.C., displacing earlier Hokan populations (Breschini and Haversat, 1997). The descendants of the native groups who lived between the Carquinez Strait and the Monterey area prefer to be called Ohlone (Margolin, 1978), although they are often referred to by the name of their linguistic group, Costanoan. Linguists have identified eight Ohlone languages (Shipley, 1978). *Awaswas* was the name of the language spoken in the area. *Awaswas* speakers' territory basically encompassed the San Lorenzo River watershed, including present day Capitola.

The Ohlone, like most Native California groups, were organized according to politically independent land-holding groups referred to by anthropologists as "tribelets." There were approximately 40 Ohlone tribelets. The basic Ohlone social unit was the family household of about 15 individuals, which was extended patrilineally (Broadbent, 1972; Harrington, 1933). Households grouped together to form villages, and villages combined to form tribelets. Tribelets exchanged trade goods such as obsidian, shell beads, and baskets; participated in ceremonial and religious activities together; intermarried; and could have extensive reciprocal obligations to one another involving resource collection. At the time of the arrival of the Spanish and establishment of Mission Santa Cruz in 1791, Capitola was within the territory of the Uypi tribelet.

<u>History.</u> In July 1769, the governor of Baja California, Gaspar de Portola, departed with an expedition from San Diego to locate Monterey Bay and passed through present-day Santa Cruz. Shortly thereafter, in September 1791, Mission Santa Cruz was established on the banks of the San Lorenzo River. Mission Santa Cruz quickly absorbed the surrounding Ohlone population and, by 1796, included 523 neophytes. At its peak of operation, the Mission had 8,000 head of cattle and produced wheat, barley, beans, corn, and lentils for consumption and trade.

Another colonial institution, Villa de Branciforte, was established on the other side of the San Lorenzo River across from Mission Santa Cruz in 1797. The Spanish government established Villa de Branciforte to create a self-sufficient secular settlement populated by retired soldiers, craftsmen, and farmers who could mobilize and defend the coast of Alta California from foreign invasion. However, the colonial government generally viewed Villa de Branciforte as a failure. Early settlers generally lacked the skills to be self-sufficient farmers and when rumors spread that the French pirate, Hippolyte de Bouchard, had raided Monterey, the residents of Branciforte, instead of defending the Mission, responded by looting much of its assets. In 1834, the California missions were secularized, and Mission Santa Cruz lands came under the control of Villa de Branciforte.

Commercial development of the region's natural resources was well under way by the time California became part of the United States in 1848. Logging, lime production, and tanneries were three important industries in the early economy of Santa Cruz County. The lime and logging industries thrived in response to the growing demand for building materials during San Francisco's post gold rush construction boom. These industries spawned the County's residential growth and infrastructure development during the 19th century.

In 1869, Camp Capitola, a 15-acre summer resort developed by Frederick A. Hihn, was the nucleus of the area that is now the City of Capitola. By 1883, Hihn had built a hotel, a dance

hall, bath houses, a shooting gallery, a bowling alley and a skating rink and had subdivided a portion of the camp into home sites. The arrival of the Santa Cruz Railroad in 1876 (discussed below) facilitated access to the resort. Most of the 21.1 mile track through Soquel to Watsonville and Pajaro was built by Chinese immigrants who lived in a cluster of tents on the railroad right-of-way during construction. Just after the railroad was completed, a permanent Chinese fishing camp was located just east of Camp Capitola on the beach at the base of the bluff in New Brighton Beach State Park. The establishment of Camp San Jose in 1878 on the bluff above this fishing village forced the Chinese to move down the coast toward Aptos. By 1884, Camp Capitola had greatly expanded. The City merited a post office beginning in May 28, 1889 and was incorporated in January 1949.

The economic focus of Capitola gradually shifted to tourism near the turn of the 19th century. The growth of local tourism was largely a result of railroad access to Santa Cruz County beginning in the late 1870s. The Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way began operation in May 1876 as a narrow gauge passenger and freight rail line. In 1881, Southern Pacific purchased the Santa Cruz railroad at auction from the original owners and in 1883 replaced the narrow gauge railroad with a standard gauge line. In 1908, the rail line was extended north toward Davenport, with freight and passenger operations beginning on the northern portion. Passenger service was discontinued in 1938. In 1996, Union Pacific purchased the Watsonville-Santa Cruz line from Southern Pacific and Rio Grande Railroads. The California Transportation Commission subsequently acquired the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for public ownership in October 2012.

Hihn planned expansive improvements for Capitola between 1895 and 1905 to transition from Camp Capitola to Capitola By-the-Sea. In addition to an expanded number of rental units and apartments, Hihn planned several new subdivisions in areas previously occupied by cabins or tents. Between 1895 and 1913, Hihn revamped Capitola several times in order to maintain its competitiveness with other large resorts in the region. This included altering the eastern bluff so that it would be a clean wall from base to summit and in order to allow him to increase the size of the Capitola Hotel, which was located at the foot of the bluff. After Hihn's death and the eventual 1919 sale of Capitola By-the-Sea, the new owner, H. Allen Rispin, drastically changed the outline of the resort (Capitola) and promoted it as a high-class area to purchase a home, rather than an affordable vacation site. Real estate prospered in the area until 1926, when a series of fires, struck Capitola By-the-Sea. The resort recovered, and as automobile travel increased, the reliance on tourism began to increase as well.

During World War II, tourism declined substantially in Santa Cruz due to travel restrictions and gasoline shortages. Capitola was relatively quiet and new commercial construction was postponed due to lack of materials. After the war, in May 1948, the Capitola Improvement Club was formed. The Club, led by Jack Rosensteel, Joe Tabacchini, John Battistini, and Brad Macdonald, raised money to analyze incorporating Capitola and in 1949 the vote to create the City of Capitola was won. Tourists continued to visit the City and residential developments expanded.

<u>Archaeological Sensitivity.</u> According to the Santa Cruz County General Plan, much of Santa Cruz County is potentially archaeological sensitive, especially undeveloped coastal areas, valleys, slopes, and drainages. The project site itself is located in an archaeological/

paleontological sensitivity area as designated by the City of Capitola General Plan (1989). Furthermore, based on the proximity of previously recorded cultural resource sites, the project area is considered sensitive for archaeological resources (Northwestern Information Center, [NWIC], 2013).

b. Monarch Cove Historical Setting. Architectural Resources Group (ARG) prepared an *Historic Resources Technical Report* for the project (October 2013; refer to Appendix D). The purpose of this technical report was to identify and evaluate any historic resources that may be affected by implementation of the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project, to assess any potential impacts of the project on historic resources, and to recommend mitigation measures where appropriate. The following section is based on this report. Refer to Appendix D for a description of the report methodology.

<u>Historical Background and Construction History</u>. The project site is currently occupied by the Monarch Cove Inn. The property was part of a larger private estate known as the English Cottages in the 1890s. Since its inception, the property has changed ownership five times and has been expanded, renamed, and subdivided (refer to Figure 4.4-1 for a depiction of how the site's boundaries have changed over time).

The history of the project site and its immediate surroundings are best understood with reference to four historical eras:

- <u>English Cottages Era (1895-1910)</u>. The Robertson and Rawlins families developed the portion of Depot Hill south of El Salto Drive and east of Livermore Avenue with four houses, including the Main House extant on the project site today. The property was used as a private estate by the two families.
- <u>El Salto Estate Era (1911-1946)</u>. Lewis Hanchett and his family substantially expanded the property and constructed several new buildings and structures, including the two cottages extant on the project site. The property continued to function as a private family estate.
- <u>El Salto Resort Era (1946-1961</u>). Mary and Joseph Tabacchini converted the Hanchett-era cottages including the two extant on the project site into individual rental units with kitchenettes. They also added a wing onto the Hanchett-era garage, creating the L-shaped building present on the site today.
- <u>Blodgett Era (1962-present)</u>. Elizabeth Blodgett subdivided the former El Salto Resort property into multiple lots. Her son Robert Blodgett acquired the portion of the site corresponding to the current project site in 1989.

Additional information regarding each of these eras is included below, along with a discussion of which features remain today. Given the large number of buildings historically present on the larger El Salto property, and the predominately vernacular style of those buildings, the historical record is often too imprecise to associate a given occupant or use with a specific building.



Source: Historic Resources Technical Report, ARG, October 2013

Boundary of Historical English Cottages, El Salto Estate, and Proposed Project Site *English Cottages Era (1895-1910).* The property at 620 El Salto Drive was originally developed by two families, the Robinson and the Rawlins families, in the 1890s. James S. Robinson and James E. Rawlins, both from England and both graduates of the Royal Agricultural College, immigrated to California and settled near the town of Hanford around 1875. Both men were major figures in the Hanford area and played integral roles in its development. In 1881, they formed the firm of Robinson & Rawlins, which established the Hanford Water Works and developed a coal mine near Coalinga, which the firm operated until 1888, when it incorporated as the San Joaquin Valley Coal Mining Company. Both men helped to establish the Bank of Hanford as well as the Hanford Development Company (ARG, 2013).

The pair, along with their wives Ethel E. Robinson and Margaret A. Rawlins, moved to Capitola in 1895 and purchased property at the eastern end of Depot Hill. Robertson (formerly Robinson) and Rawlins constructed four houses on the property in the late 1890s; two of these homes, including the "Main House" (now referred to as the Victorian structure or Victorian building), served as summer homes for the families, while the other buildings were used as guest houses or servants' quarters. The site also included a clay tennis court, a boathouse, a greenhouse, a barn, and elaborate gardens. The Robertson and Rawlins families moved back to England around 1906, but continued to rent the property (ARG, October 2013).

The Main House appears to be the only remnant of the English Cottages estate that retains integrity. House No. 2 was destroyed by a fire in the 1980s. House No. 3 was demolished by the Tabacchinis in 1956. The integrity of House No. 4 (Grandmother's Cottage) at 106 Livermore Avenue was lost through the construction of a 3,200-square-foot, two-story addition in the early 2000s (ARG, 2013).

The only extant feature from this era is the Main House. The gardens associated with the English Cottages era are no longer fully extant. It has been determined that the existing garden immediately west of the Main House has been altered substantially since this era [refer to Section 4.4.1(f) for a discussion of the historical significance of the Main House and garden].

El Salto Estate Era (1911-1946). In 1909, Lewis E. Hanchett rented House No. 1 (the Main House) from the Robertson and Rawlins families. Hanchett purchased the English Cottages property in 1911. By that time, Hanchett's daughter, Lucy, recalled that the buildings were quite rundown and the estate included the four houses and "a barn, boat house, water tank, clay tennis court, croquet lawn, and...a hot house. It was all fenced in and a road ran completely around the place" (Hanchett Butler, as cited in ARG, 2013).

Hanchett proceeded to substantially expand and improve the estate, which he renamed El Salto. He first modernized the existing estate by adding electricity, telephone service, and improved plumbing to the four English Cottages. He also added porches to House No. 1 (the Main House) and House No. 2. Hanchett proceeded to substantially increase his landholdings, purchasing virtually the entire portion of Depot Hill east of Sacramento Avenue.

Hanchett demolished the English Cottages-era barn and built a new one at another location on the property, and relocated the greenhouse nearby. The old boat house and old barn area were converted to children's play areas. The family raised horses and cows, which used the field near the new barn for grazing, and grew vegetables and fruit trees.

Hanchett also substantially increased the roster of buildings on the site. He built a four-car garage, a three bedroom cottage with separate bath, a second three bedroom cottage with an adjacent laundry building for the maids, and perhaps as many as eight guest cottages (ARG, 2013). This new construction included the two extant cottages on the Monarch Cove project site, though it is unknown whether they were used as guest or servant cottages. Lucy Hanchett Butler recalled that "four garages [were] built with a circle turnaround," which likely refers to the L-shaped building on the project site before it was expanded by the Tabacchinis in 1959 *(ibid)*.

When he was on-site, Hanchett hosted several famous guests at El Salto, including silent film star Mary Pickford, professional golfer Marion Hollins, local baseball star Harry Hooper, and tennis champion Helen Wills (ARG, 2013).

Since Hanchett's time, the property has greatly diminished in size and many of the buildings have been demolished or relocated. As of 2002, six cottages built by Hanchett remained, and two of these had been substantially altered through additions (ARG, 2013). These six cottages included the two on the Monarch Cove project site, the Mariner's Cottage at 709 El Salto Drive, the Lamplighter's Cottage at 709 El Salto Drive, and two other cottages near the Tabacchini fourplex at 723 El Salto Drive (*ibid*). Review of present-day aerial photographs implies that one of these unnamed cottages is no longer extant, or has been absorbed into a larger building. Extant features from this era include Cottages 1 and 2 (on the project site), an L-shaped building (also on the project site), and three other off-site cottages.

El Salto Resort Era (1946-1961). Following their relocation to Santa Barbara, the Hanchett family sold the property to Joseph and Mary Tabacchini in 1946. Joseph Tabacchini was a prominent figure in Capitola, serving on the City Council for eleven years and acting as mayor for six.

The Tabacchinis converted the private El Salto estate into a rental property they called El Salto Resort. Specifically, they converted the Hanchett-era cottages – including the two extant on the project site – into individual rental units with kitchenettes (ARG, 2013). In addition, they painted the cottages white; previously they were dark green with red and white trim (*ibid*).

The Tabacchinis substantially altered the property by replacing House No. 3 from the English Cottages era with a 4,000-square-foot fourplex. They also relocated one of the other English Cottages. In 1959, they added a wing that more than doubled the size of the Hanchett-era garage complex, creating the L-shaped administrative/garage building present on the site today. Extant features from this era include an off-site fourplex and an addition to the on-site L-shaped building

Blodgett Era (1962-present). In 1962, Elizabeth Blodgett acquired a substantial portion of the El Salto property, which then consisted of about a dozen houses and cottages. Beginning in the 1980s, Elizabeth Blodgett subdivided the property into more than a dozen lots that she sold individually. House No. 3 from the English Cottage era was destroyed by fire in the early 1980s and the City of Capitola declared the remaining cottages unsafe in 1989, at which point Elizabeth's son, Robert Blodgett, acquired the portion of the site corresponding to the current Monarch Cove Inn property. In 1998, Douglas and Robert Dodd bought two parcels to the west

of Robert Blodgett's property (709 and 723 El Salto Drive) that include the Lamplighter's Cottage, the Mariner's Cottage, one other Hanchett-era cottages and the Tabacchini-era fourplex.

<u>Building Permit History.</u> A number of improvements or modifications on the property were completed according to a review of building permits from the Capitola Building Department. Most of the building permits do not specify which building they involve. Based on a review of these permits, the most recent modification of the Main House was the 1999 addition of a utility room and a handicap accessible bathroom to the north end of the west façade (ARG, 2013). Although not indicated on the permit, it appears that new windows were installed in the west part of the south façade as well. Other notable permits associated with the site included building additions, repairs, and interior renovations. For a full list of permits, refer to Appendix D.

c. Historical Description of Extant Structures. As described in Section 4.4.1(c) above, there are four extant structures on the project site remaining from the historical eras. Each of these structures are described below.

<u>The Main House/Victorian Building</u>. The Main House, historically referred to as House No. 1 and referred to in the remainder of this EIR as the Victorian building, is a two-story building that is mostly square in plan. The hipped roof is clad in asphalt shingles. The house is clad in horizontal wood siding, with accents of decorative shingles on the second-story dormer windows and gabled addition at the east. Fenestration is characterized primarily by casement windows surmounted by small, divided-light windows. There are two polygonal projecting bay windows, one located at the center of the south elevation, and one at the northeast corner of the house. At the east end of the building is a two-story, gabled-roof portion that is not original to the building. The roof of this addition has a shallower pitch than the rest of the building. Because the building has been converted into nine units, each with its own entryway, there is no discernible main entrance.

The south elevation of the Main House contains a four-sided window projecting from the center of the façade. Just above this bay window are two gabled dormers that include three small casement windows. Each dormer has diamond-shaped shingles below the gable portion and fish scale-shingles on the sides. To the right (east) of the porch is a series of casement windows of varying sizes surmounted by small six-paned, divided-light windows. To the left (west) of the bay window is a recessed porch that contains groups of two and three casement windows topped by smaller divided-light windows, as well as a three-paneled wooden door with glazing on the upper portion. The porch extends outward and contains a low wooden railing. To the left (west) of this porch are another partially-glazed door and a divided-light picture window.

The west elevation is characterized primarily by a porch with doors at either end and central stairs leading up to the second floor. Fenestration includes casement windows with divided-light upper windows on the first level, and gabled dormers with four casement windows on the second floor.

The north elevation contains two doors – a three-paneled, partially-glazed door on the left and a five-paneled wooden door on the right – separated by a set of two casement windows with

divided-light uppers to left and three of the same type to the right. A short staircase leads up to the doors. On the second floor of the north elevation are eight dormer windows, both with tripartite glazing above. The four casement windows on the left are slightly wider than those on the right. To the west of the larger dormer windows is a small divided-light dormer window with shed roof.

The east elevation consists of three main bays. The central is clad with horizontal wood siding on the first floor and shingles on the second. Fenestration on the east elevation is somewhat similar to the building's other elevations, and includes casement and picture windows surmounted by divided-light uppers. The upper story on the east elevation, however, contains a set of small casement windows flanked by larger picture windows. The five-sided projecting bay window located at the northeast corner of the building contains a casement window surmounted by a divided-light window on each of its sides. This projecting bay also has a pointed roof that extends above the main roofline. See Figure 4.4-2 for an historic photograph of the Main House from the Hanchett family and a photograph of the same view from 2013.

<u>Cottage 1.</u> This cottage is nearly square in plan, with a gabled roof and horizontal wood siding. The symmetrical façade consists of a fully-glazed divided-light main entryway at the center surrounded by a trellis (refer to Figure 4.1-1 in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, for a photograph of Cottage 1 as it stands today). Fenestration on the main (west) façade is characterized by sets of two, 6-over-1, double-hung windows. Other openings include divided-light casement windows, picture windows, and a partially-glazed, paneled door.

<u>Cottage 2.</u> This cottage is smaller and more rectangular than Cottage 1, and further from the Main House. A fully-glazed divided-light door surrounded by a trellis comprises the entryway. Fenestration consists of casement and picture windows, double-hung windows, and a sliding glass door on the east façade leading to the deck. To the right (north) of the sliding door is a projecting bay featuring casement and picture windows. Refer to Figure 4.1-1 in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, for a photograph of Cottage 2 as it stands today.

L-shaped Building/Garage. The L-shaped building at the northwestern portion of the property houses administrative offices and several garage spaces. The building consists of two perpendicular structures, one generally running northwest-southeast axis and the other northeast-southwest axis, which form the sides of a courtyard (refer to Figure 4.1-1 in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, for a photograph of the L-shaped building as it stands today). Both structures feature a gabled roof and vertical wood siding and each consists of four garage bays facing the courtyard. The building on the west side of the courtyard contains a projecting bay at the rear (north), which consists of board-and-batten siding, and a wide picture window and paneled door. On the west-facing façade of the projecting wing is a set of fully-glazed, divided-light French doors.



Photo 1 - Undated photograph of House No. 1 (Source: Hanchett family photograph, reproduced in *Historic Context Statement for the City of Capitola, 26*).



Photo 2 - House No. 1 - Main House today (Source: Architectural Resources Group, July 2013.)

Historic and Current Photographs of the Main House

At the northeast side of the courtyard is a set of fully-glazed French doors that access the offices. At the rear (east) side of the building are two steps leading up to another set of fully-glazed French doors. Just to the right (north) of this door is a shed-roofed addition, which joins the two structures at the northeast corner. The east façade of this structure is clad in vertical and diagonal wood siding and contains a picture window to the right of a solid door and small window. The north façade of the shed contains no openings and is clad in vertical wood siding.

d. Regulatory Setting. CEQA requires evaluation of project impacts on cultural and historic resources, including properties or buildings "listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources [or] included in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in an historical resource survey." In analyzing the significance of buildings located within the project site, various criteria for designation under federal, state, and local landmark programs were considered and applied, as described below. It should be noted, however, that pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(a)(4), "[t]he fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources...or identified in an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1."

<u>Federal</u>.

National Register of Historic Places. Federal regulations for cultural resources are primarily governed by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, which applies to actions taken by federal agencies. The goal of the Section 106 review process is to offer a measure of protection to sites that are determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The criteria for determining NRHP eligibility are found in Title 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 60. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and affords the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings. The Council's implementing regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties," are found in Title 36 CFR Part 800.

The NRHP is the official list of the Nation's historic places worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, it is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect the country's historic and archeological resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service under the Secretary of the Interior. Properties listed in the National Register include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture. Property owners must agree to such listing. The National Register includes:

- All historic areas in the National Park System;
- National Historic Landmarks that have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior for their significance to all Americans; and
- Properties significant to the nation, state, or community which have been nominated by state historic preservation offices, federal agencies, and tribal preservation offices, and have been approved by the National Park Service (National Park Service website).

To be considered eligible, a property must meet the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, found in Title 36 CFR Part 60.4. This involves examining the property's age, integrity, and significance as follows:

- Age and Integrity. Is the property old enough to be considered historic (generally at least 50 years old) and does it still look much the way it did in the past?
- Significance. Is the property associated with events, activities, or developments that were important in the past? With the lives of people who were important in the past? With significant architectural history, landscape history, or engineering achievements? Does it have the potential to yield information through archeological investigation about our past?

Archaeological site evaluation assesses the potential of each site to meet one or more of the criteria for NRHP eligibility based on visual surface and subsurface evidence (if available) at each site's location, information gathered during the literature and records searches, and the researcher's knowledge of and familiarity with the historic or prehistoric context associated with each site.

American Indian Religious Freedom Act. The American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Title 42 U.S. Code Section 1996, protects Native American religious practices, ethnic heritage sites, and land uses.

National Historic Landmarks. National Historic Landmarks are nationally significant historic places designated by the Secretary of the Interior because they possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the United States. Today, fewer than 2,500 historic places bear this national distinction. National Historic Landmarks are places where nationally significant historic events occurred, that are associated with prominent Americans that represent those pivotal ideas that shaped the nation, that teach Americans about their ancient past, or that are premier examples of design or construction. While many historic places are important locally or at a state level, a lesser number have meaning for all Americans. National Historic Landmarks are places that "possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating and interpreting the heritage of the United States" (National Park Service, 1997).

<u>State</u>.

California Register of Historical Resources. The California Register of Historical Resources (California Register, or CRHR) is a guide to cultural resources that must be considered when a government agency undertakes a discretionary action subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The California Register helps government agencies identify, evaluate, and protect California's historical resources, and indicates which properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change [Pub. Resources Code, Section 5024.1(a)]. The California Register is administered through the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) that is part of the California State Parks system.

A cultural resource is evaluated under four California Register criteria to determine its historical significance. A resource must be significant at the local, state, or national level in accordance with one or more of the following criteria set forth in the *State CEQA Guidelines* at Section 15064.5(a)(3):

- 1) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of California's history and cultural heritage;
- 2) It is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- 3) It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- 4) It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, the California Register requires that sufficient time must have passed to allow a "scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource." Fifty years is used as a general estimate of the time needed to understand the historical importance of a resource according to SHPO publications. The California Register also requires a resource to possess integrity, which is defined as "the authenticity of a historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association." Archaeological resources can sometimes qualify as "historical resources" [*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15064.5(c)(1)]. In addition, Public Resources Code Section 5024 requires consultation with SHPO when a project may impact historical resources located on State-owned land.

Two other programs are administered by the state: California Historical Landmarks and California "Points of Interest." California Historical Landmarks are buildings, sites, features, or events that are of statewide significance and have anthropological, cultural, military, political, architectural, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other historical value. California Points of Interest are buildings, sites, features, or events that are of local (city or county) significance and have anthropological, cultural, military, political, economic, scientific or technical, religious, experimental, or other historical value.

Native American Consultation. Prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan proposed on or after March 1, 2005, Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65352.4 require a city or county to consult with local Native American tribes that are on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission. The purpose is to preserve or mitigate impacts to places, features, and objects described in Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 (Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine located on public property) that are located within a city or county's jurisdiction. As the proposed project does not entail a General Plan amendment, no such consultation is required.

Human Remains. Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code states that in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered has determined whether or not the remains are subject to the coroner's authority. If the human remains are of Native American origin, the coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5 directs the lead agency (or

applicant), under certain circumstances, to develop an agreement with the Native Americans for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

Public Resources Code Section 5097.5. California Public Resources Code Section 5097.5 prohibits excavation or removal of any "vertebrate paleontological site…or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands." Public lands are defined to include lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of the state or any city, county, district, authority or public corporation, or any agency thereof. Section 5097.5 states that any unauthorized disturbance or removal of archaeological, historical, or paleontological materials or sites located on public lands is a misdemeanor. The proposed project site is not located on public lands; however, the disturbance or removal of archaeological, historical, or paleontological materials or sites should be avoided.

CEQA. The *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5 definition of a "historical resource" is presented in Section 4.5.2(a) (Methodology and Significance Thresholds) below. CEQA requires that historical resources and unique archaeological resources be taken into consideration during the CEQA review process (Public Resources Code, Section 21083.2). If feasible, adverse effects to the significance of historical resources must be avoided, or significant effects mitigated [*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(b)(4)].

If the cultural resource in question is an archaeological resource, *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(c)(1) requires that the lead agency first determine if the resource is a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(a). If the resource qualifies as a historical resource, potential adverse impacts must be considered in the same manner as a historical resource (California Office of Historic Preservation, 2001a). If the archaeological resource does not qualify as a historical resource but does qualify as a "unique archaeological resource," then the archaeological resource is treated in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 [see also *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15069.5(c)(3)]. "Unique archaeological resource" means an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

- Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a *demonstrable public interest in that information.*
- Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type.
- *Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.*

In practice, most archaeological sites that meet the definition of a unique archaeological resource will also meet the definition of an historical resource (Bass, Herson, and Bogdan, 1999).

Treatment options under Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 include activities that preserve such resources in place in an undisturbed state. Other acceptable methods of mitigation include excavation and curation or study in place without excavation and curation (if the study finds

that the artifacts would not meet one or more of the criteria for defining a "unique archaeological resource").

Advice on procedures to identify cultural resources, evaluate their importance, and estimate potential effects is given in several agency publications such as the series produced by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). The technical advice series produced by OPR strongly recommends that Native American concerns and the concerns of other interested persons and corporate entities, including but not limited to, museums, historical commissions, associations and societies, be solicited as part of the process of cultural resources inventory.

Local.

City of Capitola Municipal Code. Title 17 of the Capitola Municipal Code contains policies that address the identification of what the City call "historic features," which are defined in Section 17.03.285 as:

Any improvement, or group of improvements on a single site, of historic significant because of special aesthetic, cultural, architectural, archaeological, paleontological characteristic which has been so designated by the city council upon the recommendation of the planning commission (Ord. 515 § 3, 1982).

Designation criteria for City of Capitola historic features are laid out in Section 17.87.030 of the City's Municipal Code, which include a number of required findings that must be made prior to making the determination of whether a feature should be designated as historic. Chapter 17.87 outlines the City's procedure for establishing or designating historic feature designation, and Section 17.60.030 specifies the requirements that must be met in order for changes to an historic feature to be permitted.

Finally, Section 17.11.030 describes the archaeological survey report requirement, which requires an archaeological survey report for any development within an archaeological/paleontological sensitivity area, including the project site. Refer to the Capitola Municipal Code for full text of these code sections. Refer also to Section 4.8, *Land Use and Planning*, for a discussion of the project's consistency with Sections 17.60.030 and 17.11.030.

City of Capitola General Plan. The Capitola General Plan is currently being updated. The current General Plan was adopted in 1989. The Open Space, Parks and Recreation chapter of the existing Capitola General Plan contains the following policies related to cultural and historical resources.

<u>Policy 24</u>	It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to provide for the protection, preservation, and proper disposition (where necessary) of archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources within Capitola. This policy shall be implemented in cooperation with the landowners, developers, State Historic Preservation Office and the Archaeological Regional Research Center.
Policy 26	The city shall identify architecturally and historically significant structures and provide for their protection. These include special, unique structures in Capitola Village and surrounding bluffs, both public and private.

City of Capitola Local Coastal Program. The City of Capitola Local Coastal Program (LCP) identifies the presence of archeological and paleontological resources located in several different areas of Capitola's Coastal Zone. The LCP notes that Capitola's Coastal Zone "contains an important fossil record," and that a significant number of fossils have been found (including a whale skull) in the bluffs below Grand Avenue. Significant paleontological resources are predominantly associated with the Purisima Formation. This formation is present throughout the entire bluff area of Capitola, and there is a high potential for paleontological resources along the bluffs in Capitola. Map I-1 of the LCP identifies all coastal bluffs and cliffs as having high paleontological resources:

<u>Policy I-3</u> It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to provide for the protection, preservation, and proper disposition (where necessary) of archaeological, historical and paleontological resources within Capitola. This policy shall be implemented in cooperation with the landowners, developers, State Historic Preservation Office and the Archaeological Research Center.

e. Eligibility of Project Site Buildings.

<u>Prior Evaluations of the Project Site.</u> According to the City of Capitola Historic Structures List, the property at 620 El Salto Drive has a State Historic Resource Code of 7N, indicating that it needs to be reevaluated. The discussion in the draft *Historic Context Statement for the City of Capitola* (2004) associates the Main House with the early development of the Depot Hill Subdivision and states the house "may be eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources and possibly the National Register of Historic Places" (Swift, as quoted in ARG, 2013). This document and the accompanying architectural survey, however, were never finalized or formally adopted and hence do not constitute a "local register of historical resources" as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code.

The most thorough historic evaluation of the project site is a report entitled "Evaluation of a Proposed Project to Construct a Wall at Monarch Cove Inn" (Kirk, 2001). In the report, Kirk (2001) concluded that the Main House appears to be "potentially eligible" for listing on both the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. Kirk (2001) also concluded that no other buildings, structures or objects on the site were significant. Specifically, he found that some elements could potentially be considered district contributors, but that the site had changed so extensively that no district from either the English Cottage or El Salto eras in fact remained.

In March 2002, Kirk completed evaluations for two off-site cottages – the Lamplighter's Cottage and the Mariner's Cottage – that were part of the Hanchett-era build-out of the El Salto estate and are located at 709 El Salto Drive, southwest of the Monarch Cove project site. Kirk found that no historic district to which the cottages could contribute was present.

In April 2002, the City of Capitola commissioned a peer review of Kirk's evaluations of the Lamplighter's and Mariner's Cottages (Lehmann, 2002). In contrast to Kirk, Lehmann (2002) concluded that the Lamplighter's Cottage was eligible for local designation as a historical resource for its association with the Hanchett-era El Salto estate and as a representative example of a 1920s tourist cottage. Lehmann (2002) also concluded that the cottage was not eligible for

listing on the NRHP or CRHR. While the Mariner's Cottage shares a similar history, Lehmann found that that cottage had been too extensively altered to be eligible for designation as a historical resource.

In June 2004, the Capitola City Council determined that both the Lamplighter's Cottage and the Mariner's Cottage should be considered local historical resources for purposes of CEQA (ARG, 2013). The Capitola City Council has not listed either of the Cottages present on the existing Monarch Cove Inn site as historical resources.

<u>District.</u> Because the Monarch Cove project site and its surroundings fail to retain historic integrity from the English Cottages, El Salto estate, or El Salto Resort eras, ARG concluded that no historic district is present (ARG, 2013).

<u>Main House</u>. As the only surviving remnant of the English Cottages estate, the Main House appears to be eligible for listing under NRHP/CRHR Criterion A/1 for its association with the early development of the Depot Hill Subdivision as a residential area characterized by vacation homes and private estates (ARG, 2013). The Main House also appears to satisfy NRHP/CRHR Criterion C/3 as a grand and well-preserved example of late-Victorian architecture (*ibid*).

The Main house possesses several character-defining features, including:

- Rectangular plan
- Horizontal wood siding with corner boards
- *Hipped roof with gabled dormers*
- Casement/picture windows with divided-light upper windows
- Shingles at dormers
- Polygonal bays on south elevation and northeast corner
- Bayside location

The Main House appears to retain a fair level of integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship (ARG, 2013). Most of the materials present, including wood cladding, doors and window sash, appear to be original. The level of workmanship is high, as there are features throughout the house that display fine craftsmanship, including the doors and ceilings. The house appears to retain most of its original design dating to the late nineteenth century. The addition located on the east façade most likely dates from the first half of the twentieth century. Even with this addition, however, the building retains integrity of feeling and association as a grand, bayside Victorian house (ARG, 2013).

The Main House appears to satisfy the following (6) City of Capitola historic feature criteria found in Chapter 17.87 of the City of Capitola Municipal Code:

- *1.* The proposed feature is particularly representative of a distinct historic period, type, style or way of life,
- 3. The proposed feature is of greater age than most other features serving the same function,
- 8. The architecture, the materials used in construction, or the difficulty or ingenuity of construction associated with the proposed feature are significantly unusual or remarkable,

- 9. The proposed historic feature by its location and setting materially contributes to the historic character of the city,
- 10. The proposed historic feature is a long established feature of the city,
- *11.* The proposed history feature is a long established feature of the city, or is a prominent and identifying feature of the landscape and is of sufficient aesthetic important to be preserved

Based on the above evidence, the Main House's period of significance extends from its construction in the late 1890s until Lewis Hanchett acquired the English Cottages property in 1911 and proceeded to modify the estate substantially (ARG, 2013).

<u>Cottages.</u> Based on site reconnaissance and a review of the evaluations of related structures conducted by Anthony Kirk and Susan Lehmann, ARG concluded that Cottage 1 and Cottage 2, like the Lamplighter's and Mariner's cottages, appear to date from the 1920s. The cottages are significant for their association with the Hanchett family's build out of the El Salto estate (ARG, 2013).

In June 2004, the Capitola City Council determined that both the Lamplighter's Cottage and the Mariner's Cottage (which are located off the project site) should be considered local historical resources for purposes of CEQA. As a result, ARG concluded that the Monarch Cove cottages should likewise be considered historical resources for purposes of CEQA. Each cottage appears to satisfy City of Capitola historic feature criterion 10, as listed in Section 17.87.030 of the City's Zoning Ordinance: "The proposed historic feature is a long established feature of the city." As a representative example of an ancillary building (whether a servant or guest cottage) in support of the larger estate, each cottage also appears to satisfy City of Capitola historic feature criterion 1: "The proposed feature is particularly representative of a distinct historic period, type, style, or way of life." The period of significance associated with the cottages extends from their construction in the 1920s until 1946, when the Tabacchinis assumed ownership of the property and transformed it into the El Salto Resort (ARG, 2013).

As was previously determined with respect to the Lamplighter's and Mariner's Cottages, neither of the Monarch Cove cottages appears eligible for listing as an individual resource on the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places. They are also not eligible for NRHP/CRHR listing as district contributors because, as described above, no district is present. Furthermore, the Capitola City Council has not listed either of the cottages present on the existing Monarch Cove Inn site as historical resources.

Both cottages appear to retain sufficient integrity to convey their historic significance, with the exception of integrity of setting, which has been reduced through the subdivision and material loss of much of the El Salto estate (ARG, 2013). No record was found indicating that either cottage had been moved, so they appear to retain integrity of location. Both cottages are still legible as simple guest cottages or servant's quarters, and neither appears to have undergone any substantial additions or exterior alterations. Modifications to the cottages consist primarily of interior alterations that have not changed the buildings' exterior appearance. Exterior modifications appear to be limited to a few minor additions, including the entry pergolas at both cottages, the small bay at the rear of Cottage 2, and the deck that has been added to the side and rear of Cottage 1. As a result, the cottages retain integrity of design, workmanship, materials, feeling and association (ARG, 2013).

The following character-defining features have been identified for Cottage 1:

- *Rectangular plan*
- Single story
- Hipped roof
- Horizontal wood siding
- Wood sash windows, including fixed and six-over-one, double-hung windows
- Wood window and door surrounds

The following character-defining features have been identified for Cottage 2:

- *Rectangular plan*
- Single story
- Gabled roof with exposed rafter tails
- Horizontal wood siding
- Double-hung wood windows
- Wood window and door surrounds

<u>L-shaped Administrative/Garage Building</u>. Though the historical record is less than definitive, some portion of the L-shaped Building appears to date from the Hanchett-era El Salto estate (ARG, 2013). The original building, however, was substantially altered in 1959, when the Tabacchinis added a wing to the building, creating the L-shaped configuration extant today. Because the footprint of the building has been so substantially altered, the L-shaped Building does not appear to be eligible for listing under NRHP Criterion A or CRHR Criterion 1 (associations with historic events), NRHP Criterion B or CRHR Criterion 2 (associations with historically significant individuals), or NRHP Criterion C or CRHR Criterion 3 (an example of a type, period, or method of construction or association with a master designer). Due to its substantial alteration since it was first built and the lack of sufficient historical or architectural importance, it is not eligible for consideration as a designated City historic feature (ARG, 2013).

Landscape. The Historic Resources Technical Report (ARG, 2013; refer to Appendix D) included an analysis of the historical significance of the extant landscape at the Monarch Cove Inn. As discussed therein, no evidence has been found to suggest that the garden located at the Monarch Cove Inn project site has historic significance as a landscape. It is not listed in any national or state databases of historic landscapes, nor was it a garden of which the California Garden and Landscape History Society (CGLHS) had any knowledge. The ownership of the property has changed numerous times since it was first developed in the late 1890s, which increases the likelihood that substantial alterations to the landscape have been made. Furthermore, the parcels have been subdivided, making it nearly impossible for the original layout of the garden to retain integrity for the period of significance. The trees on the project site are not considered "heritage" trees under City of Capitola regulations, nor are they historically significant trees that have been on the property since the 1920s. Therefore, the extant garden at the Monarch Cove Inn property does not meet the definition of a designed historic landscape and is not a historical resource.

<u>Eligibility Summary</u>. The Main House, Cottage 1, and Cottage 2 possess both historic significance and integrity and are therefore considered historical resources for purpose of

CEQA. The L-shaped Administrative/Garage Building is not included in an historic district and therefore, is not considered a district contributor. The building has been altered substantially since it was first built and does not possess sufficient historical or architectural importance to be considered an individual historical resource. The landscape does not have historic significance, as it has been altered dramatically since the 1890s and does not meet the definition of a designed historic landscape.

4.4.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. The analysis of historic resources is based on the *Historic Resources Technical Report* prepared for the project (ARG, October 2013). The analysis of prehistoric and archaeological cultural resources is based on a search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), as well as a *Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Survey* prepared for the project (Rincon Consultants, Inc., November 2013). These reports are included in Appendix D to this EIR.

In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, impacts would be significant if project implementation would:

- 1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
- 2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
- 3) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; *and/or*
- 4) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

When a proposed project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, CEQA requires a lead agency to carefully consider the possible impacts before proceeding (Public Resources Code Section21084.1). CEQA equates a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource with a significant effect on the environment (Section 21084.1). A "substantial adverse change" in the significance of a historical resource is defined as "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource is "materially impaired." Further, that the significance of an historical resource is "materially impaired" when a project:

- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources... or its identification in an historical resources survey..., unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the

California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA. [State Guidelines Section 15064.5(b)]

The lead agency is responsible for the identification of potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource. The specified methodology for determining if impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels are the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* and the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* (1995), publications of the National Park Service [*State CEQA Guidelines* §15064.5(b)(3-4)].

The significance of a cultural resource deposit and, subsequently, the significance of an impact are determined by whether or not that deposit can increase knowledge of the past. The determining factors are site content and degree of preservation. A finding of archaeological significance follows the criteria established in the *State CEQA Guidelines*, as summarized in Section 4.4.1(d) (Regulatory Setting).

Historical resources are "significantly" affected if there is demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its surroundings. Generally, impacts to historical resources can be mitigated to below a level of significance by following the Secretary of the Interior's *Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* or the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* [13 PRC 15064.6 (b)]. In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource by way of historic narrative photographs or architectural drawings will not mitigate the impact of demolition below the level of significance [13 PRC 15126.4 (b)(3)]. Preservation in place is the preferred form of mitigation for a "historical resource of an archaeological nature" as it retains the relationship between artifact and context, and may avoid conflicts with groups associated with the site [PRC 15126.4 (b)(3)(A)]. Historic resources of an archaeological nature and "unique archaeological resources" can be mitigated to below a level of significance by:

- *Relocating construction areas such that the site is avoided;*
- Incorporation of sites within parks, greenspace, or other open space;
- "Capping" or covering the site with a layer of chemically stable soil before building; or
- Deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. [PRC 15126.4 (b)(3)(B)]

In the event that resources cannot be preserved, "unique archaeological resources" can only be excavated as mitigation if they are threatened with damage or destruction by the proposed project. The time and cost limitations that may apply to the excavation of archaeological resources do not apply to activities that determine whether the archaeological resources are "unique" [PRC 15064.5 (c)(3)].

If an archaeological resource does not meet either the historic resource or the more specific "unique archaeological resource" definition, impacts do not need to be mitigated [13 PRC 15064.5 (e)]. Where the significance of a site is unknown, it is presumed to be significant for the purpose of the EIR investigation.
b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact CR-1The proposed project would demolish two on-site cottages,
which are eligible for designation as local historical resources.
Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.

The project includes demolition of Cottage 1 and Cottage 2, both of which may be eligible for listing in the Capitola Register of Historic Features (ARG, 2013). As discussed in greater detail in Section 4.4.1(f) (Eligibility of Project Site Buildings), the cottages are potentially significant for their association with the Hanchett family's build out of the El Salto estate. The cottages have retained sufficient integrity to convey their historic significance (ARG, 2013). As a result, the proposed project may have a significant impact on historical resources.

It should also be noted that the determination of local significance is ultimately made by City decision-makers, in accordance with Chapter 17.87 of the Capitola Municipal Code. Pursuant to these requirements, City Council consideration of historical significance must occur at a duly noticed public hearing, where specific findings regarding the qualities of the feature under consideration must be made. Upon determination of historical significance by the City Council, the Community Development Director must notify the owner, and the City Clerk must add the feature to the City's register of historic features.

If Cottage 1 and Cottage 2 are not determined to be locally significant by City decision-makers, then impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. For the purpose of this analysis, however, it is assumed that the cottages are confirmed as historic by City decision-makers, and impacts are therefore considered potentially significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. Because the project proposes to demolish both cottages, there are no existing regulatory requirements that would mitigate this potential impact. However, upon relocation of the cottages (as required by mitigation measure CR-1, below), the Secretary of the Interior's *Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Guidelines)* and *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (Standards)* [13 PRC 15064.6 (b)] would ensure that the buildings retain their integrity and historical significance after relocation.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. The following mitigation measure is required, unless City decision-makers determine after a duly noticed public hearing that the cottages are not locally significant.

CR-1 Cottage Relocation. Cottage 1 and Cottage 2 shall be stabilized and relocated elsewhere on the project site, and shall be used for a purpose other than guest rooms (e.g. spa facilities). A probable location for the cottages is in the vicinity of the current outdoor deck, which is proposed to contain landscaping, pathways, and two fire pits (refer to Figure 2-3 in Section 2.0, *Project Description*). This location is shown in Figure 4.4-3, and would place the cottages outside of the 50-foot cliff setback. The relocation of the cottages shall be completed prior to construction of the proposed new buildings. The applicant

shall submit adequate funds to the Community Development Department to retain a qualified historical building mover to oversee relocation activities. The cottages shall each be moved as a single piece, if feasible. After relocation, the cottages shall be preserved and restored in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to ensure that the buildings retain their integrity and historical significance. The qualified historical building mover shall summarize the results of the relocation efforts in a letter report submitted to the Community Development Department.

<u>Significance After Mitigation.</u> Due to the substantial changes that have occurred on the cottages setting, their future setting on the project site, in accordance with mitigation measure CR-1, would be sufficiently similar to their current setting. Thus, by eliminating the proposed demolition of these two cottages, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Impact CR-2 The temporary relocation, seismic retrofits, and reorientation of the Main House, as well as the construction of the Bayview Building, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the historic significance of the Main House. Therefore, project impacts on the Main House would be Class III, *less than significant*.

As described in Section 4.4.1(f) (Eligibility of Project Site Buildings), the Main House appears to be an historical resource under NRHP, CRHR, and the City of Capitola historic feature criteria. The proposed project would include seismic improvements and construction of a new foundation for this building, which would be slightly adjusted in orientation from its existing location. During construction, the building would be temporarily relocated 15 to 20 feet south of its existing location. The house's final location would overlap considerably with its existing location (see Figure 4.4-4). As such, the proposed reorientation itself is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change in the historic significance of the Main House (ARG, 2013).

Central to any assessment of whether a proposed action is in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* is an evaluation of the effect the action would have on character-defining features. To meet the Secretary's *Standards*, care need be taken to, wherever possible, preserve character-defining features, to repair instead of replace deteriorated features, and to replace-in-kind features that are too severely deteriorated to repair.

The only portions of the Main House that are proposed to be detached as part of the relocation process are the existing foundation, along with four decks (two on the north elevation and two on the south elevation) consisting of wooden floorboards and railings. The decks would be reconstructed using materials similar to the existing materials, and the house would receive a new concrete foundation.

None of the existing decks appears to be original to the building. The sizable deck at the house's southeast corner does not appear in the only available historic photograph of the building (refer to Figure 4.4-2). The other deck on the south elevation has been substantially reconfigured since this historic photograph was taken, and none of the



PROJECT DATA TOTAL SITE AREA: 61,892 SF LESS AREA BELOW CLIFF: 6,374 SF 55,518 SF NET DEVELOPABLE: AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT 30 FT EXISTING GUEST ROOMS: NEW PROPOSED GUEST ROOMS 32 TOTAL GUEST ROOMS: 41 AREA CALCULATIONS BUILDING COVERAGE: 15,794 SF 28.4% TERRACES, FOUNTAINS, PLANTERS: 3,137 SF 5.7% LANDSCAPE: 24,830 SF 44.7% PERVIOUS PAVED DRIVEWAY: 5,653 SF 10.2% CONCRETE SIDEWALKS & DRIVEWAYS: 6,104 SF 11% RIGHT OF WAY POROUS PAVING: 2,617 SF 12.7% CONCRETE DRIVEWAY AND RAMP: 2.494 SF 12.2% ASPHALT: 450 SF 2.2% LANDSCAPE PLANTING: 14.950 SF 72.9% PARKING GARAGE UPPER LEVEL: 26 SPACES GARAGE LOWER LEVEL: UNCOVERED: 30 SPACES 4 SPACES TOTAL SPACES: 60 SPACES STANDARD SPACES: 38 SPACES H.C. ACCESSIBLE SPACES: TANDEM SPACES: 2 SPACES 20 SPACES TOTAL SPACES: 60 SPACES CLASS 1 BIKE PARKING: 16 SPACES CI 255 2 11 SPACES

Source: Thacher & Thompson Architects, November 2013 Cottage Relocation Mitigation





Source: Charles Eadie, Hamilton Swift and Associates, August 16, 2013.



Current, Proposed Temporary and Proposed Final Location of the Main House existing floorboards or railing appears to be original. Given their size and configuration, the two small decks on the north side of the house appear to date from the post-WWII conversion of the house into nine separate rental units. Because the decks do not date from the building's period of significance, their removal and reconstruction using in-kind materials does not constitute a significant impact to historical resources.

There is a sufficient level of distance between the proposed site of the Bayview Building and the Main House to ensure that construction of the new Bayview Building would not damage the exterior of the historic house and no protective barriers would be necessary (ARG, 2013). The new construction would not include any pile driving or other activities that may generate significant ground-borne vibrations that would endanger the structural stability of the Main House.

The project would include the construction of two new buildings: a "Main Building" and a "Bayview Building." The new Main Building would have a maximum height of 30 feet and the new Bayview Building would have a maximum height of 26 feet. The proposed design of both buildings would be compatible with the design of the Main House and would be in conformance with Secretary Standard 9 (ARG, 2013). The existing Main House would be shifted, but its design would not be altered and the Bayview Building would be similarly designed and would not be taller than the Main House.

The new construction would not interfere with the Main House's relationship with the coast, nor would the proposed locations for the Main House and the Bayview Building affect the Main House's historic significance (ARG, 2013). The location proposed for the Bayview Building would require removal of the garden immediately west of the Main House. As discussed above, this garden does not meet the definition of a designed historic landscape, and thus is not an historical resource; therefore, no impact would occur as a result of its removal.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. As described above, the proposed project would be required to comply with The Secretary of the Interior's *Guidelines* and *Standards* [13 PRC 15064.6 (b)]. Compliance with these standards would ensure that impacts to the Main House and its historic significance are less than significant.

<u>Mitigation Measures.</u> No mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact CR-3 There are no known prehistoric or archaeological resources in the proposed project area. Impacts to known archeological resources would therefore be Class III, *less than significant*.

A search of the CHRIS was conducted by NWIC (October, 2013) to identify all previously conducted cultural resources work within the project site and a 0.5-mile radius around the project site, as well as to identify previously recorded cultural resources within or near the project site. The CHRIS search included a review of the NRHP, the CRHR, the California Points of Historical Interest list, the California Historical Landmarks list, the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility list, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory list. The

records search also included a review of all available historic USGS 7.5- and 15-minute quadrangle maps.

Based on this search, a total of 50 studies have been conducted within a 0.5 mile radius of the project site. The NWIC mapped one study (S-10556) as within the project site, but further research identified its location as outside the project site (ARG, 2013). An additional five studies have been conducted within the project vicinity but are not mapped due to insufficient information. The records indicate that the Monarch Cove project site itself has not been surveyed for archaeological resources. As a result, *Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Survey* of the project site was conducted in November 2013 (refer to Appendix D). The results of the cultural resources records search, Native American scoping, and intensive pedestrian survey included in the Phase 1 survey did not identify any archaeological resources within the project site.

There are 22 previously recorded cultural resources within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. No cultural resources have been recorded within the project site. Of these, six are prehistoric archaeological sites, one is a historic archaeological site, and the remaining 15 are historic built-environment resources. Based on the proximity of previously recorded sites, the project site is considered sensitive for archaeological resources. Impacts to previously unrecorded resources are addressed in Impact CR-4 below.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. The proposed project would be required to comply with Section 17.11.030 of the City of Capitola's Municipal Code, which requires the preparation of an archaeological survey report based on site's location within an Archaeological Sensitivity Area. This report is summarized in the impact discussion above.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. No mitigation measures are required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact CR-4 Construction of the proposed project would involve surface excavation. Although unlikely, construction activities have the potential to unearth or impact previously unidentified archaeological cultural resources. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Project construction activities, including ground clearing, grading and excavation, could have adverse impacts on previously unidentified prehistoric or archaeological cultural resources. Pre-construction reconnaissance can only confidently assess the potential for encountering surface prehistoric or archaeological cultural resource remains. As discussed in Section 4.4.1(a) (Historical Background), the project site is located in an archaeological/paleontological sensitivity area as designated by the City of Capitola General Plan (1989). Furthermore, based on the proximity of previously recorded cultural resource sites, the project area is considered sensitive for archaeological resources (Northwestern Information Center, [NWIC], 2013). Therefore, the possibility remains for encountering previously unidentified subsurface prehistoric or archaeological cultural resources during construction activities.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. If such resources are discovered, *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5(c)(1) requires that the lead agency first determine if an archaeological resource is a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(a). If the resource qualifies as a historical resource, potential adverse impacts must be considered in the same manner as a historical resource (California Office of Historic Preservation, 2001a). If the archaeological resource does not qualify as a historical resource but does qualify as a "unique archaeological resource," then the archaeological resource is treated in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 [see also *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15069.5(c)(3)].

Mitigation Measures. The following mitigation measures are required.

CR-4(a) Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring. At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction or any site preparation activities, the project applicant shall deposit adequate funds with the Community Development Department to retain a qualified archaeological monitor. The archaeological monitor shall have the authority to stop work if archaeological resources are discovered. At least seven working days prior to the commencement of construction activities, a pre-construction meeting will be held. The archaeological monitor will attend the pre-construction meeting. In addition, the archaeological monitor will organize a meeting with all construction workers associated with earth disturbing activities. The meeting shall describe the potential of exposing archaeological resources, the types of cultural materials may be encountered, and directions on the steps that shall be taken if such a find is encountered.

A qualified archaeologist shall be present during all initial earth moving activities. In the event that unearthed prehistoric or archaeological cultural resources or human remains are encountered during project construction, mitigation measure CR-2(b) shall take effect.

CR-4(b) Unearthed Prehistoric or Archaeological Cultural Remains. If prehistoric or archaeological cultural resource remains are encountered

prehistoric or archaeological cultural resource remains are encountered during construction or land modification activities, work shall stop and the City of Capitola shall be notified at once to assess the nature, extent, and potential significance of any prehistoric or archaeological cultural remains. A Phase II subsurface testing program shall be implemented to determine the resource boundaries within the project component/impact area, assess the integrity of the resource, and evaluate the site's significance through a study of its features and artifacts. The findings of the testing program along with mitigation recommendations, as applicable, shall be submitted to the City for review and approval.

If the site is determined significant, the City may require that the resource area be capped using culturally sterile and chemically

neutral fill material. A qualified archaeologist shall be retained to monitor the placement of fill upon the site. If a significant site will not be capped, the results and recommendations of the Phase II study shall determine the need for a Phase III data recovery program designed to record and remove significant prehistoric or archaeological cultural materials that could otherwise be tampered with. If the site is determined insignificant, no capping and or further archaeological investigation shall be required. The results and recommendations of the Phase II study shall determine the need for construction monitoring.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Impact CR-5 Construction of the proposed project would involve surface excavation, which has the potential to unearth or adversely impact previously unidentified human remains. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

No cemeteries are known to occur within or adjacent to the proposed project site and no evidence of a cemetery or burial areas was identified within or adjacent to the proposed project site. Thus, discovery of buried human remains is not likely to occur with construction of the proposed project. Nonetheless, excavation and soil removal of any kind, irrespective of depth, would have the potential to encounter human remains. While not considered likely, construction would require excavation, trenching, and related earthwork that could uncover human remains.

If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the City Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Native American, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As described above, the proposed project would be required to comply with the State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 for the discovery of human remains. Compliance with these standards would ensure that the project would not have a significant impact on human remains.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. No mitigation measures beyond existing regulatory obligations are required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact CR-6 Construction of the proposed project would involve surface excavation. These activities have the potential to unearth and/or impact paleontological resources. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Paleontological sensitivity refers to the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils. Direct impacts to paleontological resources occur when earthwork activities, such as grading or trenching, cut into the geologic deposits (formations) within which fossils are buried and physically destroy the fossils. Since fossils are the remains of prehistoric animal and plant life, they are considered to be nonrenewable. Sensitivity is determined by rock type, past history of the geologic unit in producing significant fossils, and fossil localities recorded from that unit. Paleontological sensitivity is derived from the known fossil data collected from the entire geologic unit, not just from a specific survey.

Currently, two generally accepted paleontological sensitivity classifications are used: the system outlined in the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) *Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources* (SVP, 2010) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) *Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC)* system outlined in the *BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM) No. 2008-009* (BLM, 2009). The City of Capitola has identified the entire coastal bluff and cliff area within the City as having paleontological sensitivity (see Map I-1 of the City of Capitola LCP). In addition, a single geological unit, the Purisima Formation, is mapped underlying the project site (Brabb, 1997; Diblee and Minch, 2005). This Pliocene aged formation consist of light brown to tan, weakly lithified, massive to bedded, fine to medium grained sandstone that is locally fossiliferous including bivalves, gastropods, echinoderms, shark's teeth, and marine mammals. Based on known fossil occurrences from the Purisima Formation (Addicott et al., 1978; Madrid et al., 1977; Perry, 1977, 1993; Powell et al., 2007), this unit would be considered to have high paleontological sensitivity under both SVP and BLM guidelines.

Excavation and grading that extends beyond the depth of surface soils (typically 3 to 5 feet) have a likelihood of disturbing geologic units with high paleontological sensitivity. Based on the above information, the proposed project site is located in an area with high paleontological sensitivity; therefore, there is a potential to disturb scientifically significant paleontological resources. As a result, project construction, including ground clearing, grading and excavation, could have adverse impacts on paleontological resources.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. As described previously, the proposed project would be required to comply with the City of Capitola Local Coastal Program, including its policies to protect archaeological, paleontological and historical resources. Section 30244 of the Coastal Act affords protection to archaeological and paleontological resources, and that the historic preservation element contains a statement that archeological and paleontological resources should be preserved.

Mitigation Measures. The following mitigation measures are required.

CR-6(a) Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Monitoring Program. At least 30 days prior to commencement of construction or any site preparation activities, the project applicant shall deposit adequate funds with the Community Development Department to retain a qualified paleontological monitor. The paleontological monitor shall have the authority to stop work if paleontological resources are discovered. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the qualified paleontological monitor shall prepare a Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program to be implemented during project ground disturbance activity. This program shall outline the procedures for construction staff Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training, paleontological monitoring extent and duration, salvage and preparation of fossils, the final mitigation and monitoring report, and paleontological staff qualifications.

- **CR-6(b)** Paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program. At least seven working days prior to the commencement of construction activities, the paleontological monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting. In addition, the paleontological monitor shall conduct a meeting to inform all construction personnel about the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff.
- **CR-6(c)** Paleontological Resource Construction Monitoring. Any excavations exceeding three feet in depth shall be monitored on a full-time basis by the qualified paleontological monitor. Ground disturbing activity that does not exceed three feet in depth shall not require paleontological monitoring. If no fossils are observed during the first 50% of excavations exceeding three feet in depth, paleontological monitoring may be reduced to weekly spotchecking if recommended by the qualified paleontologist and approved by the City.
- CR-6(d) Salvage, Preparation, and Curation of Fossils. If fossils are discovered, the paleontological monitor shall recover them. Typically fossils can be safely salvaged quickly by a single paleontologist and not disrupt construction activity. In some cases larger fossils (such as complete skeletons or large mammal fossils) require more extensive excavation and longer salvage periods. In this case the paleontologist shall have the authority to temporarily direct, divert or halt construction activity to ensure that the fossil(s) can be removed in a safe and timely manner. Once salvaged, fossils shall be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection, along with all pertinent field notes, photos, data, and maps.
- **CR-6(e)** Final Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Report: Upon completion of ground disturbing activity (and curation of fossils if necessary), the qualified paleontological monitor shall prepare a final mitigation and monitoring report outlining the results of the mitigation and monitoring program. The report shall include

discussion of the location, duration and methods of the monitoring, stratigraphic sections, any recovered fossils, and the scientific significance of those fossils, and where fossils were curated.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As discussed in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. These and any other projects proposed in the future would increase ground disturbance and structural development within the City. Such development would have the potential to impact historic, cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources. The proposed project would incrementally contribute to these cumulative impacts. However, development projects would be subject to City review on a case-by-case basis, and subject to applicable CEQA review. The City of Capitola would require that all proposed projects comply with the regulations outlined in this section to protect cultural resources. Potential impacts from future development would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and appropriate mitigation would be designed to mitigate impacts resulting from individual projects. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

4.5 GEOLOGY

4.5.1 Setting

a. Regional Geology. The land within the City of Capitola is considered a marine terrace, a flat section of coastline that is terraced, like a staircase. Coastal streams, such as Soquel Creek, carve the landscape. Siltstone and sandstone make up the underlying geologic formation, with outcrops of severely weathered, soft, light grayish-brown sandstone in coastal bluff areas.

The northwest-southeast structural grain of the Coast Ranges is controlled by a complex of active faults within the San Andreas Fault system. Southwest of the San Andreas Fault, the Coast Ranges, including the Santa Cruz Mountains, are underlain by a large, northwest-trending, fault-bounded elongated prism of granitic and metamorphic basement rocks. The granitic and metamorphic basement is Cretaceous in age or older, and is overlain by a sequence of dominantly marine sedimentary rocks of Paleocene to Pliocene age and non-marine sediments of Pleistocene and Holocene age. The older sedimentary rocks are moderately to strongly deformed, with steep-limbed folds and several generations of faults associated with uplift of the Santa Cruz Mountains.

The Santa Cruz Mountains are cut by several active faults, of which the San Andreas and Zayante Faults pose the most probable seismic hazards to Capitola. Along the coast, the ongoing tectonic activity is most evident in the gradual uplift of the coastline, as indicated by the series of uplifted marine terraces that sculpt the coastline (City of Santa Cruz, 2013).

b. Site Geology and Topography. The Monarch Cove Inn is situated in the Depot Hill area of Capitola. The existing hotel is bounded by the coastal bluff along its southern perimeter with the Escalona Drive right of way on the eastern edge of the project site. The coastal bluff top is approximately 95 feet above the beach below and consists of about 28 feet of marine terrace deposits overlying weakly cemented sandstone bedrock.

The project site is relatively flat with bluffs along the southern portion of the site. The general project site subsurface profile consists of 25 to 28 feet of marine or alluvium terrace deposits overlying sandstone bedrock of the Purisima Formation. The blufftop terrace deposits consists of near surface, medium dense silty and clayey sands over medium dense to dense, sands and gravels. The sandstone bedrock was found to be dense to very dense. The testing samples from both the deeper terrace deposits and the underlying sandstone exhibited little to no cementation. Historic fill soil wedges, two to seven feet thick were found along the northern perimeter of the project site.

During the July 2012 field investigation conducted as part of the *Geotechnical Investigation* by Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., groundwater was observed at approximately 24 to 26 feet below grade within the northern half of the project site. The groundwater was found to be perched upon the sandstone bedrock. Groundwater levels are expected to rise during the winter rainy season.

c. Landslides. According to the City of Capitola General Plan, the majority of Capitola is flat; therefore, landslides and mudflows are not a significant concern throughout much of the City. However, there are some areas of steep slopes, especially along creeks, gulches, and coastal bluffs, which are susceptible to landslides and mudflows. In particular, the areas along coastal bluffs pose landslide risks.

The proposed Monarch Cove Hotel would be located on a site with relatively flat topography that is currently developed. However, the site is situated at the top of a 95-foot high coastal bluff subject to wave action at the toe (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., August 2013), and may therefore be susceptible to landslides and mudflows (Capitola General Plan, 1989).

d. Seismic Setting. The United States Geological Survey (USGS) defines active faults as those that have had surface displacement within Holocene time (approximately within the last 11,000 years). Surface displacement can be recognized by the existence of cliffs in alluvium, terraces, offset stream courses, fault troughs and saddles, the alignment of depressions, sag ponds, and the existence of steep mountain fronts. Active faults as defined by the State Geologist have been designated as Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones and require special regulation and study for projects proposed in these zones. Further discussion of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is provided in the Regulatory Setting. Potentially active faults are those that have had surface displacement during Quaternary time (the last 1.6 million years). Inactive faults have not had surface displacement within the last 1.6 million years.

Capitola is located in one of the most seismically active areas of the country. Although there are no known active faults running through Capitola, there are several substantial faults in the region, including the San Andreas, Zayante-Vergeles, and Palo Colorado-San Gregorio Faults. The San Andreas Fault, which is located in the Santa Cruz Mountains approximately nine miles northest of Capitola, and the Zayante-Vergeles Fault, which is located approximately four miles north of the site, pose the most probable seismic hazards to the project(City of Capitola General Plan, 1989).

Figure 4.5-1 shows the locations of the San Andreas, Zayante-Vergeles, and San Gregorio Faults in relation to the project site.

San Andreas Fault Zone. The San Andreas Fault Zone is the dominant active fault in California. The San Andreas Fault Zone is the primary surface boundary between the Pacific and North American plates. The main trace of the fault is approximately nine miles northeast of Capitola; it trends northwest-southeast and extends over 800 miles from the Gulf of California through the Coast Ranges to Point Arena, where the fault passes offshore and merges with the Cascadia Fault Zone. One of the largest earthquakes in the Santa Cruz area, the Loma Prieta earthquake, occurred on October 17, 1989 due to movement on this fault. This event measured 7.1 on the Richter scale and causing significant ground shaking in Capitola. The epicenter of the Loma Prieta earthquake was approximately five miles north-northwest of the project site (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., 2013).

Monarch Cove Hotel EIR Section 4.5 Geology



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013. Additional data provided by the U.S. Geological Survey, 2008,

Regional Faults

Zayante-Vergeles Fault. The Zayante Fault lies southwest of the San Andreas Fault. The southern extent of the Zayante Fault merges with the Vergeles Fault. It is at this junction that the fault is considered potentially active (California Geologic Survey, 2010). The Zayante Fault is located approximately four miles north of the project site. The California Division of Mines and Geology considers the Zayante Fault active, although it has not caused any significant earthquakes historically. However, this fault did generate several aftershocks after the Loma Prieta earthquake.

San Gregorio Fault. The San Gregorio Fault cuts the ocean floor seaward of Monterey Bay and skirts the Santa Cruz County coastline before coming on land just south of Point Año Nuevo. The San Gregorio Fault is located approximately 18 miles southwest of the project site. It is considered potentially active (California Geologic Survey, 2010.) The area where the San Gregorio Fault comes on land is considered an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone.

e. Seismic Hazards. Faults generally produce damage in two ways: groundshaking and surface rupture. Seismically induced groundshaking covers a wide area and is greatly influenced by the distance of the site to the seismic source, soil conditions, and depth to groundwater. Surface rupture is limited to very near the fault. Other hazards associated with seismically induced groundshaking include earthquake-triggered landslides and tsunamis. Tsunamis and seiches are associated with ocean surges and inland water bodies, respectively. The California Department of Conservation's Tsunami Hazard Inundation Map for the Soquel Quadrangle (July 1, 2009) shows that the project site would not be subject to tsunamis. Seiches are standing waves in an enclosed or partially enclosed body of water. The project site is not located adjacent to enclosed or partially enclosed bodies of water therefore the site would not be subject to seiches.

<u>Ground Rupture.</u> The project area is located outside an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act of 1972 (now the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act), which regulates development near active faults. Thus, as discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project (Appendix A), the potential for ground rupture to the project area from an active fault is low.

<u>Seismically Induced Ground Shaking</u>. As described in Section 4.4.1(d) above, there are numerous faults of significance potentially affecting Capitola. An earthquake along any of these faults could induce seismic ground shaking at the proposed project site.

Liquefaction. Liquefaction is a temporary, but substantial, loss of shear strength in water-saturated sediment (such as granular solids, including sand, silt, or gravel), usually occurring during or after a major earthquake. In cohesionless, granular materials with low relative density (loose to medium dense sands, for example) the vibration that occurs as a result of an earthquake can disturb the particle framework, leading to increased compaction of the material and reduction of pore space between framework grains. If the sediment is saturated, water occupying the pore spaces resists this compaction and exerts port pressure that reduces the contact stress between the sediment grains. With continued shaking, transfer of intergranular stress to pore water can generate pore pressures great enough to cause the sediment to lose its strength and change from a solid state to a liquefied state. This mechanical transformation, termed liquefaction, can cause various kinds of ground failure at or near the ground surface. This liquefaction process typically occurs at depths less than 50 feet below the

ground surface. Liquefaction can occur at deeper intervals, given the right conditions, however, ground manifestations have been found to be relatively minor.

As indicated in the City's Local Hazards Mitigation Plan (2013), soils in the vicinity of the project site have a low potential for liquefaction. Additionally, the *Geotechnical Investigation* completed by Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc. (2013) identified the site as low potential for liquefaction due to the dense to very dense bedrock located beneath the site.

<u>Lateral Spreading.</u> Lateral spreading is the horizontal movement of loose, unconfined sedimentary and fill deposits during seismic activity. The potential for lateral spreading is highest in areas underlain by soft, saturated materials, especially where bordered by steep banks or adjacent hard ground. The underlying soils on the site are very hard and firm, making the potential for lateral spreading on the site low (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., 2013).

f. Soil Related Hazards. Soil related hazards include expansive soils, subsidence, settlement, and erosion. There are two soil types on the project site: Elkhorn sandy loam, 2 to 9% slopes; and Elkhorn Pfeiffer complex, 30 to 50% slopes (refer to Figure 4.5-2). The soil related hazards associated with these soil types are shown in Table 4.5-1 and described in greater detail below.

Table 4.5-1 Project Site Soil Hazard Potential

Soil Type	Expansive Soils	Subsidence	Settlement	Soil Erosion
Elkhorn sandy Loam	Low	No	No	Yes
Elkhorn Pfeiffer complex	Low	No	No	Yes

Source: Natural Resource Conservation Service [NRCS], 2013.

<u>Expansive Soils</u>. Expansive soils are those possessing clay particles that react to moisture changes by shrinking (when they dry) or swelling (when they become wet). In general, the project site is underlain by sandy loam soils, which are not classified as expansive soils (Natural Resource Conservation Service [NRCS], 2013). The Local Hazards Mitigation Plan (2013) identifies low potential for impacts from expansive soils throughout the City of Capitola.

<u>Subsidence</u>. Subsidence is the lowering of ground surface. It often occurs as a result of withdrawal of fluids such as water, oil, and gas from the subsurface. When fluids are removed from the subsurface, the overburden weight, which the water had previously helped support through buoyant forces, is transferred to the soil structure. Subsidence typically occurs over a long period of time and results in a number of structural impacts. Facilities most affected by subsidence are long, surface infrastructure facilities such as canals, sewers, and pipelines.

The extraction of groundwater from an aquifer beneath an alluvial valley can result in subsidence or settlement of the alluvial soils. The factors that influence the potential occurrence and severity of alluvial soil settlement due to groundwater withdrawal include: degrees of groundwater confinement; thickness of aquifer systems; individual and total thickness of fine-grained beds; and compressibility of the fine-grained layers. No known areas of subsidence are located on the project site (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013).



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013. Additional data provided by the USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey, 2013. <u>Settlement</u>. The possible effects of liquefaction (see above for a further discussion on liquefaction) would likely include seismically-induced settlement and potentially lateral spreading. Seismically induced settlement of non-liquefied soil is the settlement that can occur in dry, sandy soils as a result of a seismic shock. No areas known to possess significant settlement potential are located on the project site (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013).

<u>Soil Erosion.</u> The proposed Monarch Cove Hotel is located in an area of high bluff erosion, as indicated by the City's Local Hazards Mitigation Plan (2013). The local shoreline is nearly parallel to the dominant direction of approach for refracted waves. As a result, littoral drift is rapid, inhibiting formation of a continuous protective beach. Instead, a series of pocket beaches, which are sensitive to seasonal changes and human intervention, have formed. The Depot Hill neighborhood portion is unprotected.

The bluff recession rate between 1928 and 1990 was estimated to be 1.1 feet per year (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013). Assuming this constant rate of retreat, the first houses in the Depot Hill Neighborhood would be threatened or damaged in approximately 50 years, and most first-line houses would be damaged or destroyed within approximately 75 years and after 100 years (Local Hazards Mitigation Plan, 2013). After 100 years, some of the second-line houses could be threatened (*ibid*). The existing Victorian structure on the property is located approximately 90 feet from the blufftop and would be threatened or damaged within approximately 80 years (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013). Figure 4.5-3 shows the estimated erosion of the bluff face over the next 100 years.

g. Slope Stability and Landslides. Landslides result when the driving forces that act on a slope (i.e. the weight of the slope material, and the weight of objects placed on it) are greater than the slope's natural resisting forces (i.e. the shear strength of the slope material). Slope instability may result from natural processes, such as the erosion of the toe of a slope by a stream, or by ground shaking caused by an earthquake. Slopes can also be modified artificially by grading, or by the addition of water or structures to a slope. Development on a slope can substantially increase the frequency and extent of potential slope stability hazards. Steep, unstable slopes in weak soil/bedrock units that have a record of previous slope failure typically characterize areas susceptible to landslides. There are numerous factors that affect the stability of the slope, including: slope height and steepness, type of materials, material strength, structural geologic relationships, ground water level, and level of seismic shaking.

Landslides typically occur in areas where steep slopes exist, such as hillsides or mountain regions. The project site contains gently sloping topography. However, the site is situated at the top of a 95-foot high coastal bluff subject to wave action at the toe (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., August 2013). Erosion of the bluff could potentially result in a landslide. In general, landslides are downslope motions of earth material. They occur because the earth materials lose their ability to maintain their integrity at a specific gradient and settle into a lesser gradient or position of greater equilibrium. The soils underlying the site consist of 25 to 28 feet of marine or alluvium terrace deposits overlying sandstone bedrock of the Purisima Formation. The blufftop terrace deposits soils profile consists of near surface, medium dense silty and clayey sands over medium dense to dense, sands and gravels. The sandstone bedrock is considered dense to very dense. The soils that comprise the site and the bluff are not susceptible to landslides.



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013. Additional data from Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013

Estimated Cliff Retreat

h. Sea Level Rise. According to *The Impacts of Sea-Level Rise on the California Coast,* prepared by the California Climate Change Center (CCCC) (May 2009), climate change has the potential to induce substantial sea level rise in the coming century. The rising sea level increases the likelihood and risk of flooding and erosion. The study identifies a sea level rise on the California coast over the past century of approximately eight inches. Based on the results of various global climate change models, sea level rise is expected to continue. The California Climate Adaptation Strategy (December 2009) estimates a sea level rise of up to 55 inches by the end of this century.

In Santa Cruz County, higher sea levels would allow waves and tides to travel farther inland, exposing beaches, cliffs, and coastal dunes to more persistent erosional forces. Statewide, a 4.6 foot rise in sea level has the potential to erode approximately 41 square miles of coastline by the end of the century (Center for Ocean Solutions, 2013). Along the northern shore of Monterey Bay, sea cliffs in Santa Cruz County experience average retreat rates of approximately 0.17 to 2.1 feet per year (*ibid*), which may increase as a result of sea level rise.

The Pacific Institute (2009) has developed a series of coastal hazard maps for the entire coast of California, including in the vicinity of the proposed project (refer to Figure 4.5-4). These maps illustrate the projected sea level rise and landward extent of erosion under a moderate sea level rise scenario. These maps show that the sea level rise scenario (coastal 100-year base flood plus 55 inches) would extend only a short distance further inland than existing conditions in the vicinity of project components near the coastline. For example, under existing conditions, the 100-year coastal base flood would extend inland approximately 55 feet in the vicinity of the Monarch Cove Hotel; with sea level rise projections, this flood could extend an additional 25 feet inland (refer to Figure 4.5-4). For areas near where Soquel Creek empties into the bay, both the base flood and the sea level rise scenario extend substantially further inland along the course of the creek. The proposed project would not be subject to substantial effects from sea level rise according to these maps; however, this could contribute to bluff erosion adjacent to the site.

i. Regulatory Setting.

State.

California Building Code. The California Building Code (CBC) provides standards for building construction, including design guidelines and specifications to meet earthquake standards.

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning (AP) Act was passed into law in 1971 following the destructive San Fernando earthquake. The AP Act provides a mechanism for reducing losses from surface fault rupture on a statewide basis. The intent of the AP Act is to ensure public safety by prohibiting the siting of most structures for human occupancy across traces of active faults that constitute a potential hazard to structures from surface faulting or fault creep. There are no Alquist-Priolo zones located on the project site.



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2014. Additional data provided by Pacific linstitute, 2009

Projected Sea Level Rise Close

Local.

City of Capitola General Plan. The City of Capitola General Plan is currently being updated. As of December 2013, this updated General Plan is in public draft review and comment form and has not been adopted by the City of Capitola to supersede its existing 1989 General Plan. Therefore, only policies from the 1989 City of Capitola General Plan are included in regulatory setting considered by this EIR. The 1989 General Plan includes the following policies related to geology:

<u>Goal</u>	<i>Strive to protect the community from injury, loss of life, and property damage resulting from natural catastrophes and other hazardous conditions.</i>
Policy 11	New development along the coastal bluffs shall be evaluated for seismic integrity.
<u>Impl. 11</u>	 All development along the coastal bluffs and beach areas must demonstrate the geologic stability of a structure for a 50 year period, must not significantly contribute to the instability of the coastal bluffs or beach areas, and must be consistent with other policies of the Capitola General Plan and the Local Coastal Plan. Soils Report and seismic evaluation shall be required of all new construction within 200 feet of the edge of the coastal cliff line.

Capitola Municipal Code. Title 15 of the City of Capitola Municipal Code includes regulations for excavation and grading, which addresses hazardous conditions, erosion control, and requirements for inspection reports.

4.5.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Thresholds of Significance. The analysis of potential geologyrelated impacts is based in part on a *Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Hotel Structures with Underground Parking Garage at the Monarch Cove Inn* (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., August 2013; refer to Appendix E), which was peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants, Inc., as well as other available information. In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines,* impacts relating to geology would be considered significant if the project would:

- 1) Expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismically related ground failure (including liquefaction), or landslides;
- 2) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;
- 3) Be located on a geologic unit that is unstable or would become unstable as a result of the project, potentially resulting in landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse;
- 4) Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property; and/or
- 5) 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.

All areas of California are subject to certain risks associated with seismic and geologic activity. Therefore, impacts are considered significant if the project would be exposed to an unusually

high potential for hazards associated with ground shaking, landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, or expansive soils without incorporation of appropriate design techniques to minimize their potential to cause substantial risk of loss, injury, or death.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the proposed project (Appendix A), the potential for surface rupture and liquefaction in the project area is considered low. In addition, the site is not located in an area that contains expansive soils. The project currently has connections to the sewer system in the area and would not use septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Therefore, these issues will not be discussed in the following section. For further detail see Appendix A.

The City of Capitola has not adopted a significance threshold for sea level rise. For the purposes of this assessment, impacts related to sea level rise would be considered potentially significant if projected sea level rise would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, consistent with the above thresholds.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact GEO-1Seismically induced ground shaking could destroy or
damage structures and infrastructure, resulting in loss of
property or risk to human safety. However, mandatory
compliance with applicable California Building Code
requirements would reduce impacts to a Class III, less than
significant, level.

Given the highly seismic character of the California region and the project site's proximity to known active and potentially active faults, severe ground shaking is anticipated during the life of the project. As discussed in Section 4.5.1(d) above, several active and potentially active faults are located in the region. These include the San Andreas Fault, Zayante Fault, and the San Gregorio Fault (refer to Figure 4.5-2).

The Zayante Fault is the closest fault to the project site, located approximately four miles north of the site. This fault is considered to have the most substantial effect on the site from a probabilistic design standpoint (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013). Earthquakes along this or any of the faults in the region could potentially damage buildings and pose risks to human health and safety.

Construction of the proposed project would be required to comply with California Building Code (CBC) design standards related to seismic stability. CBC standards require that structures are built to resist forces generated by ground shaking during an earthquake. With mandatory compliance with CBC standards, impacts from ground shaking would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. Construction of the proposed project would be required to adhere to the CBC, which requires structures to be built so that they resist forces generated by ground shaking during an earthquake.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant with required adherence to existing regulations, no mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact GEO-2 Construction of the proposed project could result in erosion or loss of topsoil. However, compliance with recommendations contained in the site-specific *Geotechnical Investigation* would reduce impacts to a Class III, *less than significant*, level.

Development on the project site could result in the erosion of topsoil and the coastal bluff. Excavation and grading on-site could result in erosion of on-site soils and sedimentation during storms or high wind events. Development would also involve the removal of soil from the site for the laying of structural foundations, construction of the underground garage, and/or the importation of soil as fill material. This would likely necessitate temporary on-site stockpiling of soils. During excavation, grading and soil stockpiling, there is potential for soil migration via wind entrainment and/or water erosion. General construction activities would loosen and expose soils, potentially resulting in erosion and sedimentation. Section 15.28.130 of the City of Capitola Municipal Code includes design standards for erosion and sediment control. These include requirements for the retention of vegetation, establishment of runoff control, and the stockpiling of topsoil.

As a condition of project approval, all construction at the site would be required to adhere to recommendations contained in the site-specific *Geotechnical Investigation* (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013). This includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Clearing graded areas of all obstructions including loose fill, building foundations, trees not designated to remain, or other unsuitable material.
- Stripping cleared areas of organic-laden topsoil.
- Scarifying areas to receive non-expansive engineered fill to a depth of eight inches.
- Placing engineered fill in thin lifts not exceeding eight inches in loose thickness; moisture conditioned, and compacted to at least 90% relative compaction.
- *Utilizing only imported soils as engineered fill that meet specific requirements.*
- Planting all exposed slopes as soon as possible with erosion-resistant vegetation.

Any deviations from these recommendations would require certification from a registered engineer and approval by the City.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. The City of Capitola Municipal Code Section 15.28.130 contains design standards for erosion and sediment control. These include requirements for the retention of vegetation, establishment of runoff control, and the stockpiling of topsoil. Compliance with these requirements, in addition to implementation of recommendations contained in the *Geotechnical Investigation*, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. No mitigation measures are required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact GEO-3 The project site is subject to ongoing coastal bluff erosion, and may be subject to landslides. However, project improvements would not be located within 50 feet of the bluff, and would

not increase the rate of bluff erosion, nor increase the potential for landslides. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

The bluff along the southern edge of the site is 95 feet tall and subject to wave action erosion at the toe. The bluff foe and bluff face are expected to continue to recede landward at an approximately rate of 1.1 feet per year (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013). Figure 4.5-3 shows the estimated erosion of the bluff over approximately 100 years.

The Victorian building and proposed Bayview Building would be situated approximately 90 feet from the blufftop. Therefore, if bluff erosion proceeds unimpeded, the bluff would reach these structures in approximately 100 years (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013). However, the project itself would not affect coastal bluff stability or increase the rate of coastal bluff recession (*ibid*). In order to stop or slow the erosion of the bluff, a slope stabilization system would be required. This would most likely include construction of a sea wall. Recession of the blufftop is an existing condition that would not be affected by the construction of the proposed project. Therefore, construction of a slope stabilization system is not the responsibility of the project. The project would not accelerate the rate of bluff erosion, nor increase the potential for landslides. Impacts would be less than significant.

The potential impact associated with accelerated coastal bluff erosion due to sea level rise is addressed in Impact GEO-4 below.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements that would reduce the impacts of bluff erosion in the area.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant with required adherence to existing regulations, no mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact GEO-4 The proposed project would be located in an area that may be subject to shoreline retreat and accelerated bluff erosion associated with sea level rise. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

The coastline within the City of Capitola is subject to flooding during large storm events and may be subject to increased shoreline retreat associated with sea level rise. Figure 4.5-4 shows the current coastal base flood area and the areas that would be subject to flooding after sea level rise. The California Climate Adaptation Strategy (December 2009) estimates a sea level rise of up to 55 inches by the end of this century. The proposed project would not be subject to substantial effects from sea level rise, according to maps generated by the Pacific Institute (2009). As shown in Figure 4.5-4, the beach area of Capitola would be subject to the most flooding as a result of sea level rise. This area is relatively low-lying, and is already subject to coastal flooding. The project site is somewhat protected from increases in flooding due to its location on top of a coastal bluff.

In addition to flooding, sea level rise can create an increased potential for erosion and shoreline retreat as a result of beaches and coastal bluffs being exposed to increased and more frequent wave attacks. Such erosion, as a result of climate change-induced sea level rise, could adversely affect the proposed project. However, such projections are based on assumptions regarding future global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. As such, the specific effects of climate change-induced sea level rise on the Capitola shoreline are uncertain. The proposed project would not exacerbate the effects of sea level rise. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements that would reduce the impacts of sea level rise-induced bluff erosion in the area.

Mitigation Measures. No mitigation is required

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact GEO-5 Construction and operation of the proposed underground parking garage could result in settling of the structure. However, compliance with recommendations contained in the site-specific *Geotechnical Investigation* would reduce impacts relating to settling of the proposed parking structure to a Class III, *less than significant, level*.

The proposed project includes the construction of a two-level, below grade parking garage (8,322 square feet on each level) with 56 parking stalls and 27 bicycle parking spaces. This is proposed under the main building, which would house 22 guest rooms (refer to Figures 2-4a, 2-4b, and 2-4c in Section 2.0, *Project Description*). Due to the weight of the proposed main building and the underground parking structure, it is possible that the structure would settle at a faster rate than adjacent at-grade improvements (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., 2013). This is due to the nature of the soils on the site and the size of the proposed buildings. Additionally, this structure would need to be drained of any water that would accumulate due to rain or seepage from the surrounding soil (*ibid*). If this water is not drained but is instead allowed to pool, it would cause damage to the foundation and walls of the structure and could cause the facility to settle at a rate higher than the surrounding buildings.

As a condition of approval, project construction would be required to adhere to recommendations contained in the site-specific *Geotechnical Investigation* (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc., 2013), including recommendations that would ensure that water would not pool around the underground parking facility. This includes, but would not be limited to, the following:

- Supporting guest units placed atop the parking garage solely by the underground parking structure with at-grade decks cantilevered from the underground parking structure.
- Mechanically compacting the gravel backdrain to minimize future consolidation of the gravel section.
- Installing the capillary break and associated manifold system in accordance with specific geotechnical recommendations.

- *Keeping foundation trenches moist and thoroughly cleaning of all slough or loose materials prior to pouring concrete.*
- Thoroughly cleaning all foundation excavations prior to placing steel and concrete.
- Providing proof that the design for the parking structure basement walls were evaluated for the two load combinations listed in the Geotechnical Investigation.

Any deviations from the *Geotechnical Investigation* recommendations would require certification from a registered engineer and approval by the City.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. The proposed structures would be required to comply with CBC requirements and recommendations contained in the site-specific *Geotechnical Investigation*.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. No mitigation measures are required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would less than significant.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As discussed in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. These and any other projects proposed in the future would increase structural development within the City. Such development would expose new residents and property to potential risks from seismic, soils, and slope stability hazards in the area. The proposed project would incrementally contribute to these cumulative impacts. However, development projects would be subject to City review on a case-by-case basis, and subject to applicable CEQA review. The City of Capitola requires that all new structures comply with the latest CBC seismic design standards, as well as supplemental design criteria necessary to ensure that buildings are designed so as to avoid structural collapse, along with application of standard engineering practices and conformity to the City Municipal Code. Potential impacts from future development would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and appropriate mitigation would be designed to mitigate impacts resulting from individual projects. With adherence to existing requirements of the State and the City of Capitola, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

4.6 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

4.6.1 Setting

a. Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases. Climate change is the observed increase in the average temperature of the Earth's atmosphere and oceans along with other substantial changes in climate (such as wind patterns, precipitation, and storms) over an extended period of time. The term "climate change" is often used interchangeably with the term "global warming," but "climate change" is preferred to "global warming" because it helps convey that there are other changes in addition to rising temperatures. The baseline against which these changes are measured originates in historical records identifying temperature changes that have occurred in the past, such as during previous ice ages. The global climate is continuously changing, as evidenced by repeated episodes of substantial warming and cooling documented in the geologic record. The rate of change has typically been incremental, with warming or cooling trends occurring over the course of thousands of years. The past 10,000 years have been marked by a period of incremental warming, as glaciers have steadily retreated across the globe. However, scientists have observed acceleration in the rate of warming during the past 150 years. Per the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the understanding of anthropogenic warming and cooling influences on climate has led to a high confidence (90% or greater chance) that the global average net effect of human activities since 1750 has been one of warming. The prevailing scientific opinion on climate change is that most of the observed increase in global average temperatures, since the mid-20th century, is likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations (IPCC, 2007).

Gases that absorb and re-emit infrared radiation in the atmosphere are called greenhouse gases (GHGs). GHGs are present in the atmosphere naturally, are released by natural sources, or are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. The gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced climate change include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxides (N₂O), and fluorinated gases such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). Water vapor is excluded from the list of GHGs because it is short-lived in the atmosphere and its atmospheric concentrations are largely determined by natural processes, such as oceanic evaporation.

GHGs are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. Of these gases, CO_2 and CH_4 are emitted in the greatest quantities from human activities. Emissions of CO_2 are largely byproducts of fossil fuel combustion, whereas CH_4 results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Man-made GHGs, many of which have greater heat-absorption potential than CO_2 , include fluorinated gases and SF_6 (California Environmental Protection Agency [CalEPA], 2006). Different types of GHGs have varying global warming potentials (GWPs). The GWP of a GHG is the potential of a gas or aerosol to trap heat in the atmosphere over a specified timescale (generally, 100 years). Because GHGs absorb different amounts of heat, a common reference gas (CO_2) is used to relate the amount of heat absorbed to the amount of the gas emissions, referred to as "carbon dioxide equivalent" (CO_2E), and is the amount of a GHG emitted multiplied by its GWP. CO_2 has a GWP of one. By contrast, CH_4 has a GWP of 21, meaning its global warming effect is 21 times greater than CO_2 on a molecule per molecule basis (IPCC, 1997). The accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the earth's temperature. Without the natural heat trapping effect of GHGs, Earth's surface would be about 34°C cooler (CalEPA, 2006). However, it is believed that emissions from human activities, particularly the consumption of fossil fuels for electricity production and transportation, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations. The following discusses the primary GHGs of concern.

Carbon Dioxide. The global carbon cycle is made up of large carbon flows and reservoirs. Billions of tons of carbon in the form of CO_2 are absorbed by oceans and living biomass (i.e., sinks) and are emitted to the atmosphere annually through natural processes (i.e., sources). When in equilibrium, carbon fluxes among these various reservoirs are roughly balanced (United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA], April 2012). CO₂ was the first GHG demonstrated to be increasing in atmospheric concentration, with the first conclusive measurements being made in the last half of the 20th century. Concentrations of CO_2 in the atmosphere have risen approximately 40% since the industrial revolution. The global atmospheric concentration of CO_2 has increased from a pre-industrial value of about 280 parts per million (ppm) to 391 ppm in 2011 (IPCC, 2007; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association [NOAA], 2010). The average annual CO₂ concentration growth rate was larger between 1995 and 2005 (average: 1.9 ppm per year) than it has been since the beginning of continuous direct atmospheric measurements (1960-2005 average: 1.4 ppm per year), although there is year-to-year variability in growth rates (NOAA, 2010). Currently, CO₂ represents an estimated 82.8% of total GHG emissions (Department of Energy [DOE] Energy Information Administration [EIA], August 2010). The largest source of CO₂, and of overall GHG emissions, is fossil fuel combustion.

Methane. Methane (CH₄) is an effective absorber of radiation, though its atmospheric concentration is less than that of CO₂ and its lifetime in the atmosphere is limited to 10 to 12 years. It has a global warming potential (GWP) approximately 21 times that of CO₂. Over the last 250 years, the concentration of CH₄ in the atmosphere has increased by 148% (IPCC, 2007), although emissions have declined from 1990 levels. Anthropogenic sources of CH₄ include enteric fermentation associated with domestic livestock, landfills, natural gas and petroleum systems, agricultural activities, coal mining, wastewater treatment, stationary and mobile combustion, and certain industrial processes (USEPA, April 2012).

Nitrous Oxide. Concentrations of nitrous oxide (N₂O) began to rise at the beginning of the industrial revolution and continue to increase at a relatively uniform growth rate (NOAA, 2010). N₂O is produced by microbial processes in soil and water, including those reactions that occur in fertilizers that contain nitrogen, fossil fuel combustion, and other chemical processes. Use of these fertilizers has increased over the last century. Agricultural soil management and mobile source fossil fuel combustion are the major sources of N₂O emissions. The GWP of N₂O is approximately 310 times that of CO₂.

*Fluorinated Gases (HFCS, PFCS and SF*₆). Fluorinated gases, such as HFCs, PFCs, and SF₆, are powerful GHGs that are emitted from a variety of industrial processes. Fluorinated gases are used as substitutes for ozone-depleting substances such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), and halons, which have been regulated since the mid-1980s because of their ozone-destroying potential and are phased out under the Montreal Protocol (1987) and Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Electrical transmission and distribution systems account

for most SF₆ emissions, while PFC emissions result from semiconductor manufacturing and as a by-product of primary aluminum production. Fluorinated gases are typically emitted in smaller quantities than CO_2 , CH_4 , and N_2O , but these compounds have much higher GWPs. SF₆ is the most potent GHG the IPCC has evaluated.

b. Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory. Worldwide anthropogenic emissions of GHGs were approximately 40,000 million metric tons (MMT) CO₂E in 2004, including ongoing emissions from industrial and agricultural sources, but excluding emissions from land use changes (i.e., deforestation, biomass decay) (IPCC, 2007). CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel use accounts for 56.6% of the total emissions of 49,000 MMT CO₂E (includes land use changes) and CO₂ emissions from all sources account for 76.7% of the total. Methane emissions account for 14.3% of GHGs and N₂O emissions account for 7.9% (IPCC, 2007).

Total U.S. GHG emissions were 6,821.8 MMT CO₂E in 2009 (USEPA, April 2012). Total U.S. emissions have increased by 10.5% since 1990; emissions rose by 3.2% from 2009 to 2010 (USEPA, April 2012). This increase was primarily due to: (1) an increase in economic output resulting in an increase in energy consumption across all sectors; and (2) much warmer summer conditions resulting in an increase in electricity demand for air conditioning. Since 1990, U.S. emissions have increased at an average annual rate of 0.5%. In 2010, the transportation and industrial end-use sectors accounted for 32% and 26% of CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion, respectively. Meanwhile, the residential and commercial end-use sectors accounted for 22% and 19% of CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion, respectively.

Based upon the California Air Resources Board (ARB) California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2011, California produced 448 MMT CO₂E in 2011 (ARB, August 2013). The major source of GHG in California is transportation, contributing 38% of the state's total GHG emissions. Industry is the second largest source, contributing 21% of the state's GHG emissions (ARB, October 2013). California emissions are due in part to its large size and large population compared to other states. However, a factor that reduces California's per capita fuel use and GHG emissions, as compared to other states, is its relatively mild climate. The ARB has projected statewide unregulated GHG emissions for the year 2020 will be 507 MMT CO₂E (ARB, August 2013). These projections represent the emissions that would be expected to occur in the absence of any GHG reduction actions.

c. Potential Effects of Climate Change. Globally, climate change has the potential to affect numerous environmental resources through potential impacts related to future air temperatures and precipitation patterns. Scientific modeling predicts that continued GHG emissions at or above current rates would induce more extreme climate changes during the 21st century than were observed during the 20th century. Scientists have projected that the average global surface temperature could rise by1.0-4.5°F (0.6-2.5°C) in the next 50 years, and the increase may be as high as 2.2-10°F (1.4-5.8°C) in the next century. In addition to these projections, there are identifiable signs that global warming is currently taking place, including substantial ice loss in the Arctic (IPCC, 2007).

According to CalEPA's 2010 *Climate Action Team Biennial Report*, potential impacts of climate change in California may include loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, and more drought years (CalEPA, April

2010). Below is a summary of some of the potential effects that could be experienced in California as a result of climate change.

Sea Level Rise. According to *The Impacts of Sea-Level Rise on the California Coast*, prepared by the California Climate Change Center (CCCC) (May 2009), climate change has the potential to induce substantial sea level rise in the coming century. The rising sea level increases the likelihood and risk of flooding. The study identifies a sea level rise on the California coast over the past century of approximately eight inches. Based on the results of various climate change models, sea level rise is expected to continue. The California Climate Adaptation Strategy (December 2009) estimates a sea level rise of up to 55 inches by the end of this century. Impacts related to accelerated bluff erosion resulting from sea level rise are addressed in Section 4.5, *Geology*.

Air Quality. Higher temperatures, which are conducive to air pollution formation, could worsen air quality in California. Climate change may increase the concentration of ground-level ozone, but the magnitude of the effect, and therefore its indirect effects, are uncertain. If higher temperatures are accompanied by drier conditions, the potential for large wildfires could increase, which, in turn, would further worsen air quality. However, if higher temperatures are accompanied by wetter, rather than drier conditions, the rains would tend to temporarily clear the air of particulate pollution and reduce the incidence of large wildfires, thereby ameliorating the pollution associated with wildfires. Additionally, severe heat accompanied by drier conditions and poor air quality could increase the number of heat-related deaths, illnesses, and asthma attacks throughout the state (CEC, March 2009).

Water Supply. Analysis of paleoclimatic data (such as tree-ring reconstructions of stream flow and precipitation) indicates a history of naturally and widely varying hydrologic conditions in California and the west, including a pattern of recurring and extended droughts. Uncertainty remains with respect to the overall impact of climate change on future water supplies in California. However, the average early spring snowpack in the Sierra Nevada decreased by about 10% during the last century, a loss of 1.5 million acre-feet of snowpack storage. During the same period, sea level rose eight inches along California's coast. California's temperature has risen 1°F, mostly at night and during the winter, with higher elevations experiencing the highest increase. Many Southern California cities have experienced their lowest recorded annual precipitation twice within the past decade. In a span of only two years, Los Angeles experienced both its driest and wettest years on record (California Department of Water Resources [DWR], 2008; CCCC, May 2009).

This uncertainty complicates the analysis of future water demand, especially where the relationship between climate change and its potential effect on water demand is not well understood. The Sierra snowpack provides the majority of California's water supply by accumulating snow during wet winters and releasing it slowly during California's dry springs and summers. Based upon historical data and modeling, DWR projects that the Sierra snowpack will experience a 25 to 40% reduction from its historic average by 2050. Climate change is also anticipated to bring warmer storms that result in less snowfall at lower elevations, reducing the total snowpack (DWR, 2008).

Hydrology. As discussed above, climate change could potentially affect: the amount of snowfall, rainfall, and snow pack; the intensity and frequency of storms; flood hydrographs (flash floods, rain or snow events, coincidental high tide and high runoff events); sea level rise and coastal flooding; coastal erosion; and the potential for salt water intrusion. Sea level rise may be a product of climate change through two main processes: expansion of sea water as the oceans warm and melting of ice over land. A rise in sea levels could jeopardize California's water supply due to salt water intrusion. Increased storm intensity and frequency could affect the ability of flood-control facilities, including levees, to handle storm events.

Agriculture. California has a \$30 billion agricultural industry that produces half of the country's fruits and vegetables. Higher CO₂ levels can stimulate plant production and increase plant water-use efficiency. However, if temperatures rise and drier conditions prevail, water demand could increase; crop-yield could be threatened by a less reliable water supply; and greater air pollution could render plants more susceptible to pest and disease outbreaks. In addition, temperature increases could change the time of year certain crops, such as wine grapes, bloom or ripen, and thereby affect their quality (CCCC, 2006).

Ecosystems and Wildlife. Climate change and the potential resulting changes in weather patterns could have ecological effects on a global and local scale. Increasing concentrations of GHGs are likely to accelerate the rate of climate change. Soil moisture is likely to decline in many regions, and intense rainstorms are likely to become more frequent. Rising temperatures could have four major impacts on plants and animals: (1) timing of ecological events; (2) geographic range; (3) species' composition within communities; and (4) ecosystem processes, such as carbon cycling and storage (Parmesan, 2004; Parmesan, C. and H. Galbraith, 2004).

d. Local Effects of Climate Change. While the above discussion identifies the possible effects of climate change at a global and potentially statewide level, current scientific modeling tools are unable to predict what local impacts may occur with a similar degree of accuracy. In general, regional and local predictions are made based on downscaling statewide models (CalEPA, April 2010). Due to its coastal location, sea level rise and related flooding and coastal erosion are critical issues for the project site.

e. Regulatory Setting. The following regulations address both climate change and GHG emissions.

International and Federal Regulations. The United States is, and has been, a participant in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) since it was produced by the United Nations in 1992. The UNFCCC is an international environmental treaty with the objective of, "stabilization of GHG concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system." This is generally understood to be achieved by stabilizing global GHG concentrations between 350 and 400 ppm, in order to limit the global average temperature increase between 2 and 2.4°C above pre-industrial levels (IPCC, 2007). The UNFCCC itself does not set limits on GHG emissions for individual countries or enforcement mechanisms. Instead, the treaty provides for updates, called "protocols," that would identify mandatory emissions limits. Five years later, the UNFCCC brought nations together again to draft the *Kyoto Protocol* (1997). The Kyoto Protocol established commitments for industrialized nations to reduce their collective emissions of six GHGs (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, SF₆, HFCs, and PFCs) to 5.2% below 1990 levels by 2012. The United States is a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol, but Congress has not ratified it and the United States has not bound itself to the Protocol's commitments (UNFCCC, 2007). The first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol ended in 2012. Governments, including 38 industrialized countries, agreed to a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol beginning January 1, 2013 and ending either on December 31, 2017 or December 31, 2020, to be decided by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol at its seventeenth session (UNFCCC, November 2011).

The United States is currently using a voluntary and incentive-based approach toward emissions reductions in lieu of the Kyoto Protocol's mandatory framework. The Climate Change Technology Program (CCTP) is a multi-agency research and development coordination effort (led by the Secretaries of Energy and Commerce) that is charged with carrying out the President's National Climate Change Technology Initiative (USEPA, December 2007). However, the voluntary approach to address climate change and GHG emissions may be changing. The United States Supreme Court in *Massachusetts et al. v. Environmental Protection Agency et al.* ([2007] 549 U.S. 05-1120) held that the USEPA has the authority to regulate motor-vehicle GHG emissions under the federal Clean Air Act.

EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) are taking coordinated steps to enable the production of a new generation of clean vehicles with reduced GHG emissions and improved fuel efficiency from on-road vehicles and engines. This will be done through coordination of the GHG emission limits and the NHTSA Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards. In May 2010, the final combined EPA and NHTSA standards that comprise the first phase of this national program were promulgated regarding passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles, covering model years 2012 through 2016. The CAFE standards require these vehicles to meet an estimated combined average emissions level of 250 grams of CO₂ per mile, equivalent to 35.5 miles per gallon (mpg) if the automobile industry were to meet this CO₂level solely through fuel economy improvements. In October 2010, the agencies each proposed complementary GHG and CAFE standards under their respective authorities covering medium and heavy-duty trucks for the model years 2014-2018. In August 2012, new emissions limits and CAFE standards for the 2017 to 2025 model years were promulgated, increasing fuel economy to the equivalent of 54.5 mpg for cars and light-duty trucks.

In October 2009, the USEPA issued a Final Rule for mandatory reporting of GHG emissions for facilities that emit more than 25,000 metric tons (MT) CO_2E per year. This Final Rule applies to fossil fuel suppliers, industrial gas suppliers, direct GHG emitters, and manufacturers of heavy-duty and off-road vehicles and vehicle engines, and requires annual reporting of emissions. The first annual reports for these sources were due in March 2011. Additionally, the reporting of emissions is required for owners of SF₆- and PFC-insulated equipment when the total nameplate capacity of these insulating gases is above 17,280 pounds.

On May 13, 2010, the USEPA issued a Final Rule that took effect on January 2, 2011, setting a threshold of 75,000 MT CO_2E per year for GHG emissions. New and existing industrial facilities

that meet or exceed that threshold will require a permit after that date. On November 10, 2010, the USEPA published the "PSD and Title V Permitting Guidance for Greenhouse Gases." The USEPA's guidance document is directed at state agencies responsible for air pollution permits under the Federal Clean Air Act to help them understand how to implement GHG reduction requirements while mitigating costs for industry.

On January 2, 2011, the USEPA implemented the first phase of the Tailoring Rule for GHG emissions Title V Permitting. Under the first phase of the Tailoring Rule, all new sources of emissions are subject to GHG Title V permitting if they are otherwise subject to Title V for another air pollutant and they emit at least 75,000 MT CO₂E per year. Under Phase 1, no sources were required to obtain a Title V permit solely due to GHG emissions. Phase 2 of the Tailoring Rule went into effect July 1, 2011. At that time new sources were subject to GHG Title V permitting if the source emits 100,000 MT CO₂E per year, or they are otherwise subject to Title V permitting for another pollutant and emit at least 75,000 MT CO₂E per year.

On July 3, 2012 the USEPA issued the final rule that retains the GHG permitting thresholds that were established in Phases 1 and 2 of the GHG Tailoring Rule. These emission thresholds determine when Clean Air Act permits under the New Source Review Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V Operating Permit programs are required for new and existing industrial facilities.

<u>State Regulations</u>. ARB is responsible for the coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs in California. Various statewide and local initiatives to reduce the state's contribution to GHG emissions have raised awareness about climate change and its potential for severe long-term adverse environmental, social, and economic effects.

Assembly Bill (AB) 1493 (2002), referred to as "Pavley," requires ARB to develop and adopt regulations to achieve "the maximum feasible and cost-effective reduction of GHG emissions from motor vehicles." On June 30, 2009, USEPA granted the waiver of Clean Air Act preemption to California for its GHG emission standards for motor vehicles beginning with the 2009 model year. Pavley I took effect for model years starting in 2009 to 2016 and Pavley II, which is now referred to as "LEV (Low Emission Vehicle) III GHG" will cover 2017 to 2025. In January 2012, ARB approved a new emissions-control program combining the control of smog, soot causing pollutants and GHG emissions into a single coordinated package of requirements for passenger cars and light trucks model years 2017 through 2025. The Advanced Clean Cars program coordinates the goals of the Low Emissions Vehicles (LEV), Zero Emissions Vehicles (ZEV), and Clean Fuels Outlet programs and would provide major reductions in GHG emissions. By 2025, when the rules would be fully implemented, new automobiles would emit 34% fewer GHGs. Statewide CO₂E emissions would be reduced by 3% by 2020 and by 12% by 2025. The reduction increases to 27% in 2035 and even further to a 33% reduction in 2050 (ARB, 2013).¹

In 2005, former Governor Schwarzenegger issued Executive Order (EO) S-3-05, establishing statewide GHG emissions reduction targets. EO S-3-05 provides that by 2010, overall GHG emissions shall be reduced to 2000 levels; by 2020, emissions shall be reduced to 1990 levels; and by 2050, emissions shall be reduced to 80% of 1990 levels (CalEPA, 2006). In response to EO S-3-05,

¹ Percent reductions are from 2008 baseline emissions levels.

CalEPA created the Climate Action Team (CAT), which in March 2006 published the Climate Action Team Report (the "2006 CAT Report") (CalEPA, 2006). The 2006 CAT Report identified a recommended list of strategies that the state could pursue to reduce GHG emissions. These are strategies that could be implemented by various state agencies to ensure that the emission reduction targets in EO S-3-05 are met and can be met within the existing authority of the state agencies. The strategies include the reduction of passenger and light duty truck emissions, the reduction of idling times for diesel trucks, an overhaul of shipping technology/infrastructure, increased use of alternative fuels, increased recycling, landfill methane capture, etc.

California's major initiative for reducing GHG emissions is outlined in Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the "California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006," signed into law in 2006. AB 32 codifies the statewide goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (essentially a 15% reduction below 2005 emission levels; the same requirement as under S-3-05), and requires ARB to prepare a Scoping Plan that outlines the main state strategies for reducing GHGs to meet the 2020 deadline. In addition, AB 32 requires ARB to adopt regulations to require reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions.

After completing a comprehensive review and update process, ARB approved a 1990 statewide GHG level and 2020 limit of 427 MMT CO₂E. The Scoping Plan was approved by ARB on December 11, 2008, and includes measures to address GHG emission reduction strategies related to energy efficiency, water use, recycling and solid waste, among other measures. The Scoping Plan includes a range of GHG reduction actions that may include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, and market-based mechanisms.

In early 2013, ARB initiated activities to update the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The 2013 Scoping Plan update (Public Review Draft, October 2013) defines ARB's climate change priorities and lays the groundwork to reach post-2020 goals set forth in EO S-3-05. The update highlights California's progress toward meeting the "near-term" 2020 GHG emission reduction goals defined in the original Scoping Plan (2008). It also evaluates how to align the state's longer-term GHG reduction strategies with other state policy priorities, such as for water, waste, natural resources, clean energy, transportation and land use.

EO S-01-07 was enacted on January 18, 2007. The order mandates that a Low Carbon Fuel Standard ("LCFS") for transportation fuels be established for California to reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at least 10% by 2020.

Senate Bill (SB) 97, signed in August 2007, acknowledges that climate change is an environmental issue that requires analysis in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. In March 2010, the California Resources Agency (Resources Agency) adopted amendments to the *State CEQA Guidelines* for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHG emissions. The adopted guidelines give lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHGs and climate change impacts.

ARB Resolution 07-54 establishes 25,000 MT of GHG emissions as the threshold for identifying the largest stationary emission sources in California for purposes of requiring the annual

reporting of emissions. This threshold is just over 0.005% of California's total inventory of GHG emissions for 2004.

Senate Bill (SB) 375, signed in August 2008, enhances the state's ability to reach AB 32 goals by directing ARB to develop regional GHG emission reduction targets to be achieved from vehicles for 2020 and 2035. In addition, SB 375 directs each of the state's 18 major Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) to prepare a "sustainable communities strategy" (SCS) that contains a growth strategy that meets these emission targets for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). On September 23, 2010, ARB adopted final regional targets for reducing GHG emissions from 2005 levels by 2020 and 2035. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) was assigned targets of a 0% reduction in GHGs from transportation sources from 2005 levels by 2020 and a 5% reduction in GHGs from transportation sources from 2005 levels by 2035. AMBAG is currently preparing a regional SCS, which will be incorporated into a new Metropolitan Transportation Plan, scheduled to be adopted in June of 2014.

In early 2010, ARB adopted a regulation for reducing SF₆ emissions from electric power system gas-insulated switchgear (17 CCR 95350). The regulation requires owners of such switchgear to: (1) annually report SF₆ emissions; (2) determine the emission rate relative to the SF₆ capacity of the switchgear; (3) provide a complete inventory of all gas-insulated switchgear and its SF₆ capacities; (4) produce a SF₆ gas container inventory; and (5) keep all information current for ARB enforcement staff inspection and verification. Changes to relevant facilities owned by PG&E and any gas insulated switchgear associated with the project would be subject to this regulation.

The California Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) pursuant to SB 1038, SB 1078, SB 1250, and SB 107 previously required investor-owned utilities, electric service providers, and community choice aggregators to increase the portion of energy that comes from renewable sources to 20% by 2010. Subsequently, in April 2011, Governor Brown signed SB 2X requiring California to generate 33% of its electricity from renewable energy by 2020.

For more information on the Senate and Assembly bills, Executive Orders, and reports discussed above, and to view reports and research referenced above, please refer to the following websites: <u>www.climatechange.ca.gov</u> and <u>www.arb.ca.gov/cc/cc.htm</u>.

Local Regulations and CEQA Requirements. Pursuant to the requirements of SB 97, the Resources Agency has adopted amendments to the *State CEQA Guidelines* for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHG emissions. As noted previously, the adopted *State CEQA Guidelines* provide general regulatory guidance on the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions in CEQA documents, while giving lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHGs and climate change impacts. The general approach to developing a Threshold of Significance for GHG emissions is to identify the emissions level for which a project would not be expected to substantially conflict with existing California legislation adopted for the purpose of reducing statewide GHG emissions sufficiently to move the state towards climate stabilization. If a project would generate GHG emissions above the threshold level, its contribution to cumulative impacts would be considered significant. To date, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), the San Luis Obispo
Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD), and the San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) have adopted quantitative significance thresholds for GHGs. However, in March 2012 the Alameda County Superior Court (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District*) issued a judgment finding that the BAAQMD had failed to comply with CEQA when it adopted the thresholds contained in the BAAQMD's 2010 CEQA Guidelines.²

The City of Capitola is currently developing a Climate Action Plan (CAP) in concert with its updated General Plan. Key components of the CAP are integrated into the General Plan, and General Plan goals, policies, and actions reinforce the CAP. To date, no GHG emissions targets have been established for the City.

4.6.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. Pursuant to the requirements of SB 97, the Resources Agency adopted amendments to the *State CEQA Guidelines* for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHG emissions in March 2010. These guidelines are used in evaluating the cumulative significance of GHG emissions from the proposed project. According to the adopted *State CEQA Guidelines*, impacts related to GHG emissions from the proposed project would be significant if the project would:

- 1) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; and/or
- 2) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

The vast majority of individual projects do not generate sufficient GHG emissions to create a project-specific impact through a direct influence to climate change; therefore, the issue of climate change typically involves an analysis of whether a project's contribution towards an impact is cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355).

For future projects, the significance of GHG emissions may be evaluated based on locally adopted quantitative thresholds, or consistency with a regional GHG reduction plan (such as a CAP). However, the Monterey Bay Area Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), the County of Santa Cruz, and the City of Capitola have not adopted GHG emissions thresholds to date.

The MBUAPCD is currently in the process of developing GHG emissions thresholds for evaluating projects under CEQA. According to an informational report from Mike Gilroy, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, to the District Board of Directors, MBUAPCD recommends a threshold of 10,000 MT of CO₂E per year for stationary source projects and a

² In August 2013, the First District Court of Appeal overturned the trial court and held that the thresholds of significance adopted by the BAAQMD were not subject to CEQA review. However, no guidance by the BAAQMD as to the use of the adopted thresholds has been issued as of October 25th, 2013.

threshold of 2,000 MT CO₂E per year for land-use projects or compliance with an adopted GHG Reduction Plan/Climate Action Plan. MBUAPCD is currently evaluating a percentage-based threshold option (MBUAPCD, 2013).

Prior to development of District thresholds, MBUAPCD had previously recommended use of the adopted SLOAPCD quantitative emissions threshold of 1,150 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂E) per year for most land use projects. Since the MBUAPCD thresholds have not yet been adopted, the SLOAPCD threshold is the most appropriate for analysis of the proposed project. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to GHG emissions and climate change would be cumulatively considerable if the project would produce more than 1,150 MT CO₂E per year.

The SLOAPCD threshold was developed to help reach the AB 32 emission reduction targets by attributing an appropriate share of the GHG reductions needed from new land use development projects subject to CEQA. Land use sector projects that comply with the GHG thresholds would not be "cumulatively considerable" because they would be helping to solve the cumulative problem as a part of the AB 32 process. Such small sources would not significantly add to global climate change and would not hinder the state's ability to reach the AB 32 goal, even when considered cumulatively. Therefore, a project which falls below the quantitative GHG emissions annual threshold of 1,150 MT CO₂E is consistent with the reduction goals of AB 32 and is presumed to have a less than significant GHG impact.

<u>Study Methodology.</u> Calculations of CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O emissions are provided to identify the magnitude of potential project effects. The analysis focuses on CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O because these comprise 98.9% of all GHG emissions by volume (IPCC, 2007) and are the GHG emissions that the project would emit in the largest quantities. Fluorinated gases, such as HFCs, PFCs, and SF6, were also considered for the analysis. However, fluorinated gases are primarily associated with industrial processes. Emissions of all GHGs are converted into their equivalent weight in CO₂ (CO₂E). Minimal amounts of other main GHGs (such as chlorofluorocarbons [CFCs]) would be emitted; however, these other GHG emissions would not substantially add to the calculated CO₂E amounts. Calculations are based on the methodologies discussed in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) CEQA and Climate Change white paper (January 2008) and included the use of the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) General Reporting Protocol (January 2009).

Construction Emissions. In order to estimate the annual emissions that would result from construction activity associated with the project, GHGs from construction projects are quantified and amortized over the life of the project. The amortized construction emissions are added to the annual average operational emissions and then compared to the operational thresholds in SLOAPCD's CEQA Handbook (Section 3.5.1, Significance Thresholds for Project-Level Operational Emissions). To amortize the emissions over the life of the project, the total GHG emissions for the construction activities are calculated, divided by the project life then added to the annual operational phase GHG emissions. The estimated useful life of the project is 30 to 40 years. For the purpose of this analysis, the estimated project life used was 30 years to provide a conservative estimate of amortized construction emissions.

Construction of the project would generate temporary GHG emissions primarily due to the operation of construction equipment and truck trips. Construction emissions were estimated based on total square footage of proposed development, including the underground parking garage (total of 39,267 square feet). As discussed in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, excavation and cut and fill would result in approximately 6,950 net cubic yards exported from the site. Site preparation and grading typically generates the greatest amount of emissions due to the use of grading equipment and soil hauling. For construction analysis, it was assumed that the project would be developed by the end of year 2015 and would take approximately 12 to 16 construct. While actual construction timing may vary, the emissions model conservatively assumes a 12 month construction phase to demonstrate worst case scenario emissions. The CalEEMod software program was used to estimate emissions associated with short-term construction equipment operating on the site. Complete CalEEMod results and assumptions can be viewed in Appendix F.

Operational Emissions. Operational emissions were calculated based on the net increase in hotel rooms (30 rooms). Operational emissions associated with area sources including consumer products, landscape maintenance, hearths, and architectural coating were calculated in CalEEMod and utilize standard emission rates from ARB, USEPA, and District supplied emission factor values or appropriate state-wide values when local data was not provided (CalEEMod User Guide, 2013).

Operational emissions from energy use (electricity and natural gas use) for the 41 room hotel were estimated using CalEEMod (see Appendix F for calculations). The default values on which the CalEEMod model are based include the California Energy Commission (CEC) sponsored California Commercial End Use Survey (CEUS) and Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) studies. CalEEMod provides operational emissions of CO₂, N₂O and CH₄. This methodology is considered reasonable and reliable for use, as it has been subjected to peer review by numerous public and private stakeholders and in particular by the CEC. It is also recommended by CAPCOA (January 2008).

Emissions from waste generation were also calculated in CalEEMod and are based on the IPCC's methods for quantifying GHG emissions from solid waste using the degradable organic content of waste (CalEEMod User Guide, 2013). Waste disposal rates by land use and overall composition of municipal solid waste in California was primarily based on data provided by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle).

Emissions from water and wastewater usage calculated in CalEEMod were based on the default electricity intensity from the CEC's 2006 Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California using the average values for Northern and Southern California.

Emissions of CO₂ and CH₄ from transportation sources for the proposed project were quantified using CalEEMod. CalEEMod does not calculate N₂O emissions from mobile sources; however, N₂O emissions represent a minute fraction of overall mobile emissions and would be negligible due to the project's minimal vehicle mileage generation. Total daily trips for the hotel were based on trip rates used in the Traffic Study (prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., October 2013) and were calculated and extrapolated to derive total annual mileage in CalEEMod (based on the net increase in hotel rooms).

One of the limitations to a quantitative analysis is that emission models, such as CalEEMod, evaluate aggregate emissions and do not demonstrate, with respect to a global impact, what proportion of these emissions are "new" emissions, specifically attributable to the project in question. For most projects, the main contribution of GHG emissions is from motor vehicles and the total vehicle miles traveled (VMT), but the quantity of these emissions appropriately characterized as "new" is uncertain. Traffic associated with a project may be relocated trips from other locales, and consequently, may result in either higher or lower net VMT. For the proposed project analyzed in this report, it is likely that some of the GHG emissions associated with traffic and energy demand would be truly "new" emissions. However, it is also likely that some of the emissions are associated with onsite development, it is not possible to discern how much diversion is occurring or what fraction of those emissions represents global increases. In the absence of information regarding the different types of trips, the VMT estimate generated by CalEEMod assumes all project trips are "new" and is used as a conservative, "worst-case" estimate.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact GHG-1 The proposed project would generate additional GHG emissions beyond existing conditions. However, GHG emissions generated by the project would not exceed the significance threshold of 1,150 MT CO₂ per year. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

As stated above, GHG emissions for the project were calculated using the CalEEMod computer model. The following summarizes the project's overall GHG emissions (see Appendix F for full CalEEMod worksheets).

Construction Emissions. For the purpose of this analysis, construction activity is assumed to occur over a period of one year. Based on the CalEEMod model results, construction activity for the project would generate an estimated 279 MT of CO_2E , as shown in Table 4.6-1 below. Following recommended methodology to amortize emissions over a 30-year period (the assumed life of the project), construction of the proposed project would generate an estimated 9.29 MT CO_2E per year.

Emission Type	Total Emissions Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO₂E)
Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂)	277.51 MT
Methane (CH ₄)	1.12 MT
Nitrous Oxide (N ₂ O)	0.00 MT
Total	278.63 MT
Amortized over 30 years	9.29 MT per year

 Table 4.6-1

 Estimated Construction Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

See Appendix F for calculations and for GHG emission factor assumptions.

Operational Stationary and Mobile Emissions. CalEEMod was used to calculate direct sources of air emissions located at the project site, as well as indirect sources of air emissions occurring as a result of project operation. Direct sources include area sources (consumer products, landscape maintenance equipment, and architectural coating) and transportation, while indirect operational sources include energy use (electricity and natural gas), solid waste generation, and water use. As discussed above, area source, energy use, solid waste, and water use emissions were calculated using default values which are built into the CalEEMod model. Transportation emissions were estimated using trip generation rates based on project site driveway counts consistent with the project's traffic study prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. (October 2013) and by the total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) estimated in CalEEMod. Based on the CalEEMod estimate, the project would generate approximately 495,963 annual VMT.

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO₂E)
Area	<0.01 MT
Energy Electricity Natural Gas	91.96 MT 46.22 MT
Solid Waste	7.47 MT
Water Use	2.23 MT
Mobile Emissions	206.47 MT
Total	354.35 MT

Table 4.6-2Operational Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

See Appendix F for calculations and for GHG emission factor assumptions.

As shown in Table 4.6-2, because the project is relatively small in size (39,267 square feet of development on a 1.4 acre lot) and would not include any hearths, combined emissions associated with area sources would be negligible (less than 0.01 MT CO₂E per year). Electricity consumption associated with the proposed project would generate approximately 92 MT CO₂E per year, and natural gas use would generate approximately 46 MT CO₂E per year. Thus, overall energy use at the project site would generate approximately 138 MT CO₂E per year. Additionally, solid waste generated by the proposed hotel would generate approximately 7 MT CO₂E annually, and water used by the proposed hotel would generate approximately 2 MT CO₂E per year. Finally, mobile emissions represent the largest contribution to operation emissions and would result in approximately 207 MT CO₂E annually from mobile sources. Combined, operational emissions from the proposed project would total approximately 354 MT CO₂E.

Combined Construction, Stationary and Mobile Source Emissions. Table 4.6-3 combines the construction, stationary operational and mobile GHG emissions associated with the proposed project. As noted previously, emissions associated with construction activity (approximately 279 MT CO₂E) are amortized over 30 years (the anticipated life of the project).

Emission Source	Annual Emissions (Carbon Dioxide Equivalent) (CO₂E)
Construction	9.29 MT
Operational Area Energy Solid Waste Water	<0.01 MT 138.18 MT 7.47 MT 2.23 MT
Mobile	206.47 MT
Total	363.64 MT

 Table 4.6-3

 Combined Annual Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

See Appendix F for calculations and for GHG emission factor assumptions.

For the proposed project, the combined annual emissions would total approximately 364 MT CO₂E per year. This total represents roughly 0.000081% of California's total 2011 emissions of 448 MMT. These emission projections indicate that the majority of the project's GHG emissions are associated with vehicular travel (57%). However, as noted above, mobile emissions are in part a redirection of existing travel to other locations, and so are already a part of total GHG emissions in California.

As noted above, the MBUAPCD, the County of Santa Cruz, and the City of Capitola have not adopted formal GHG emissions thresholds that apply to land use projects. Therefore, the proposed project is evaluated based on the SLOAPCD's quantitative land use emissions threshold of 1,150 MT CO₂E per year (SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 2012). For the proposed project, total GHG emissions would be approximately 363 MT CO₂E per year. Although the proposed project would generate additional GHG emissions beyond existing conditions, because the total amount of GHG emissions would be well below the annual threshold of 1,150 MT CO₂E, GHG emissions generated by the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable and impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would be generally consistent with applicable regulations or plans addressing GHG reductions. As indicated above, the City of Capitola is currently in the process of updating its General Plan, which will include preparation of a CAP. In addition, AMBAG is currently preparing a regional SCS designed to help the region achieve its SB 375 GHG emissions reduction target, thereby contributing to the state's overall GHG emissions reduction goals identified in AB 32.

As shown in Table 4.6-3, the proposed project falls well below the annual quantitative GHG emissions threshold of 1,150 MT CO₂E, and would therefore be consistent with the objectives of AB 32, SB 97, and SB 375, and its contribution to cumulative GHG emissions and climate change would be incremental. Since the project is consistent with the goals of AB 32, it would not conflict with the goals of local reduction plans (including the planned Capitola CAP and AMBAG's SCS) designed to meet the same state goals. Impacts would therefore be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. The state maintains several requirements regulating new development and commercial properties including the 2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (2013 Standards will go into effect January on 1, 2014) and Mandatory Commercial Recycling. Furthermore, the City of Capitola is in the process of developing a CAP, which would further regulate new development within the City. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable state regulations and CAP policies which would further reduce projectgenerated GHG emissions.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As specified above, the proposed project would result in less than 1,150 MT CO₂E per year; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

Significance after Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As indicated above under Impact GHG-1, the project would be consistent with the objectives of AB 32, SB 97, and SB 375, and its contribution to cumulative GHG emissions and climate change would be less than significant based on existing adopted thresholds. Analyses of GHGs are cumulative in nature as they affect the accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere. Since there is no project impact, and given the relatively small contribution to cumulative GHG emissions associated with the proposed project, GHG emissions from the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

4.7.1 Setting

a. Hydrology. Soquel Creek is the primary water body in Capitola that flows year round; it flows from the Santa Cruz Mountains to Capitola and discharges to Monterey Bay (City of Capitola Draft General Plan Update, 2013). Soquel Creek is the primary drainage for the Soquel watershed, which encompasses the majority of the City of Capitola. There are also several other smaller drainages that drain into Soquel Creek or seasonally drain directly into Monterey Bay, such as Escalona Gulch. Historically, Soquel Creek was allowed to flow freely into Monterey Bay. Since the 1990s the City has implemented a Soquel Creek Lagoon Management Plan to construct a levee and develop a deep water lagoon with flows directed into a pipe beneath the beach to maintain fish passage. This plan addresses concerns for wildlife habitat and water quality issues.

The project site drains into the adjacent Escalona Gulch. The Gulch is located along the eastern boundary of the site and drains to the Bay.

b. Flood Hazard Zones. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has defined the 100-year flood hazard areas through the publication of Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). The FIRM for the project site (Map ID 06087C0352E) indicates that the site is within Zone X. Zone X designates an area with a minimal risk of flooding (not within the 100-year flood zone).

c. Stormwater Drainage. Stormwater runoff is one of the leading causes of pollution in surface waters. In fields and forests, most rain is absorbed by the soil or is taken up by plants and trees. Rainwater that flows overland is called stormwater runoff. However, developed urban areas contain many impervious surfaces like roofs, parking lots, and streets. This increase in impervious coverage can cause both water quantity and quality problems. The added impervious coverage prevents rain from infiltrating into the ground and concentrates the runoff so that most of the water rapidly runs off the property and into storm drain systems, creeks or the ocean in unnaturally large amounts.

Stormwater can quickly become polluted by picking up chemicals, fertilizers, soil, and litter while traveling overland. Even low concentrations of pollutants that accumulate on roads, parking lots, and sidewalks can be transported into nearby streams, rivers, wetlands, and the ocean potentially causing water quality problems. Stormwater pollution is non-point source pollution, meaning the sources are varied and widespread.

The Santa Cruz County Flood Control District, the Water Conservation District, and the City of Capitola provide flood protection and stormwater drainage for Capitola. The City of Capitola maintains its street drainage systems and relies on the County to provide major storm drain services. The infrastructure associated with flood protection and stormwater drainage includes underground systems, above ground drainage ditches and water courses, pump stations, catch basins, and outfalls. Stormwater from the project site drains into the Escalona Gulch and out into Monterey Bay.

d. Regulatory Setting.

Federal.

Clean Water Act (CWA). The CWA, enacted in 1972, regulates the discharge of pollutants to waters of the United States from any point source. Section 401 of the CWA requires water quality certification for any activity, including the construction or operation of a facility, which may result in any discharge into navigable waters (Title 33 CFR §1341). Section 404 of the CWA requires a permit for the discharge of dredged fill material into navigable waters at specified disposal sites (Title 33 CFR §1344). In 1987, amendments to the CWA added Section 402(p), which establishes a framework for regulating non-point source stormwater discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The NPDES stormwater program is further described below under the "State Regulations" subsection.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA is a former independent agency that became part of the new Department of Homeland Security in March 2003 and is tasked with responding to, planning for, recovering from, and mitigating against disasters. Formed in 1979, FEMA is responsible for determining flood elevations and floodplain boundaries based on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers studies and approved agencies studies and for coordinating the federal response to floods, earthquakes, hurricanes, and other natural or man-made disasters. FEMA also provides disaster assistance to states, communities and individuals. FEMA distributes the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMS), which identify the locations of special flood hazard areas (SFHAs), including the 100-year flood zone. Executive Order 11988 (Flood Plain Management) links the need to protect lives and property with the need to restore and preserve natural and beneficial flood plain values. Specifically, federal agencies are directed to avoid conducting, allowing, or supporting actions on the base floodplain unless the agency finds that the base floodplain is the only practicable alternative location. Similarly, Department of Transportation (DOT) Order 5650.2, which implements Executive Order 11988 and was issued pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, prescribes policies and procedures for ensuring that proper consideration is given to avoidance and mitigation of adverse floodplain impacts in agency actions, planning programs, and budget requests.

State.

Water Board. The California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) have the responsibility in California to protect and enhance water quality, both through their designation as the lead agencies in implementing the Section 319 non-point source program of the federal Clean Water Act, and through the state's primary water pollution control legislation, the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The SWRCB establishes statewide policies and regulations for the implementation of water quality control programs mandated by federal and state water quality statutes and regulations. The RWQCBs develop and implement Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) that consider regional beneficial uses, water quality characteristics, and water quality problems. All projects resulting in discharges, whether to land or water, are subject to Section 13263 of the California Water Code and are required to obtain approval of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) by the RWQCBs. Land and groundwater-related WDRs (i.e., non-NPDES WDRs) regulate discharges of privately or publicly treated domestic wastewater and process and wash-down wastewater. WDRs for discharges to surface waters also serve as NPDES permits, which are further described below.

The Central Coast (Region 3) office of the RWQCB guides and regulates water quality in streams and aquifers throughout the central coast of California and the Monterey Bay region through designation of beneficial uses, establishment of water quality objectives, and administration of the NPDES permit program for stormwater and construction site runoff. The RWQCB is also responsible for providing permits and water quality certifications (Section 401) pursuant to the CWA.

All dischargers of waste to waters of the State are subject to regulation under the Porter-Cologne Act and the requirement for WDRs is incorporated into the California Water Code. This includes both point and non-point source (NPS) dischargers. All current and proposed NPS discharges to land must be regulated under WDRs, waivers of WDRs, a basin plan prohibition, or some combination of these administrative tools. Dischargers of waste directly to state waters would be subject to an individual or general NPDES permit, which also serve as WDRs. The RWCQBs may issue individual WDRs to cover individual discharges or general WDRs to cover a category of discharges. WDRs may include effluent limitations or other requirements that are designed to implement applicable water quality control plans, including designated beneficial uses and the water quality objectives established to protect those uses and prevent the creation of nuisance conditions. Violations of WDRs may be addressed by issuing Cleanup and Abatement Orders or Cease and Desist Orders, assessing administrative civil liability, or seeking imposition of judicial civil liability or judicial injunctive relief. Construction activity on projects that disturb one or more acres of soil, or less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, must obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit, 99-08-DWQ). Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of a facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP). The SWPPP should identify stormwater collection and discharge points, drainage patterns across the project, and BMPs that the discharger will use to protect stormwater runoff and the placement of those BMPs.

As mandated by Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act, the SWRCB maintains and updates a list of "impaired water bodies" (i.e., water bodies that do not meet State and Federal water quality standards). This list is known as the Section 303(d) list of impaired waters. The State is then required to prioritize waters/watersheds for development of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) regulations. This information is compiled in a list and submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for review and approval. The SWRCB and RWQCBs monitor and assess water quality on an ongoing basis. According to the 2010 Integrated Report [CWA Section 303(d) List/305(b) Report], the following water bodies in the project vicinity currently do not meet water quality standards:

- Pacific Ocean from Point Año Nuevo to Soquel
- San Vicente Creek
- Moore Creek
- San Lorenzo River Lagoon
- Carbonera Creek
- Branciforte Creek
- Arana Gulch
- Rodeo Creek Gulch

- Soquel Creek
- Nobel Gulch
- Porter Gulch
- Aptos Creek
- Harkins Slough
- Gallighan Slough
- Watsonville Slough

Local.

City of Capitola. The City of Capitola, in conjunction with the County of Santa Cruz, has adopted a Stormwater Management Program (SWMP), which provides guidelines for preventing stormwater pollution. In addition, the City of Capitola Municipal Code Section 13.16 regulates stormwater pollution prevention and protection. This section contains requirements regarding discharge, construction site stormwater runoff control, and notification of spills.

4.7.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. The analysis of potential drainagerelated impacts is based in part on a *Preliminary Stormwater Drainage Report* (Bowman & Williams, April 19, 2013; refer to Appendix G), which was peer reviewed by Rincon Consultants, Inc., as well as other available information. In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, impacts would be considered potentially significant if the proposed project would:

- 1) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;
- 2) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering or the local groundwater table level;
- 3) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area such that substantial erosion or siltation occurs;
- 4) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which results in flooding;
- 5) 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 ;
- 6) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality;
- 7) 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;
- 8) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows;
- 9) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; and/or
- 10) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

As discussed in the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project (Appendix A), the project site is not within a flood hazard, dam inundation, or tsunami inundation area. These impacts would be less than significant and are not discussed further in this section.

The proposed project's effect on groundwater supplies is discussed in Section 4.12, *Utilities and Service Systems*.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact HWQ-1 Site preparation, grading and construction activities could degrade water quality due to the potential for erosion and sedimentation. However, compliance with existing federal, state, and local requirements would ensure that impacts remain Class III, *less than significant*.

The proposed project would include the demolition of two existing small cottages, an existing L-shaped building, and an outdoor deck, and the construction of two new buildings, a two-level below grade parking garage, as well as the extension of Escalona Drive to the back side of the property (for access to the parking garage). Site preparation would include grading and excavation, resulting in the export of approximately 6,950 net cubic yards of material from the site. Excavation and grading could result in erosion of soils and sedimentation, which could cause temporary impacts to surface water quality and therefore violate water quality standards or contribute additional sources of polluted runoff. Project development would also likely require temporary on-site storage of excavated soils (stockpiling). During grading and soil storage, there is the potential for soil migration offsite via wind entrainment and/or water erosion. In addition, there is potential for erosion from tires of construction vehicles and equipment.

As discussed in Section 4.7.1(d) (Regulatory Setting), construction activity on projects that disturb one or more acres of soil are required to comply with the NPDES program through preparation of a SWPPP, which outlines BMPs that would address post-construction runoff. BMPs that are typically specified within the SWPPP may include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- The use of sandbags, straw bales, and temporary de-silting basins during project grading and construction during the rainy season to prevent discharge of sediment-laden runoff into storm water facilities;
- *Revegetation as soon as practicable after completion of grading to reduce sediment transport during storms;*
- Installation of straw bales, wattles, or silt fencing at the base of bare slopes before the onset of the rainy season (October 15th through April 15th).
- Installation of straw bales, wattles, or silt fencing at the project perimeter and in front of storm drains before the onset of the rainy season (October 15th through April 15th).

In addition, the City of Capitola Municipal Code Section 13.16 regulates stormwater pollution prevention and protection. This section contains requirements regarding discharge, construction site stormwater runoff control, and notification of spills.

With required implementation of a SWPPP and compliance with Municipal Code Section 13.16, temporary impacts from construction activities would be reduced to a less than significant level.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> Implementing a SWPPP as well as Section 13.16 of the Capitola Municipal Code would reduce the potential for stormwater pollution associated with construction activities, including on- and off-site sedimentation, deposition, and erosion.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact HWQ-2 The proposed project would increase stormwater runoff due to the increase in impervious surfaces in the project area, which could also degrade water quality. However, the proposed on-site stormwater detention facilities and compliance with federal, state, and local requirements would ensure historic runoff volumes are maintained and water quality standards are met. Impacts related to surface runoff volumes and water quality would be Class III, *less than significant*.

The project would include hardscaping such as rooftops and parking lots, which would increase the amount of impervious surface on the site compared to existing conditions. The project would result in 14,728 square feet of building coverage (26.5% of the project site), 3,137 square feet of terraces, fountains and planters (5.7% of the project site), 25,896 square feet of landscaping (46.6% of the site), 5,653 square feet of pervious paved driveway (10.2% of the site), and 6,104 square feet of concrete sidewalks and driveways (11% of the site). Currently the site contains approximately 15,878 square feet (26%) of impervious surfaces. After construction of the proposed project, approximately 23,550 square feet (39%) of the project site would be covered with impervious surfaces (refer to Appendix G). Impervious surfaces such as driveways would accumulate deposits of oil, grease, and other vehicle fluids and hydrocarbons. In addition, maintenance of new landscaping could introduce chemical inputs such as pesticides and herbicides. During storms, these deposits could be washed into and through the drainage systems and to the Pacific Ocean. The addition of fertilizers, pesticides and other chemicals to new landscaping has the potential to include higher than natural concentrations of trace metals, biodegradable wastes (which affect dissolved oxygen levels), and excessive major nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorus.

Urban runoff can have a variety of deleterious effects. Oil and grease contain a number of hydrocarbon compounds, some of which are toxic to aquatic organisms at low concentrations. Heavy metals such as lead, cadmium, and copper are the most common metals found in urban stormwater runoff. These metals can be toxic to aquatic organisms, and have the potential to contaminate drinking water supplies. Nutrients from fertilizers, including nitrogen and phosphorous, can result in excessive or accelerated growth of vegetation or algae, resulting in oxygen depletion and additional impaired uses of water. Therefore, the increased impervious surface area, vehicular activity, and use of pesticides for landscaping on-site, could increase the

amount of pollutants in on-site runoff, which could adversely affect the water quality of receiving waters including the Pacific Ocean.

The primary pollutants of concern specific to Santa Cruz County and the City Capitola are fecal indicator bacteria, sediment, and nutrients. These pollutants of concerns would be addressed throughout the management area for the City and County's SWMP. Water on the project site drains to the adjacent Escalona Gulch, which is not listed on the 2010 Integrated Report as not meeting water quality requirements (Santa Cruz County and City of Capitola, November 2010).

In addition to affecting water quality, the increase in impervious surfaces on the project site would increase peak flows from the site to off-site drainages. This has the potential to create flooding and drainage problems if the existing drainage system is inadequate to handle additional flow.

To manage stormwater runoff, the proposed project includes low impact development (LID) elements, including porous paving, perforated sub-drain pipes on the paved entry drive, and a 450 square foot water detention "rain garden" (refer to Figure 2-8 in the *Project Description*). In addition, the project would include 1,133 cubic feet of detention and proposes to meet the County of Santa Cruz Design Criteria for stormwater detention basins. The project also proposes to comply with the Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region (Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB] Resolution No. R3-2012-0025, September 6, 2012). In accordance with these requirements, a combination of LID treatments and the proposed detention system would provide 48 hour extended detention for water quality treatment for the 85th percentile 24-hour rainfall event. These facilities would have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> In accordance with City of Capitola Municipal Code Chapter 13.16, owners and occupants of property within the City are required to minimize the runoff of water used for irrigation purposes to the maximum extent practicable. Runoff of water from washing down paved areas is required to be minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Sweeping and collection of debris is encouraged for trash disposal. In addition, the project applicant would be required to comply with the NPDES program through preparation of a SWPPP. The SWPPP should identify stormwater collection and discharge points, drainage patterns across the project, and BMPs that the discharger will use to prevent pollution of stormwater runoff and the placement of those BMPs.

Compliance with existing regulations and construction of the proposed rain gardens and detention system would reduce impacts that could occur from pollutants on-site or increase in storm flows on or off-site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact HWQ-3 The proposed project would add to impervious surfaces on the site. However, this would not interfere with groundwater recharge. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

The proposed project would add an estimated 8,672 square feet of impervious surfaces to the site. However, the site is not in a groundwater recharge area, as determined by the County of Santa Cruz Environmental Health Services Department (2013). Impacts would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> There are no regulatory requirements for the project area regarding groundwater recharge.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As discussed in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. Neither of these projects is located within the drainage area of the proposed project. Cumulative development projects within the Depot Hill area are limited to minor additions to existing single-family residences; construction, demolition and replacement of existing single-family residences and associated accessory structures; or alterations of small multi-family dwellings. These improvements could increase impervious surface area, thereby potentially increasing peak flood flows and overall runoff volumes. Each project would be evaluated and addressed individually. With implementation of NPDES requirements for construction and operation similar to the proposed project, the post development peak discharges would not substantially increase peak flood flows or increase flooding. Similar to the project, compliance with existing regulations would be required on a project-by-project basis. Consequently, a cumulative increase in peak runoff or associated flooding impacts would not be expected, and the project's contribution to such effects would not be significant.

With respect to surface water quality, construction activity associated with cumulative development would temporarily increase sedimentation due to grading and construction activities. In addition, new development would increase the generation of urban pollutants that may adversely affect water quality in the long term. However, like the proposed project, all future development would be subject to implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices in accordance with federal, state, and local requirements. Furthermore, all qualifying projects are subject to the requirements of the NPDES Permit, which is specifically designed to develop, achieve, and implement a timely, comprehensive, and cost-effective stormwater pollution control program. As with the project, cumulative projects that disturb more than one acre of soil would be required to compile and implement a SWPPP, which would include appropriate BMPs.

Thus, implementation of applicable requirements on development in the area would reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. As discussed above, with implementation of NPDES requirements, the project's contribution to increased pollutant loads in area surface water would be reduced to a less than significant level and thus would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.8 LAND USE AND PLANNING

4.8.1 Setting

a. Citywide Land Use. Capitola is a coastal community in Santa Cruz County located approximately 4.5 miles east of the City of Santa Cruz straddling the State Route 1 freeway. The City encompasses 1.7 square miles of land area (approximately 1,088 acres) in the greater Santa Cruz urban complex, and is bounded on the west by the urban unincorporated community of Live Oak, on the north by the community of Soquel, on the east by Soquel Cove, and on the south by the Monterey Bay. According to the California Department of Finance (January 2013), Capitola has a population of 9,988.

As stated in the City's General Plan (1989), Capitola is considered by many to be a unique coastal village with its own special sense of place. The heart of the City of Capitola is the Capitola Village, which features an assortment of shops, restaurants, vacation rentals, and recreational amenities. An assortment of residential neighborhoods contribute to the unique identity and family-friendly character of the community. Capitola is also home to the Capitola Mall and other region-serving retail establishments along 41st Avenue. Capitola's rich history, beautiful natural setting, and strong community identity help to create a special place that is highly valued by residents and visitors.

Within a small area of 1.7 square miles, Capitola contains a diversity of land uses. The City's General Plan states that over half of Capitola is occupied by residential uses, primarily in the form of detached single-family homes. Commercial and industrial uses occupy 21% of the City, primarily located along the 41st Avenue corridor. Open space and recreational uses, including New Brighton State Park and Capitola Beach, occupy 14% of the City.

Residential uses in Capitola are grouped together in neighborhoods, each with their own respective character. Each neighborhood designated in the City's General Plan has a unique identity defined by its history, design character, land use mix, and natural setting. The project site is located within the City's Depot Hill neighborhood.

b. Neighborhood Setting. The Depot Hill neighborhood is nestled along Capitola's shoreline and overlooks Capitola Village to the west. The neighborhood is primarily comprised of detached single-family homes on relatively small lots. A high concentration of historic single-family homes, a variety of architectural styles, and narrow streets with no sidewalks contribute to the neighborhood's coastal village setting. The Monarch Cove Inn project site is located on the eastern end of the Depot Hill neighborhood.

c. Project Site. The approximately 1.4 acre (60,984 square-feet) project site is located at 620 El Salto Drive along the Capitola coastline adjacent to the coastal bluff. The property is currently occupied by the 11-room Monarch Cove Inn, which consists of nine rooms in a historic Victorian structure, two guest cottages, a garage/administration building, and an outside deck. The site is currently accessed via El Salto Drive.

d. Surrounding Uses. The project site is surrounded by single and multi-family residences to the north, single-family residences to the west, and the Pacific Ocean (Soquel

Cove) to the south. Directly to the northeast and east is the Escalona Gulch Monarch Butterfly Grove Habitat Reserve. The Escalona Drive right of way is located at the eastern edge of the project site.

Other characteristics of the project site and existing development are discussed in Section 2.0, *Project Description*. Figure 2-2 in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, shows the project site boundaries in the context of the immediate vicinity and the parcels involved in the proposed project.

e. Regulatory Setting. The following describes the existing regulatory setting, including the City of Capitola General Plan, the City's Coastal Land Use Plan, and the City's Zoning Ordinance, which are applicable to the land use component of the proposed project.

<u>City of Capitola General Plan</u>. California state law requires that every city or county prepare and adopt a General Plan. The General Plan is a comprehensive document that provides the long-term goals, policies and objectives to guide future development. The City of Capitola General Plan was adopted in 1989 and is currently being updated.

As of December 2013, the General Plan Update is in draft form. Some of the key issues the General Plan Update will address include:

- Compatibility between new development and established neighborhoods;
- *Improved accessibility;*
- Measures to protect Capitola's unique coastal charm;
- Enhancement of 41st and Bay Avenue commercial corridors;
- Parking in Capitola Village; and
- Promoting environmental and economic sustainability.

The current City of Capitola General Plan (1989) includes seven separate state-required elements (Land Use; Housing; Opens Space, Parks and Recreation; Conservation; Safety; Noise; and Circulation) that establish goals, policies, and actions for each given topic.

While the City of Capitola General Plan is currently being updated, as of December 2013 this updated General Plan is in public draft review and comment form and has not been adopted by the City of Capitola and as of this writing does not supersede the existing 1989 General Plan. Therefore, only policies from the 1989 City of Capitola General Plan are included in the consistency analysis considered by this EIR.

City of Capitola General Plan policies applicable to the project site and proposed project are discussed under Impact LU-1.

Local Coastal Program. A central feature of the California Coastal Act is the transfer of most of the authority vested in the Coastal Commission by the Coastal Act to the local governments through adoption and certification of "Local Coastal Program." The Local Coastal Program (LCP) consists of a local government's land use plans, zoning ordinance, zoning district maps and other ordinances, which when taken together, meet the requirements of, and implement the provisions and policies of the Coastal Act at the local level. Each LCP reflects the

coastal issues and concerns of the local jurisdiction and must be consistent with the statewide policies of the Coastal Act.

The Local Coastal Program is divided into two major parts: the Land Use Plan (LUP) and the Implementation Plan. The Land Use Plan is defined in the Public Resources Code as the "... relevant portions of a local government's general plan, or local coastal element which are sufficiently detailed to indicate the kinds, location, and intensity of land uses, the applicable resource protection and development policies, and, where necessary, a listing of implementing actions." The Implementation Plan includes zoning and ordinance revisions and proposes other programs needed to carry out the goals, policies, and land use designations of the LUP.

The project site is located entirely within the Coastal Zone and is subject to the City's LUP. The Capitola LUP is divided into six "Components":

- Locating and Planning New or Intensified Development and Public Works Facilities;
- Public Access;
- Visual Resources and Special Communities;
- *Recreation and Visitor-Serving Facilities;*
- Natural Systems; and
- Natural Hazards.

The LUP was certified by the California Coastal Commission in 1981 and has been amended several times thereafter. Specific policies that are applicable to the project site and proposed project are discussed under Impact LU-1.

<u>City of Capitola Municipal Code</u>. Capitola's Zoning Ordinance/ Development Code is Title 17 of the City's Municipal Code. As identified by the City, the Zoning Ordinance is the primary implementing tool for the City's General Plan land use policy. The Zoning Ordinance sets the land use development standards and zoning map for the City, as necessary to encourage the most appropriate use of land.

Project site parcels 036-142-27, 036-142-28 (partial), and 036-143-31 have a zoning designation of Visitor Serving (V-S), while parcel 036-143-36 is zoned Parks and Open Space (P/OS). As described in the Capitola Municipal Code in Section 17.30.020, the purpose of the V-S District *"is to accommodate the visiting public with a range of opportunities to enjoy the city of Capitola's coastal location."* As described in Section 17.29.020, the P/OS District is intended for areas that:

- *A.* Are to be set aside or have been previously set aside as permanent scenic easements, forest preserves, riparian corridors, public waterfront or beach areas, public parks, or similar public open space; or
- B. Are to be set aside by the owners as buffer areas separating district from recreational, open space/scenic or natural resource areas; or
- C. Should be retained in their existing and undeveloped open character because of excessive danger from flood, fire and erosion.

Specific relevant V-S zoning code applicable to the project site are discussed under Impact LU-1; no proposed project components would occur on parcel 036-143-36, zoned P/OS.

4.8.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. The analysis in this section addresses whether the proposed project would be in substantial conformance with regional and local plans, policies, and regulations that are applicable to the proposed project and project site. The following subjective thresholds of significance are based on the *State CEQA Guidelines* Appendix G. For the purposes of this EIR, land use and planning impacts would be potentially significant if the proposed project would:

- 1) *Physically divide an established community;*
- 2) 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; and/or
- 3) Conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

The determination of land use consistency is ultimately made by City decision-makers. *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15125(d) requires that an EIR discuss inconsistencies with applicable plans that the lead agency decision-makers should address. A project is considered consistent with the provisions of the identified regional and local plans if it meets the general intent of the plans and would not preclude the attainment of the primary goals of the land use plan or policy.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the project (Appendix A), the proposed project would be located on a previously developed site with a hotel use. No new subdivision or property expansion would occur, and therefore the proposal would not physically divide an established community. Furthermore, the proposed project would maintain and improve public access on and through the site via ADA accessible walkways. Therefore, no impacts relating to the physical division of communities would occur. There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any habitat/natural community conservation plan. These two issues are not discussed further in this section.

The project's consistency with the City of Capitola General Plan, Local Coastal Plan, and Capitola Municipal Code is discussed below, as is question of compatibility of the proposed project with adjacent residential land uses.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact LU-1The proposed project would not conflict with any land use plan,
policy, or regulation (including the City's General Plan, Zoning
Ordinance, and Local Coastal Program), which were adopted for
the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
Impacts related to policy consistency would be Class III, less
than significant.

The project site is located within the Depot Hill area, a district entirely within the designated Coastal Zone. The General Plan designation is "visitor serving." Allowed uses in the Depot Hill

area include residential and visitor serving uses; however, single-family residential is the dominant use in the area.

The proposed project would involve demolition of two existing small cottages, an existing Lshaped building (consisting of garage spaces and the hotel office), and the outdoor deck. These existing structures would be replaced by a proposed new hotel that would include three buildings: two new buildings, and an existing building to remain. A two-level, below grade parking garage is also proposed. These proposed land uses are permissible uses for the City of Capitola's V-S designation.

Table 4.8-1 contains an evaluation of the proposed project's consistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan, LCP, and Zoning Ordinance that are most applicable to the proposed project. Consistent with the scope and purpose of this EIR, this discussion primarily focuses on goals and policies that relate to avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts, and an assessment of whether any inconsistency with these standards creates a significant physical impact on the environment. As shown in the table, the proposed project would be fundamentally consistent with the City's primary land use planning documents.

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion
General Plan Safety Element	
 Policy 11. New development along the coastal bluffs shall be evaluated for seismic integrity. 1) All development along the coastal bluffs and beach areas must demonstrate the geologic stability of a structure for a 50-year period, must not significantly contribute to the instability of the coastal bluffs or beach area, and must be consistent with other policies of the Capitola General Plan and Local Coastal Plan. 2) Soils Report and seismic evaluation shall be required of all new construction within 200 feet of the edge of the coastal cliff line. 	<u>Consistent</u> . A geotechnical investigation has been prepared for the proposed project, which includes an investigation of seismic integrity for the site, a seismic evaluation, and a soils report (refer to Appendix E). The proposed project would be required to adhere to geotechnical recommendations from this report as a condition of project approval. Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.5, <i>Geology</i> , potential geologic impacts of the proposed project were determined to be less than significant. The project would be consistent with the other policies of the General Plan and LCP as described throughout this section.
General Plan Circulation Element	
Policy 2. In Capitola Village and its portals, slower speeds are desirable and some delay will be acceptable. Level of service D shall be the acceptable standard in this area.	<u>Consistent</u> . A traffic impact study has been prepared for the proposed project and determined that traffic generated from the project's operation would not result in a downgrade of Level of Service in Capitola Village or at its portals (refer to Section 4.11, <i>Traffic and Circulation</i>).
General Plan Noise Element	
Policy 2 . Ensure that new development or proposed changes to development mitigate noise to acceptable levels.	<u>Consistent</u> . As discussed in Section 4.9, <i>Noise</i> , of this EIR, potential noise impacts of the proposed project would be either less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.
Local Coastal Program	
Policy I-3. It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to provide for the protection, preservation, and proper disposition (where necessary) of archaeological, historical and paleontological resources within Capitola. This policy shall be	<u>Consistent</u> . As discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Cultural</i> <i>Resources</i> , potential impacts to cultural resources of the proposed project would be either less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. Mitigation identified

 Table 4.8-1

 General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion
implemented in cooperation with the landowners, developers, State Historic Preservation Office and the Archaeological Research Center.	therein would protect, preserve, or result in the proper disposition of archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources on the site.
Policy II-1. It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to provide safe and adequate pedestrian access to and along the shoreline as designed in the Shorelines Access Plan (see Maps II-1, 2, and 3).	<u>Consistent</u> . As described in Section 2.0, <i>Project</i> <i>Description</i> , the proposed project includes improved public access through the project site in the form of an ADA- compliant pathway. The project would, therefore, be in compliance with this policy.
Policy III-4. It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to require the planting of trees in new development and to protect existing trees by allowing removal only in accordance with the City's Tree Ordinance. The City should encourage new developments to be designed to preserve significant vegetation.	<u>Consistent</u> . The project proposes to remove 14 trees from the project site. In accordance with mitigation measure BIO-1(b) in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , the project would be required to replace these trees on-site at a ratio of 3:1. Remaining trees on-site would be avoided and protected in accordance with mitigation measures BIO-7(a) through BIO-7(c) in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> . Pursuant to implementation of these mitigation measures, the project would be consistent with this policy.
Policy III-5. Permitted development shall not block or detract from public views to and along Capitola's shoreline.	<u>Consistent</u> . As discussed in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics/Visual</i> <i>Resources</i> , the proposed project would not block or detract from public views as there is no existing public viewshed through the project site. Furthermore, the project proposes to improve public access to coastal views with installation of an ADA-compliant pathway through the project site. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy.
Policy III-10. The City shall identify architecturally and historically significant structures and provide for their protection. These include special, unique structures in Capitola Village and surrounding bluffs, both private and public.	<u>Consistent</u> . The project would demolish two existing on-site cottages and would temporarily relocate and ultimately re- orient an existing Victorian structure, which would also be seismically retrofitted as part of the project. Impacts to these structures were analyzed in an <i>Historic Resources Technical Report</i> (Architectural Resources Group, October 2013; refer to Appendix D) and Section 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , of this EIR. As noted therein, impacts to the Victorian structure would be less than significant, while impacts to the two cottages would be reduced through the application of mitigation measure CR-1. As a result, historically significant structures on the project site would be protected, consistent with this policy.
Policy VI-2 . It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to protect, maintain and, where possible, enhance the environmentally sensitive and locally unique habitats within its coastal zone, including dedication and/or acquisition of scenic conservation easements for protection of the natural environment. All developments approved by the City within or adjacent to these areas must be found to be protective of the long-term maintenances of these habitats.	<u>Consistent</u> . The project site is located immediately adjacent to the Escalona Gulch Monarch Butterfly Grove (EGMBG), and the site includes monarch foraging and sunning habitat. The project design avoids removal of most large trees on the project site, and no monarch roost trees would be removed. However, as described in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , the presence of sheltered foraging and sunning areas near the EGMBG and its associated roost trees is likely an important factor in maintaining Escalona Gulch as a viable overwintering site for the Monarch butterfly. Mitigation Measures BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(c) are required to protect monarch butterflies and the EGMBG and reduce impacts to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures would avoid wintering butterfly roost trees and increase the number of trees and associated tree windbreaks over what exists now on the site. Furthermore, all foraging and sunning areas would be either avoided or replaced at a ratio greater than 1:1 and over the long-term, and English Ivy would be replaced by

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion
	higher quality native vegetation suitable for monarch foraging. This mitigation would result in an overall increase in the total monarch butterfly foraging habitat on the project site, and an enhancement of habitat function and value from current conditions.Therefore, the project would be consistent with this ordinance.
Policy VII-1. It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to adequately plan for natural hazards in new development, reduce risks to life and property, and revise all plans and Zoning Ordinances to be in conformance with the policies of the Coastal Act relating to hazards and shoreline structures.	<u>Consistent</u> . A geotechnical investigation has been prepared for the proposed project, which includes an investigation of seismic integrity for the site, a seismic evaluation, and a soils report (refer to Appendix E). As discussed in Section 4.5, <i>Geology</i> , potential geologic impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant pursuant to compliance with these recommendations, which will be required as a condition of project approval.
Policy VII-2. All geologic/engineering reports required by the City pursuant to the policies of this component shall be prepared according to the guidelines for practice issued by the California Division of Mines and Geology, specifically CDMG notes Numbers 37 (Guidelines to Geologic/Seismic Reports), 43 (Recommended Guidelines for Determining the Maximum Probable Earthquakes), 44 (Recommended Guidelines for Preparing engineering Geologic Reports) and interpretive Coastal Commission for Bluff Top Development.	<u>Consistent</u> . A geotechnical investigation has prepared for the proposed project in accordance with California Division of Mines and Geology standards (refer to Appendix E).
Policy VII-7. Bluff and cliff top development shall be approved only if design and setback provisions are adequate to assure stability and structural integrity of the economic lifespan (at least 50 years) of the development and if the development (including storm runoff, foot traffic, grading, and irrigation) will neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion problem or geological instability of the site or surrounding area.	<u>Consistent</u> . The Victorian building and proposed Bayview Building would be situated approximately 90 feet from the blufftop (Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc., 2013), which would exceed the minimum 50-setback requirement included in the City's LCP. A geotechnical investigation has been prepared for the proposed project, which includes an investigation of geologic stability and potential erosion impacts from the proposed project (refer to Appendix E). As discussed in Section 4.5, <i>Geology</i> , potential geologic impacts of the proposed project (including shoreline retreat and accelerated bluff erosion associated with sea level rise) would be either less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.
Policy VII-8. A geological report shall be submitted for any bluff or cliff top development proposed within 200 feet for the cliff edge.	<u>Consistent</u> . A geotechnical investigation has been prepared for the proposed project in compliance with this policy (refer to Appendix E).
 Policy VI-10. a) It shall be the policy of the City of Capitola to protect the winter resting sites of the Monarch Butterfly in the eucalyptus groves of Escalona Gulch, New Brighton Gulch, and Soquel Creek as designated on Map VI-2 by requiring detailed analysis of the impacts of development on the habitat. b) It is the goal of the City to preserve the monarch butterfly overwintering site in the area known as Escalona Gulch. Preservation, based on the information presented in the Environmental Impact Report dated March 1991 prepared for the site, requires that development be limited to 6,000 square feet and does not have a total footprint of more than 4,000 square feet. The building(s) shall be located 	<u>Consistent</u> . The project site is located immediately adjacent to the EGMBG, and the site includes monarch foraging and sunning habitat. The project design avoids removal of most large trees on the project site, and no monarch roost trees would be removed. However, as outlined in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , the presence of sheltered foraging and sunning areas near the EGMBG and its associated roost trees is likely an important factor in maintaining Escalona Gulch as a viable overwintering site for the Monarch butterfly. Mitigation Measures BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(c) are required to protect monarch butterflies and the EGMBG and reduce impacts to a less than significant level. This mitigation would result in an overall increase in the total monarch butterfly foraging habitat on the project site, and an enhancement of habitat function and value from

 Table 4.8-1

 General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion
and designed so that they do not have a significant adverse impact on the Monarch butterfly habitat. The habitat, and area around it necessary to preserve the habitat, shall be placed in a conservation easement at the time of development. Any significant change in the site conditions, relevant new scientific information, or change in proposal shall be reviewed through a supplemental environmental evaluation and could require an amendment to this policy. ¹	current conditions.
Zoning Ordinance	
17.30.120 Parking. Parking standards shall be as provided in Chapter 17.51.	<u>Consistent.</u> Parking as provided by the proposed project would comply with Chapter 17.51, including, but not limited to, having a drainage plan, appropriate parking space sizing, bicycle racks, and appropriate number of parking spaces, as the 60 spaces proposed for the site exceeds the requirement for one parking space per guest room. The project would, therefore, be designed in compliance with the ordinance.
17.30.140 Landscaping and lighting. A minimum of five percent of the lot area shall be landscaped to ensure harmony with adjacent development in accordance with architectural and site approval standards. Exceptions to this standard are as follows: for the Rispin site, seventy-five percent of the site shall consist of either landscaped areas located within the developed areas of the site, or unlandscaped natural areas for those portions of the site subject to conservation easements. For the Shadowbrook Restaurant parcel that is adjacent to Soquel Creek, fifty percent of the site shall consist of landscaped or open space areas. For the planting of invasive plant species is prohibited. All exterior lighting shall be unobtrusive, harmonious with the local area and constructed or located so that only the area intended is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled. The location, type and wattage of the exterior lighting must be approved by the community development director prior to the issuance of building permits or the establishment of the use.	<u>Consistent.</u> In accordance with this ordinance, 50% of the project site must consist of landscaped or open space areas. Designs for the proposed project indicate that 52.1% of the project site would be either landscaped or open space. In addition, the proposed project includes the preparation of both landscaping and lighting plans in accordance with City requirements. The landscaping plan prepared for the project includes proposed planting of some invasive plant species, including English ivy. However, these plant types already occur on the project site, and are considered beneficial for monarch butterfly habitat. In addition, in accordance with mitigation measure BIO-1(b) in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , English ivy would be planted only as an interim source of nectar until other non-invasive species have fully developed. A phased plan to remove English ivy from the project site would be developed, and as the other species of nectar plants mature and flower, the amount of ivy would be gradually reduced and ultimately removed from the grounds of the Monarch Cove Inn. Thus, in the long-term, the proposed project would remove invasive plant species from the site. Therefore, although in the short-term the project would plant a non-native species on the site, in the long-term the project would remove invasive species, in conformance with the intent of this ordinance.

¹ It should be noted that section (b) of this policy pertains to a specific land division application (Escalona Woods) and does not apply to the proposed project.

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion
 17.63.090 Considerations in Review of Applications. The considerations of the architectural and site review committee, community development department, and/or planning commission shall include, but not be limited to, the following: A. Considerations relating to traffic circulation, safety and congestion; 	<u>Consistent.</u> The proposed project would be subject to City standards requiring the review and approval of required maps and drawings for proposed development. Specific components of the ordinance addressing specific potential issues applicable to the proposed project are summarized below. For further discussion of potential impacts, please see the below-references sections of the EIR:
 B. Considerations relating to outdoor advertising: 1. The number, location, color, size, height, lighting and landscaping of outdoor advertising signs and structures in relation to the creation of traffic hazards and the appearance and harmony with adjacent development; C. Considerations relating to landscaping: 1. The location, height and materials of walls, fences, hedges, trees and screen plantings to insure harmony with adjacent development or to conceal storage areas, utility installations or other unsightly development, 2. The planting of groundcover or other landscape surfacing to prevent dust and erosion, 3. The prevention of unnecessary destruction of 	A. Traffic circulation, safety, and congestion. As discussed in Section 4.11, Traffic and Circulation, project-generated traffic would increase traffic volumes and incrementally reduce levels of service at each of the ten study intersections and freeway segments. Although numeric significance thresholds would be exceeded at selected freeway segments and intersections, the additional trips introduced by the project would not increase congestion or impede circulation in a highly noticeable way. For example, the number of cars on neighborhood streets would increase by, at the most, a rate equivalent to approximately one every three to five minutes. Eight additional vehicles, at most, would be added to freeway segments during peak traffic hours. In addition traffic safety impacts would not be
 a. The prevention of unnecessary destruction of existing healthy trees, 4. Usable open space shall be reviewed both with respect to area and quality of landscape development; D. Considerations relating to site layout: 1. The orientation and location of buildings, decks or balconies, and open spaces in relation to the 	<i>B. Outdoor advertising.</i> Although not a CEQA issue, signage on the project site would be required to be approved by the City, ensuring it would be in accordance with City Standards.
physical characteristics of the site, the character of the neighborhood and the appearance and harmony of the buildings with adjacent development such that privacy of adjacent properties is maintained; E. Considerations relating to drainage: 1. The effect of the site development plan on the adequacy of the storm and surface water drainage to	C. Landscaping. The proposed project would involve tree removal and changes to site landscaping, hardscaping. Mitigation measures in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , would require tree replacement at a 3:1 ratio and would ensure protection of remaining on-site trees. The landscaping plan would be reviewed by City decision makers prior to project approval.
 both the site and adjacent property, Connection to existing drainage systems, Incorporation of permeable driveway materials and other means of retaining stormwater runoff on site and reducing non-point source pollution through upo of grapping synches and other water guilt to 	<i>D. Site Layout.</i> As described in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics/Visual Resources,</i> the proposed site layout would not affect views of the ocean and coastline from a public viewing area.
enhancement measures; F. Considerations relating to architectural character: 1. The suitability of the building for its purpose, 2. The appropriate use of materials to insure compatibility with the intent of the title; G. Considerations relating to fire prevention:	<i>E. Drainage.</i> Drainage-related impacts associated with the proposed site layout are addressed in Section 4.5, <i>Geology,</i> and Section 4.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality.</i> Impacts would be less than significant after compliance with mitigation measure GEO-5.
 Sufficient and suitable access to all areas for emergency vehicles, Proper location and spacing of fire hydrants; H. Considerations relating to excavation and grading; L. Consideration relating to landscape maintenance; 	<i>F. Architectural Character.</i> As discussed in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics/Visual Resources</i> , the proposed project would result in an increased intensity and scale of development on the project site. However, the project would not result in a significant aesthetic impact.
 The proper maintenance of landscape planting to encourage healthy growth and the replacement of 	<i>G. Fire Prevention.</i> The project would provide sufficient and suitable access for emergency vehicles as described in

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion	
dead plants until all plants are established,	Section 4.10, Public Services.	
 The committee may require a one thousand dollar performance bond for a period of one year beginning from the date of final inspection; Protection of historic features and vistas; K. Considerations related to encouraging utilization and protection of solar energy, including; 	<i>H. Excavation and grading.</i> Impacts related to excavation and grading are addressed in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality,</i> and Section 4.5, <i>Geology.</i> No significant impacts are anticipated.	
 The orientation of the lot, Height of proposed building, Distance between proposed building and south wall of adjacent structure(s), Extent to which adjacent building(s) will have solar 	<i>I. Landscaping maintenance.</i> Mitigation measure BIO-1(e) requires long-term maintenance and monitoring of project landscaping to ensure the long-term eradication of English ivy.	
access to south roof and/or wall, 5. Extent to which adjacent south facing wall(s), roof top(s), and solar collector(s) are shaded by the proposed structure(s); L. Consideration of design guidelines for special	J. Historic features and vistas. The project would demolish two existing on-site cottages and would temporarily relocate and ultimately re-orient an existing Victorian structure, which would also be seismically retrofitted as part of the project. As noted in Section 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> ,	
commercial or residential areas contained in the general plan, coastal plan, area plans or other approved design policies; M. Review of floodplain areas as designated on the flood boundary map in accord with the standards of Chapter 17.50 and with this title;	impacts to the Victorian structure would be less than significant, while impacts to the two cottages would be reduced by requiring preservation and relocation of the cottages (mitigation measure CR-1). In addition, as discussed in Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics/Visual Resources,</i> impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.	
N. The committee will require enclosed garbage areas of an adequate size to provide for garbage and recycling storage and collection for the project, unless an exception is made for individual containers in small residential projects.	The remaining considerations in this ordinance are not directly applicable to the proposed project.	
 17.11.030 Archaeological survey report requirement. A. An archaeological survey report shall be required for any development located within: 1. "Archaeological/Paleontological Sensitivity Areas" 		
as mapped on city of Capitola resource map (LUP p. 19, Map I-1); 2. Seven hundred fifty feet of a known		
 3. An area with a probability of containing archaeological resources, as determined through the planner's onsite investigation or other available information. B. The survey report shall be required by, submitted to and approved by the situ prior to the application. 	<u>Consistent</u> . A Phase I Archaeological Resources Survey was completed for the proposed project by a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologists. The results of the cultural resources records search, Native American scoping, and intensive pedestrian survey as components of the survey diapat identify any archaeological resources	
being considered complete. Two copies of the report shall be submitted C. The survey report shall be prepared, at the applicant's expense, by a qualified archaeologist, as included on the city's list of archaeological	within the project site (refer to Appendix D). Impacts to archaeological resources, including previously unidentified archaeological cultural resources, are discussed in Section 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> . Mitigation measures CR-4(a) and CR-4(b) require construction monitoring and outline the	
Consultants of by a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologists. D. Where construction on, or construction impacts to, an identified archaeological or paleontological	protocols for unanticipated discoveries of prehistoric or archaeological cultural remains.	
archaeological report prepared for the project, a mitigation plan shall be required for the project. Prior to the application being considered complete, the		
plan shall be required by, submitted to and approved by the city. The plan shall be prepared at the		

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion
applicant's expense by a qualified archaeologist, either on the city's list of archaeological consultants or as a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologists. Included in the plan shall be recommended preservation measures in accordance with the guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation and the State of California Native American Heritage Commission. The consulting archaeologist shall file the report with the State Office of Historic Preservation and where the plan contains recommendations that will impose any continuing restrictions or obligations on the property, an agreement approved by the city attorney, binding the property's owner to the restrictions or requirements shall be recorded. Such agreement shall list the official file number of the report and the logation of the document	
Iocation of the document. E. The recommended mitigation measures contained in the archaeological survey report prepared for the site shall be made condition(s) of approval. E. Where a mitigation plan has been prepared for a	
 proposed development, a condition of project approval shall be that: 1. The preservation measures shall be undertaken and completed prior to the issuance of building or grading permits; or 	
2. Where appropriate according to the recommendations contained in the mitigation plan, the preservation measures shall be undertaken concurrent with grading or other soil-disturbing activities and shall be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation plan, as a condition of the grading or building or building or building or building activities and shall be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation plan, as a condition of the grading or building or buildi	
3. The results of the preservation activities shall be compiled into a final report prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the city prior to the issuance of building or grading permits. Two copies of the report shall be submitted.	
report standards of the Society of Professional Archaeologists and must include, at a minimum, a field survey by the archaeologist, survey of available state resource information at the Northwest Regional Information Center of the California Archaeological Inventory, description of the site's sensitivity and any identified archaeological resources, appropriate	
levels of development on the site, and recommended mitigation measures. The report may be required to include additional information, according to the circumstances of the particular site. H. An archaeological survey report may be waived by the director of planning under the following circumstances:	
 A previous report was prepared for the site by a qualified archaeologist, as included on the city's list of archaeological consultants or as a member of the 	

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or	Consistency Discussion
Society of Professional Archaeologists; and 2. The report clearly and adequately included the currently-proposed development site within the scope of its survey; or 3. The proposed development does not involve land clearing or land disturbance.	
17.11.040 Environmental assessment requirement. All development proposed on parcels with known archaeological resources, as identified through the survey report, shall be subject to environmental assessment under the CEQA guidelines.	<u>Consistent</u> . A Phase I Archaeological Resources Survey was completed for the proposed project and the survey concluded there to be no archaeological resources on the site (refer to Appendix D). The proposed project has been the subject of this EIR, consistent with <i>State CEQA</i> <i>Guidelines</i> .
 17.60.030 Considerations. In considering an application for a conditional use involving a material change of an historic feature the planning commission shall weigh the benefits of the proposed change against the detriment to the public welfare caused by a change in the feature. In approving any such change, the commission shall make one of the following findings: The action proposed will not be significantly detrimental to the historic feature in which the change in use is to occur; or The application would result in hardship that is so substantial as to outweigh the corresponding benefit to the public of maintenance to the historic feature or structure. 	<u>Consistent.</u> As the proposed project involves impacts to historical features (refer to Section 4.4, <i>Cultural</i> <i>Resources</i>), the project would be subject to review and consideration in accordance with this ordinance. As noted in Section 4.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , impacts to historical resources would be less than significant with mitigation; thus, the project would not be significantly detrimental to an historic feature.
 17.95.060 Soquel Creek – Escalona Gulch Monarch butterfly habitat regulations A. Habitat Description. The Soquel Creek grove is located east of the intersection of Wharf Road and Clares Street, on the west side of the creek. The wintering site is part of the former Rispin Mansion property. Monterey pines, redwoods, and acacia are interspersed within the grove. Escalona Gulch is located between the Southern Pacific railroad tracks and the ocean and is bounded on the immediate west side by a residential area and El Salto Resort. To the east is a residential area. The gulch is a steep sided, deeply incised ravine with a small intermittent stream. A dense stand of eucalyptus trees with some Monterey pines and Monterey cypress completely fills the gulch. There is little native vegetation except for poison oak. The understory is overgrown with nonnative vines. B. Development in areas adjacent to the butterfly groves shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade the areas. C. The applicant shall be required to retain a qualified professional to determine the location of the outer edge of the Monarch habitat and to report to the city potential impacts and mitigation measures for proposed development. D. Removal of trees within the perimeter of the habitat areas shall be prohibited unless it is 	<u>Consistent.</u> As detailed in Section 4.3, <i>Biological</i> <i>Resources</i> , mitigation measures BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(c) would protect monarch butterflies and the EGMBHR. These measures include: preconstruction surveys, restriction of construction activities during the monarch butterfly wintering period, tree replacement exceeding City requirements (3:1 of all 14 trees proposed for removal, including fruit-bearing varieties), protection of trees and other vegetation that would not be removed during construction, the requirement that a monarch expert approve the project landscape plan prior to issuance of a grading permit, a prohibition of outdoor fireplaces or barbeques, and short-term planting of English ivy to provide an interim source of nectar until other non-invasive species have fully developed. Several of these measures are in direct conformance with this code section, and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Refer to Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , for additional detail.

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion	
determined by the community development director that such removal is necessary by reason of good forestry practice, disease of the tree, or safety considerations. Any such determinations, including tree maintenance or trimming, shall be accompanied by a written evaluation of the impacts of the proposed action on habitat resources by a qualified expert on the Monarch butterfly. Such report and investigations shall be arranged by the city and paid for by the applicant as part of environmental review. E. Construction within or on properties contiguous to the designated butterfly groves shall be prohibited during fall and winter months when the Monarch butterflies are present. Removal or modification of trees within the groves shall not be permitted during these periods except when determined by the community development director to be a necessary emergency to protect human life or property. F. Coastal development permit applications within or adjacent to the Soquel Creek-Escalona Gulch Monarch butterfly habitats shall contain landscaping plans which set forth the location and extent of any proposed modifications to existing vegetation and the locations, kinds, and extent of new landscaping. The emphasis of such landscaping plans shall be on the maintenance and enhancement of the butterfly habitats. G. Conformance to the Capitola erosion control ordinance shall be required. Grading shall be minimized within the riparian setback area. Grading shall not be permitted to damage the roots of trees within the butterfly habitat areas. Grading shall only take place during the dry season.		
 12.12.090 Tree Replacement A. Tree Replacement Ratio. An approval for tree removal under this chapter shall be conditioned upon the applicant planting, at some other location on the subject property, replacement trees to compensate for the removed tree(s) on a ratio of at least two trees or more for each one tree removed, as determined by the director. Replacement trees and/or in-lieu fees are not required if post-removal tree canopy coverage on the site or parcel will be thirty percent or more. Native trees grown from locally or regionally collected stock are preferred, in the case where a native tree is not appropriate as determined by the community development director, a non-invasive exotic tree may be planted. B. Tree Replacement Size to be Planted On Site. The community development director and/or his or her designee shall approve the type and size of replacement trees. Generally, twenty-four-inch box or larger trees should replace trees located upon properties zoned or used in whole or in part for commercial purposes. Fifteen gallon or larger trees should replace those located upon residential properties. Size of tree could vary per 	<u>Consistent</u> . The project proposes to remove 14 trees from the project site. Mitigation measure BIO-1(b) in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> , requires tree replacement at a ratio of 3:1, which exceeds these existing requirements. Remaining trees on-site would be avoided and protected in accordance with mitigation measures BIO-7(a) through BIO-7(c) in Section 4.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> .	

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion
General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code recommendation of a certified arborist and acceptance by the community development director and/or designee. For replacement selection, the applicant should refer to Chapter 17.97, Water- Efficient Landscaping, and/or to the community forest program. Trees to be planted on public property or on sensitive habitat zone shall be based on the community forest program guidelines and performance standards developed pursuant to Section 12.12.050, Community forest program. Replacement of canopy coverage calculations can be determined on the basis of the size of the subject trees removed, or based on standard landscape guides, such as the Sunset Book. C. Replacement of Canopy Coverage Related to Development Applications. New construction and major remodels of residential and commercial structures shall trigger a canopy coverage review. The goal of the city is to reach and maintain at least fifteen percent tree coverage per lot on an on-going basis. Project conditions of approval shall require planting or replacement of all or part of the trees necessary to meet the city goal per discretion of the community development director and/or the planning commission as applicable. Planting and replacement should be done within the same lot, possibly in different locations. As a last resort, should tree planting on site not be possible due to existing, nonself-imposed hardship and/or topographic conditions, a variation of this requirement may be considered with the payment of in-lieu fees. No self- imposed hardship shall mean the unusual form or shape of a lot, existing rock outcroppings on the property, or other topographic feature desired to be protected, or any site physical circumstance that does not allow the applicant to enjoy the same privileges as neighbors have by planting a tree, and/or a circumstance which negatively affects adjacent properties. Circumstances may also include n	Consistency Discussion
adjacent properties. Circumstances may also include needed sun exposure, visibility of business signs, and other such fundamental reasons that would not justify the planting of a replacement tree on site. If the trees are found to be diseased, infested or hazardous, then canopy coverage replacement is not activated. Replacement trees and/or in-lieu fees	
are not required if post-removal tree canopy coverage on the site or parcel will be thirty percent or more. D. In-Lieu Fees for Trees and Canopy Coverage Replacement. An approval for tree removal under this chapter is conditioned upon the applicant planting, at some location on the subject property,	
replacement trees and canopy coverage, or as a last resort if all other locations on site are found infeasible, pay in-lieu fees to compensate for the planting and maintenance of those trees by the public works director somewhere else off site.	

Table 4.8-1
General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Consistency

General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code	Consistency Discussion
General Plan/LCP Policy or Zoning Ordinance/Code E. In-Lieu Fee Structure. The applicant shall pay the in-lieu fees in effect at the time as established by city council resolution. In-lieu fees would include a deposit and be based on a cost recovery system for the planting and maintenance of trees and canopy percentage to be planted and/or replaced. The cost recovery system is to be approved by the public works director and/or be based on the tree guide published by the International Society of Arboriculture. The fees shall be deposited in the community tree and forest management account administered by the public works director. In-lieu fees shall be established by city resolution and include the following: For tree replacements off site; and For canopy coverage replacements in relation to healthy trees removed or to conditions on new development applications. Time Limits for Replacement. Permits for tree removal shall not be issued until five hundred dollars have been deposited with the city to secure the applicant's obligation of planting the replacement tree, unless the director receives proof that the replacement tree has been planted prior to tree removal. If the replacement tree is not planted as required, the city may utilize the money for the expenses (including, but not limited to, staff time) in effecting the planting of the replacement trees. Maintenance of Replacement Trees. Whenever a permit has been issued on the basis that the applicant will be planting a replacement tree, the applicant must agree to maintain those trees, and to refrain from destroying such trees regardless of the 	Consistency Discussion
size of the tree. If the tree dies, the applicant shall be required to replace the tree as many times as necessary.	
H. Tree Removal and Replacement Fees. The applicant shall pay a permit fee for tree removals and in-lieu fees as applicable, and set forth in the city council fee resolution. The fees would include a deposit and would recover all staff costs for processing planting and maintaining trace to	
replace lost canopy coverage.	

As shown in Table 4.8-1, the proposed project would be consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan, the LCP, and the Zoning Ordinance which have been adopted to avoid or mitigate impacts to environmental resources.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As noted above in Table 4.8-1, the proposed project would be subject to numerous policies of the Capitola General Plan and to ordinances in the Capitola Municipal Code.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As the project would be consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan, LCP, and Zoning Ordinance which were adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As noted in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. These projects are not located within the Depot Hill neighborhood. Cumulative development within Depot Hill is limited to minor additions to existing single-family residences; construction, demolition and replacement of existing single-family residences and associated accessory structures; or alterations of small multi-family dwellings. Such projects, when combined with the proposed project, would not cumulatively result in an overall change or intensification of land uses in the Depot Hill area of the City of Capitola.

Unforeseen cumulative development in the project area can be expected during the lifetime of the project, including residential remodels and additions. However, in the context of the thresholds of significance for land use impacts, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considerable. All potential future projects would be required to be consistent with the City's General Plan, LCP, and Zoning Ordinance, unless these regulatory documents would be amended with a future application. The policy consistency of each future project would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, the proposed project would not result or contribute considerably to significant cumulative land use impacts.

4.9 NOISE

4.9.1 Setting

a. Overview of Sound Measurement. Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound power levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz).

The sound pressure level is measured on a logarithmic scale with the 0 dB level based on the lowest detectable sound pressure level that people can perceive (an audible sound that is not zero sound pressure level). Based on the logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy is equivalent to an increase of 3 dB, and a sound that is 10 dB less than the ambient sound level has no effect on ambient noise. Because of the nature of the human ear, a sound must be about 10 dB greater than the reference sound to be judged as twice as loud. In general, a 3 dB change in community noise levels is noticeable, while 1 to 2 dB changes generally are not perceived. Quiet suburban areas typically have noise levels in the range of 40 to 50 dBA, while those along arterial streets are in the 50 to 60+ dBA range. Normal conversational levels are in the 60 to 65 dBA range, and ambient noise levels greater than 65 dBA can interrupt conversations.

Noise levels typically attenuate (or drop off) at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance from point sources such as industrial machinery. Noise from lightly traveled roads typically attenuates at a rate of about 4.5 dB per doubling of distance. Noise from heavily traveled roads typically attenuates at about 3 dB per doubling of distance.

In addition to the actual instantaneous measurement of sound levels, the duration of sound is important since sounds that occur over a long period of time are more likely to be an annoyance or cause direct physical damage or environmental stress. One of the most frequently used noise metrics that considers both duration and sound power level is the equivalent noise level (Leq). The Leq is defined as the single steady A-weighted level that is equivalent to the same amount of energy as that contained in the actual fluctuating levels over a period of time (essentially, the average noise level). Typically, Leq is summed over a one-hour period.

The time period in which noise occurs is also important since noise that occurs at night tends to be more disturbing than that which occurs during the daytime. Two commonly used noise metrics – the Day-Night average level (Ldn) and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) - recognize this fact by weighting hourly Leqs over a 24-hour period. The Ldn is a 24-hour average noise level that adds 10 dB to actual nighttime (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM) noise levels to account for the greater sensitivity to noise during that time period. The CNEL is identical to the Ldn, except it also adds a 5 dB penalty for noise occurring during the evening (7:00 PM to 10:00 PM).

b. Sensitive Receptors. Noise sensitive receptors are land uses that are considered more sensitive to noise than others. According to the City, noise sensitive uses are generally defined as locations where people reside or where the presence of unwanted sound could adversely affect the use of land, such as residences, schools, and hospitals (Capitola Draft

General Plan, 2013). The project site is located within a developed area of the City of Capitola and is surrounded by single-family residences to the north and west, and multi-family residential buildings beyond at the terminus of Grove Lane. The majority of surrounding residential buildings are located at least 50 feet from the project boundary, with residential buildings to the north located more than 300 feet from the site. Two residential buildings are located within 50 feet of the project site. Specifically, a multi-family 4-plex is located approximately 10 feet southwest of the project boundary, and a three-bedroom cottage is located approximately 35 feet west of the project boundary.

c. Fundamentals of Groundborne Vibration. Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. The rumbling sound caused by the vibration of room surfaces is called groundborne noise. The ground motion caused by vibration is measured as particle velocity in inches per second and, in the U.S., is referenced as vibration decibels (VdB).

The background vibration velocity level in residential and educational areas is usually around 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB (Federal Transit Administration [FTA], 2006). A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources within buildings, such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the groundborne vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings (FTA, 2006).

The general human response to different levels of groundborne vibration velocity levels is described in Table 4.9-1.

Vibration Velocity Level	Human Reaction
65 VdB	Approximate threshold of perception for many people.
75 VdB	Approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible. Many people find that transportation-related vibration at this level is unacceptable.
85 VdB	Vibration acceptable only if there are an infrequent number of events per day.

Table 4.9-1Human Response to Different Levels of Groundborne Vibration

Source: Federal Transit Administration, 2006.

d. Regulatory Setting. In accordance with State law, the Capitola General Plan (September, 1989) includes a Noise Element that provides a description of existing noise sources in Capitola and defines strategies for reducing the negative impact of noise to the community.

The Noise section includes a Land Use Compatibility table and several policies on noise and acceptable noise levels.

As recommended by the General Plan Noise Element, the maximum "normally acceptable" noise level for residential areas and transient lodging is 65 dBA CNEL (see Table 4.9-2). A "normally acceptable" noise level means that the specified land use would be compatible based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

The City is currently in the process of updating its General Plan. The Draft Noise Element (September, 2013) includes a Noise Intensity Level Map demonstrating that the northern portion of the project site is located within the "High" Noise Intensity Area surrounding Park Avenue.

Type of Proposed Project	Community Noise Exposure Level			
	Normally Acceptable	Conditionally Acceptable	Normally Unacceptable	Clearly Unacceptable
Low Density, Single-Family, Duplex, Mobile Homes	50-60	60-70	70-75	75-85
Residential – Multiple Family	50-65	60-70	70-75	75-85
Transient Lodging – Motel, Hotels	50-65	60-70	70-80	80-85
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes	50-70	60-70	70-80	80-85
Auditoriums, Concert Halls, Amphitheaters	NA	50-70	NA	65-85
Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports	NA	50-75	NA	70-85
Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks	50-70	NA	67.5-75	72.5-85
Golf Courses, Riding Stable, Water Recreation, Cemeteries	50-75	NA	70-80	80-85
Office Buildings, Business Commercial and Professional	50-70	67.5-77.5	75-85	NA
Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture	50-75	70-80	75-85	NA

 Table 4.9-2

 Land Use Compatibility Standard for Community Noise Environments

Source: Capitola General Plan, Noise Element, September 1989

Notes: NA - Not Applicable

Normally Acceptable – Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements

Conditionally Acceptable – New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice.

Normally Unacceptable – New construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.

Clearly Unacceptable – New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

According to the Capitola Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 9.12), construction noise shall be prohibited between the hours of 9:00 PM and 7:30 AM on weekdays and on weekends

with the exception of Saturday work between 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM or emergency work approved by the building official (Ord. 883 § 1, 2005; Ord. 27 § 1, 1949). In addition, the use of a loudspeaker, public address system, sound amplification system, or musical instruments outside of automobiles or dwelling houses is only permitted between the hours of 9:00 AM and 9:00 PM on private property for the private entertainment of people, provided it cannot be heard on any other property. The project would be subject to the above described conditions of the City's Noise Ordinance.

In addition, the project would be subject to an existing conditional use permit (CUP) which includes conditions regulating noise levels at the project site. This includes the following conditions:

- Weddings shall be scheduled to occur only between the hours of 12:00 noon and 6:00 PM. Other types of events may be scheduled to occur between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM. (Condition 3)
- Noise levels during events shall not exceed 70 dba as measured at the sound monitoring location shown on the site plan. A noise monitoring device shall be placed at the edge of the residential property. No public address system shall be used for events and no amplification of live music shall be allowed. The applicants shall be responsible for ensuring that decibel readings are taken, and recorded in writing, every half hour during live entertainment to ensure compliance with this condition. (Condition 6)
- Only live acoustic music shall be allowed at events. Use of karaoke machines, disc jockey, or amplified music shall not be allowed. (Condition 7)
- All wedding/events activities shall take place 20 feet from the western property line. (Condition 13)

As noted in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, it is anticipated that the conditions in the existing CUP would fundamentally remain the same in a new CUP, although some conditions may be removed or reworded in the permit review process. For example, condition 7 above may be removed because the proposed project would hold all future events indoors.

<u>Federal Railway Administration</u>. The Federal Railway Administration has developed vibration impact thresholds for noise-sensitive buildings, residences, and institutional land uses. These thresholds are 80 VdB at residences and buildings where people normally sleep (e.g., nearby residences) and 83 VdB at institutional buildings (e.g., schools and churches). These thresholds apply to conditions where there are an infrequent number of events per day.¹

e. Existing Noise Conditions and Sources. The most common sources of noise in the project vicinity are transportation-related, such as automobiles, trucks, and motorcycles. Motor vehicle noise is of concern because it is characterized by a high number of individual events, which often create a sustained noise level, and because of its proximity to areas sensitive to noise exposure. Aircraft flying overhead is occasionally audible in Capitola, but is not a significant noise source relative to traffic noise. The primary source of noise near the project site is roadway noise from Park Avenue, located approximately 1,500 feet north of the project site. Other noise sources typical in this urban location include dogs barking, leaf blowers, and

¹ "Infrequent events" is defined by the Federal Transit Administration as being fewer than 70 vibration events per day.

children playing. These sources are not significant compared to the noise produced by the dominant transportation sources (General Plan, 2013).

4.9.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. According to Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines,* noise impacts would be significant if the project would:

- 1) Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;
- 2) Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;
- 3) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- 4) 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, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; and/or
- 5) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

As discussed in the Initial Study (see Appendix A), the proposed hotel would be located approximately 10 miles from the Watsonville Municipal Airport and is located outside of the airport noise impact contours (City of Watsonville, General Plan, 2012). The project site is also located approximately six miles northwest of the Monterey Bay Academy Airport, which is a private airstrip located south of Manresa State Beach. The project would not place structures within an area exposed to airport noise, and would therefore not expose residents or workers to excessive noise levels. This impact category is not discussed further below.

Construction Activities. For considerations of noise assessment, construction equipment can be considered to operate in two modes, stationary and mobile. Stationary equipment operates in one location for one or more days at a time, with either a fixed power operation (pumps, generators, compressors) or a variable noise operation (pile drivers, pavement breakers). Mobile equipment moves around the construction site with power applied in cyclic fashion (bulldozers, loaders), or to and from the site (trucks). Construction noise was estimated based on noise level estimates from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Construction Noise Handbook (Updated May 2010). Analysis of construction noise includes noise from construction activities (e.g., excavation, grading, demolition, building construction), large equipment operating on the site (e.g., bulldozers, excavators), and large trucks moving materials to and from the site. According to the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, the descriptor used for construction noise is the Leq. This unit is appropriate for the following reasons: (1) it can be used to describe the noise level from operation of each piece of equipment separately and is easy to combine to represent the noise level from all equipment operating during a given period, (2) it can be used to describe the noise level during an entire phase, and (3) it can be used to describe the average noise over all phases of the construction (FTA, 2006).

No standardized criteria have been developed for assessing construction noise impacts. Consequently, criteria must be developed on a project-specific basis unless local ordinances
apply. The Capitola General Plan Noise Element identifies 65 dBA CNEL as the maximum "normally acceptable" noise level for multifamily residential areas and 60 dBA CNEL as the maximum "normally acceptable" noise level for low-density single family residential areas. However, these "normally acceptable" noise levels are not specifically designed for application to short-term construction noise levels, and therefore are not appropriate for the purposes of determining the significance of temporary construction noise impacts. Although the City has not established quantitative thresholds for temporary construction noise, the City's Municipal Code (9.12) identifies permitted construction hours, which are between 7:30 AM and 9:00 PM on weekdays and between 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturdays. According to the FTA, local noise ordinances have limited utility for evaluating construction noise as they usually relate to nuisance and hours of allowed activity and sometimes specify limits in terms of maximum levels, but are generally not practical for assessing the impact of a construction project. As such, the FTA has developed guidelines that can be considered reasonable criteria for construction noise assessment. According to the FTA, adverse community reaction may occur if daytime construction noise exceeds 90 dBA (one-hour Leq), 80 dBA (eight-hour Leq), or 75 dBA (30-day average Ldn) (FTA, 2006). Therefore, construction would result in a significant impact if it substantially exceeds the above listed noise levels at sensitive receptors, or if noise-generating construction activity would occur outside of the permitted construction hours identified in the City's Municipal Code.

<u>Groundborne Vibration</u>. The City of Capitola has not adopted specific thresholds for groundborne vibration impacts. Therefore, this analysis uses the Federal Railway Administration's vibration impact thresholds for sensitive buildings to determine whether groundborne vibration would be "excessive." A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Therefore, the Federal Railway Administration recommends an 80 VdB threshold at residences and buildings where people normally sleep (e.g., nearby residences).

<u>Traffic-Related Noise</u>. Noise levels associated with existing and future traffic along area roadways were calculated using standard noise modeling equations adapted from the Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Model (TNM) Lookup Table software (version 2.5) noise prediction model (noise modeling data sheets can be viewed in Appendix H). The model calculations are based on traffic data from the traffic study completed for the proposed project (see Appendix I). Cumulative conditions were represented by future traffic volumes, at the date of project occupancy, on the roadway network.

For traffic-related noise, impacts are considered significant if project-generated traffic results in exposure of sensitive receptors to unacceptable noise levels based on the May 2006 Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment guidelines created by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Table 4.9-3 shows the FTA recommendations for identifying significant changes in noise. These thresholds apply to both the noise generated by the project alone and cumulative noise increases. If sensitive receptors would be exposed to traffic noise increases exceeding the criteria below, impacts would be considered significant.

Roduway Noise Exposure				
Ldn or Le	q in dBA			
Existing Noise Exposure Allowable Noise Exposure Increase ¹				
45-50	7			
50-55	5			
55-60	3			
60-65	2			
65-74	1			
75+	0			

Table 4.9-3Significance of Changes in OperationalRoadway Noise Exposure

1. Rounded to the nearest whole decibel

Source: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), May 2006 These thresholds apply to exposure of noise sensitive receivers to the specified noise level increases.

<u>Operational Activities.</u> The thresholds contained herein are based on the Capitola Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 9.12) sections that limit certain activities, the project site's existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and the noise compatibility matrix identified above in Table 4.9-2. As identified above in Table 4.9-2, the proposed hotel would be subject to the 65 dB limitation as measured at the closest residential property line. Operation of the hotel would include weddings and events which may generate excess noise due to guests and music on the hotel grounds.² The project would result in significant impacts if it would violate provisions of the CUP, including generating noise levels in excess of 70 dba as measured at the edge of adjacent residential property. Additional noise associated with operation of the project would mainly be generated by weddings and events and additional vehicular trips generated by the project. Significant impacts would also occur if noise associated with the operation of the project would create, maintain, or cause the sound level, measured on any other property, to exceed the "normally acceptable" levels outlined in the noise compatibility matrix on Table 4.9-2 of 60 dBA CNEL for single family residential uses and 65 dBA CNEL for multiple family residential receptors.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact N-1 Project construction would intermittently generate noise on and adjacent to the site. The project would be required to comply with the City's regulations pertaining to the timing of construction activities, and construction noise would not be expected to exceed typical levels associated with excavation, grading, and building construction. However, noise-generating activity may occur as close as 10 feet from sensitive receptors and may temporarily generate noise levels which would result

² It is important to note that the number, type, and size of events permitted on the site would not change with the proposed project.

in adverse community reaction. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Noise impacts are a function of the type of activity being undertaken and the distance from the noise source to the receptor. Nearby noise-sensitive land uses would be exposed to temporary construction noise during development of the proposed project. Such uses include single-family and multi-family residences located directly north, east, and west of the project site. Specifically, a multi-family 4-plex is located approximately 10 feet southwest of the project site boundary, and a three-bedroom cottage is located approximately 35 feet west of the project site boundary. All other surrounding residences are at least 50 feet from the project site boundary. The majority of construction, and therefore the majority of construction noise, would occur at the location of the parking garage and Main building, which would be located approximately 50 feet from the majority of noise-generating construction activity. However, some construction would also occur at the location of the Bayview building and other areas throughout the site.

As indicated in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, the proposed project would involve demolition of three existing buildings and an outside deck, construction of two new buildings, and temporary relocation and renovation of an existing Victorian structure. The project also includes construction of a two-level below-grade parking garage and the addition of a new access point, among other site modifications. Construction of the project would require excavation, grading, and building activities with the potential to generate noise that may affect nearby receptors. The existing slope would be excavated to accommodate site improvements, including the below-grade parking garage at a maximum depth of 18 feet below existing grade. No piers or pile driving would be required.

Table 4.9-4 shows typical noise levels associated with activities during various phases of construction at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Typical construction noise levels range from about 81 to 85 dBA at this distance. Noise levels typically attenuate (or drop off) at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance from point sources such as industrial machinery. Therefore, noise levels are also shown for distances of 60 feet and 85 feet from the source, corresponding to the distance between the location of the majority of noise-generating activity and the nearest sensitive receptors.

Construction Phase	Type of Equipment	Average Noise Level at 50 Feet	Average Noise Level at 60 Feet (Multi- family 4-plex)	Average Noise Level at 85 Feet (3-bdrm Cottage)
Clearing	Rubber tired dozers Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Water Trucks	84 dBA	83 dBA	79 dBA
Excavation and Grading	Graders Excavators Compactors Rubber tired dozers Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Water Trucks	85 dBA	83 dBA	80 dBA

Table 4.9-4Typical Noise Levels at Construction Sites

			i	
Construction Phase	Type of Equipment	Average Noise Level at 50 Feet	verage Noise vel at 50 Feet Average Noise Level at 60 Feet (Multi- family 4-plex)	
Foundation/ Conditioning	Graders Rubber tired dozers Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes Water Trucks	85 dBA	83 dBA	80 dBA
Laying Subbase, Paving	Cement and Mortar Mixers Pavers Rollers Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	81 dBA	80 dBA	76 dBA
Finishing and Cleanup	Forklifts Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	84 dBA	83 dBA	79 dBA

Table 4.9-4Typical Noise Levels at Construction Sites

Source: FHWA Highway Construction Noise Handbook, 2010.

As shown in Table 4.9-4, typical construction noise levels would range from about 76 dBA to 83 dBA at 60 feet and 85 feet from the source of construction noise, which is the distance from the location of the majority of noise-generating activity to the nearest sensitive receptors. However, some construction would also occur at the location of the Bayview building and other areas throughout the site. As such, the source of construction noise could be as close as 10 to 35 feet from these receptors. While construction activities occurring closest to sensitive receptors would be relatively minor, construction near the property site boundary may result in noise which would temporarily result in adverse community reaction in the absence of mitigation measures.

The grading/excavation phase of project construction tends to be the shortest in duration and creates the highest construction noise levels because of the operation of heavy equipment, although it should be noted that only a limited amount of equipment can operate near a given location at a particular time. Equipment typically used during this stage includes heavy-duty trucks, backhoes, bulldozers, excavators, front-end loaders, and scrapers. Operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve one or two minutes of full-power operation followed by three to four minutes at lower power settings. Other primary sources of noise would be shorter-duration incidents, which would last less than one minute (such as dropping large pieces of equipment or the hydraulic movement of machinery lifts).

Noise-generating construction activity would be reduced by being restricted to daytime hours when sensitive receptors are the least sensitive to noise. The City's Municipal Code (Section 19.2) allows construction activities to occur only between the hours of 7:30 AM – 9:00 PM Monday through Friday, and 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturdays. While construction noise levels during these hours may temporarily exceed 80 dBA, such exceedances would be sporadic, and would not be expected to result in average daytime noise levels that would exceed an 8-hour Leq of 80 dBA, which is the FTA's recommended standard for adverse community reaction. However, because noise levels may temporarily exceed the City's long-term community standards for noise, standard construction noise measures are required to ensure that impactsare reduced to the maximum extent feasible.

In addition to construction activities occurring on the site, construction noise may also be generated by large trucks moving materials to and from the site. Large trucks would be necessary to deliver building materials to the site as well as remove dump materials and cut soil from the site. Excavation and cut and fill would be required, resulting in grading of approximately 6,950 net cubic yards to be exported from the site. Articulated dump trucks typically have a heaped capacity ranging from 20.3 to 30.3 cubic yards (Terex, 2014). Using this estimate, 230 to 343 one-way truck trips would be required to remove cut material from the project site. Additional truck trips may occur to deliver building materials and remove additional dump materials from the site.

The State of California establishes noise limits for vehicles licensed to operate on public roads. For heavy trucks, the State passby standard is consistent with the federal limit of 80 dB. The State passby standard for light trucks and passenger cars (less than 4.5 tons gross vehicle rating) is also 80 dB at 15 meters from the centerline. According to the FHWA, dump trucks typically generate noise levels of 76 dBA and flat bed trucks typically generate noise levels of 74 dBA, at a distance of 50 feet from the truck (FHWA, 2006).³ As such, noise from truck trips associated with this project would not exceed FTA threshold levels of 90 dBA (one-hour Leq) or 80 dBA (eight-hour Leq) (FTA, 2006).

Construction impacts would be reduced by being restricted to daytime hours when ambient noise levels are higher than at night and construction noise would not typically interfere with sleep. The City's Municipal Code (Section 19.2) allows construction activities to occur only between the hours of 7:30 AM – 9:00 PM Monday through Friday, and 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturdays. The proposed project would be required to comply with these regulations. However, due to the proximity of sensitive receptors, impacts would remain significant without additional mitigation.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As described above, the proposed project would be required to comply with the City's regulations pertaining to the allowable timing of construction activities. The City's Municipal Code (Section 19.2) allows construction activities to occur only between the hours of 7:30 AM – 9:00 PM Monday through Friday, and 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturdays.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. The following mitigation measures would reduce the temporary noise levels associated with project construction to the maximum extent feasible.

- **N-1(a) Construction Noise Mitigation Program.** The applicant shall provide, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director, a Noise Mitigation and Monitoring Program that requires all of the following:
 - Construction contracts that specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other State-required noise attenuation devices.

³ The Spec. 721.560 Lmax noise level for dump trucks and flat bed trucks is 84 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. However, a comparison of the Spec noise limits against the actual noise levels reveals that the Spec limits were set, in general, to realistically obtainable noise levels based on the equipment used by contractors. When measured in the field, actual noise levels vary.

- No blasting or pile driving shall be permitted.
- A public noticing procedure shall be identified that specifies how public notice shall be provided (e.g. by mail, public posting), when it will be provided and who will be notified. The notice shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director prior to the mailing or posting and shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a contact name and telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints.
- During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be located the maximum feasible distance from nearby receptors, and oriented such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.
- During operations of grading and excavation equipment and cement pouring (which have been identified as the loudest components of construction), temporary noise barriers designed to provide 15 or greater dBA attenuation shall be used between the source of construction noise and adjacent sensitive receptors to ensure that noise levels do not exceed levels of adverse community reaction identified by the FTA. In addition, sound blankets shall be used on all stationary noise generating equipment.
- **N-1(b) Construction Hour Restrictions.** Construction activities which involve heavy equipment and noisy machinery, including but not limited to excavators, graders, backhoes, compactors, jack hammers, air compressors, generators, forklifts, and dump trucks, shall only be permitted between 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday. Dump trucks and other construction vehicles shall also not queue and/or idle at the project site or in the adjoining private/public rights-of-way during these hours.
- **N-1(c) Staging Areas.** The construction contractor shall provide staging areas on-site to minimize off-site transportation of heavy construction equipment. These areas shall be located to maximize the distance between activity and sensitive receptors (neighboring residences). This would reduce noise levels associated with most types of idling construction equipment. Staging areas shall be located at the end of Escalona Drive and along the northwestern and western edge of the property, sited to avoid biological resources. All staging areas shall be located at a distance of at least 100 feet from the nearest sensitive receptors.
- **N-1(d) Diesel Equipment Mufflers**. All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory- recommended mufflers.

N-1(e) Electrically-Powered Tools and Facilities. No diesel powered compressors, generators, or power tools shall be permitted. Electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools and to power any temporary structures, such as construction trailers or caretaker facilities.

Significance After Mitigation. Common manufacturer specifications for temporary noise barriers used during construction (required by Mitigation Measure N-1[a], above) indicate a reduction of approximately 15-20 dBA when used according to the manufacturers' specifications. Therefore, use of temporary construction noise barriers in a manner consistent with the manufacturers' specifications would be expected to reduce average construction noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptor to 61-68 dBA at 60-85 feet from the source (based on a reduction of 15 dBA achieved by temporary construction noise barriers, in addition to further attenuation achieved through the additional required noise reduction measures). Therefore, Mitigation Measures N-1(a) through N-1(e) would ensure that construction noise levels at nearby receptors would occur during the City's prescribed construction hours, would not exceed the FTA "adverse community reaction" thresholds of 90 dBA (one-hour Leq), 80 dBA (eight-hour Leq), or 75 dBA (30-day average Ldn), and would remain less than significant.

Impact N-2 Project construction activities would generate intermittent levels of groundborne vibration; however, impacts would not exceed acceptable vibration levels, would be temporary in nature, and would not result in damage to surrounding buildings. Impacts would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Construction activities that would occur at the project site have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. Since the exact fleet of construction equipment and operating locations are unknown at this time, Table 4.9-5 identifies various vibration velocity levels for the typical types of construction equipment that would operate at the project site during construction activities.

Equipment	Approximate VdB					
	25 Feet	50 Feet	60 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet	
Large Bulldozer	87	78	76	73	69	
Loaded Trucks	86	77	4	71	68	
Jackhammer	79	70	67	65	61	
Small Bulldozer	58	48	46	43	39	

Table 4.9-5Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Source: Harris Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc., Transit Noise and Vibration Assessment, April 1995 (Prepared for USDOT Federal Transit Administration.

As discussed in Impact N-1 above, the majority of construction would occur at the location of the parking garage and Main building, which is approximately 50 feet from the western property line, and more than 75 feet from the nearest residences. Therefore, vibration from the majority of construction would not exceed 73 VdB. Any construction that would occur within 50 feet of the nearest residences would be minimal and temporary in nature such as light grading, path installation, and landscaping. However, based on the information presented in Table 4.9-5, vibration levels could exceed 87 VdB at the existing 4-plex residence (located 10 feet from the project site) if the heaviest construction equipment were to operate directly at the project site boundary. This "worst-case scenario" would exceed the groundborne velocity threshold level of 80 vibration decibels (VdB) established by the Federal Transit Administration for noise-sensitive buildings, residences, and institutional land uses where people normally sleep. In order to address this, construction activities and their associated vibration levels would be limited to daytime hours between 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Friday and between 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM on Saturday in accordance with Mitigation Measure N-1(b). Therefore, construction activities would not occur during recognized sleep hours for residences. While construction equipment operating within 50 feet of the nearest residences may cause temporary groundborne vibration at levels known to cause human annovance, such vibration events would be temporary and would not occur during recognized sleep hours. Therefore, impacts to nearby sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

In addition to causing temporary annoyance to humans residing in nearby residences, construction vibration also has the potential to cause building damage to these structures. As discussed above, vibration levels could exceed 87 VdB at the existing 4-plex residence if the heaviest construction equipment were to operate at the project site boundary. However, this "worst-case scenario" would be less than the groundborne velocity threshold level of 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings (FTA, 2006). Therefore, construction vibration would not cause damage to surrounding buildings. Impacts would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As described above, the proposed project would be required to comply with the City's regulations pertaining to the allowable timing of construction activities. The City's Municipal Code (Section 19.2) allows construction activities to occur only between the hours of 7:30 AM and 9:00 PM Monday through Friday, and 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM on Saturdays. In addition, mitigation measure N-1(b) would impose more restrictive construction hour limitations. Compliance with these standards would ensure that construction vibration would not interfere with recognized sleep hours of adjacent residences.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Mitigation measure N-1(b) would impose construction hour limitations that are more restrictive than the City's Municipal Code requirements. No additional mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact N-3 Project-generated traffic would incrementally increase noise levels on area roadways. However, the increase in noise would not exceed significance thresholds and would therefore be Class III, *less than significant*.

The proposed project would add 30 new guest rooms and would continue to host special events as allowed by the existing CUP. As such, the number, type, and size of events permitted on the site would not change with the proposed project. However, an increase in guests and visitors would be expected to increase traffic in the neighborhood, which would incrementally increase traffic noise on area roadways. The project would therefore incrementally increase noise at neighboring uses. The street network surrounding the project vicinity is lined with residential uses. Saturday average daily traffic volumes from the Traffic Study (see Appendix I), were used to model the change in noise levels resulting from increased traffic on neighborhood roadways because they represent the busiest traffic conditions. Table 4.9-6 illustrates the increase in roadway noise along the studied roadway segments.

Roadway Segment	Existing	Existing Plus Project	Project Increase Compared to Existing Traffic (dB)
1. El Salto Drive, east of Livermore Avenue	49.5	52.6	+3.1
2. El Salto Drive, between Sacramento Avenue and Livermore Avenue	52.7	54.5	+1.8
3. El Salto Drive, between Saxon Avenue and Oakland Avenue	52.6	54.5	+1.9
4. Escalona Drive, between Saxon Avenue and Oakland Avenue	56.9	57.7	+0.8
5. Escalona Drive, between Central Avenue and Saxon Avenue	57.7	58.3	+0.6
6. Central Avenue, between Escalona Drive and Cliff Avenue	57.6	58.3	+0.7

Table 4.9-6				
Project Contribution to Neighborhood Roadway Noise Levels	1			

Source: See Appendix H for Federal Highway Administration's Traffic Noise Model 2.5 noise Lookup Table modeling data sheets.

¹ Noise levels are as modeled at edge of standard roadway (32.8 feet from centerline).

As indicated in Table 4.9-6, the highest noise level increase for both the existing and future scenarios would be 3.1 dB along El Salto Drive, east of Livermore Avenue. While a 3 dB change in noise levels would be noticeable (e.g., the difference between noise from an electric bus verses a hybrid bus at 50 feet), this is less than the Federal Transit Administration's allowable noise exposure increase for determining significance of operational roadway noise exposure (refer to Table 4.9-3). As shown in Table 4.9-3, roadways (such as El Salto Drive, east of Livermore Avenue) which currently operate between 45 to 50 dB have an allowable noise exposure increase of 7 dB. The 3.1 dB increase along El Salto Drive is less than the 7 dB threshold for significant increases in noise as shown in Table 4.9-3. The increase in noise levels for each of the roadways identified in Table 4.9-6 is less than the applicable threshold for significance based on existing noise levels of the identified roadways. In addition, all postproject noise levels would remain within the normally acceptable range for residential areas within the City, as defined by the City's General Plan Noise Element and shown in Table 4.9-2. Therefore, project-generated traffic noise impacts on noise-sensitive receptors along these streets would be less than significant.

Due to the project's close proximity to and regional access via Highway 1, the project's contribution to increased traffic noise on freeway segments was also analyzed. PM Peak-hour traffic volumes from the Traffic Study (see Appendix I), were used to model the change in noise levels resulting from increased traffic on Highway 1, because they represent the busiest traffic conditions. Table 4.9-7 illustrates the increase in roadway noise along the studied freeway segments.

Freeway Segment	Existing	Existing Plus Project	Cumulative Plus Project	Project Increase Compared to Existing Traffic (dB)	Project plus Cumulative Increase Compared to Existing Traffic (dB)
1. Highway 1, between State Park Drive and Park Avenue	80.4	80.4	80.5	+0.0	+0.1
2. Highway 1, between Park Avenue and Bay Avenue	80.3	80.3	80.4	+0.0	+0.1
3. Highway 1, between Bay Avenue and 41st Avenue	80.3	80.4	80.5	+0.1	+0.2

Table 4.9-7Project Contribution to Freeway Noise Levels1

Source: See Appendix H for Federal Highway Administration's Traffic Noise Model 2.5 noise Lookup Table modeling data sheets. ¹ Noise levels are as modeled at 75 feet (distance from centerline of 2-lane traffic to nearest receptor)

As indicated in Table 4.9-7, existing noise levels along Highway 1 between Bay Avenue and 41st Avenue would increase by 0.1 dB with the addition of project traffic. Noise levels along the remaining studied segments of Highway 1 would remain the same. According to the Federal Transit Administration, roadways (such as Highway 1) which currently operate above 75 dB noise exposure have an allowable noise exposure increase of 0 dB. Since this criterion is based on dB levels rounded to the nearest whole decibel, a 0.1 dB increase would not represent an exceedance of the threshold. As such, project generated traffic would not result in a significant increase to existing freeway noise levels.

Noise levels from project-generated traffic were also modeled with cumulative traffic on Highway 1. Cumulative conditions were represented by future traffic volumes, at the date of project occupancy, on the roadway network. As shown in Table 4.9-7, cumulative plus project noise levels would exceed existing conditions by no more than 0.2 dB, which when rounded to the nearest whole decibel, would not exceed the zero dB threshold. Impacts would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As discussed in Section 4.11, *Traffic and Circulation*, the project site's existing CUP requires shuttle services to remote parking for large events, which would reduce project-generated traffic, and therefore traffic-related noise, along neighborhood roadways.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Mitigation is not required since significant impacts have not been identified.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact N-4 Operation of the proposed project would generate noise levels that may periodically be audible to existing uses near the project site. On-site noise sources would include deliveries and other service vehicles, hotel guests, weddings and events, and live acoustic music. However, the project would be required to adhere to the site's existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and the City's Municipal Code standards for noise limits and use of amplified sound. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

"Normally acceptable" noise levels for various land uses are outlined in the noise compatibility matrix on Table 4.9-2, and are 60 dBA CNEL for single family residential receptors and 65 dBA CNEL for multiple family residential receptors. Existing sensitive receptors, including the residences adjacent to the north, east, and west sides of the project site may periodically be subject to noise associated with operation of the proposed hotel, including noise from delivery trucks, hotel guests, and weddings and events. Since the proposed project would involve the demolition of the outdoor event deck, weddings and large events would occur inside hotel buildings, therefore limiting the noise exposure to adjacent sensitive receptors. Occasionally some portions of the outdoor gardens/grounds may be used in conjunction with scheduled events, although this would be somewhat limited given the proposed demolition of the existing outside deck. Any such events would maintain a 20 foot setback from the property line.

As discussed above, currently the hotel is subject to a CUP which limits noise levels to 70 dbA at the property boundary (condition 6), prohibits use of public address systems, karaoke machines, disc jockeys, or amplified music (condition 7), and requires all wedding/event activities to take place 20 feet from the western property line (condition 13). In addition, the CUP requires the applicant to record decibel readings every half hour during live entertainment

to ensure compliance with these conditions. As discussed in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, the hotel would continue the conditions as required by the CUP, which are anticipated to be fundamentally the same as the existing CUP, although some conditions may be removed or reworded in the permit review process. For example, condition 7 above may be removed because the proposed project would hold all future events indoors. Additionally, the hotel would adhere to the City Municipal Code standards for noise limits and use of amplified sound.

Based on several comments received during the NOP scoping period (refer to Table 1-1 in Section 1.0, Introduction), there is a neighborhood concern related to noise caused by hotel guests and event attendees walking through adjacent residential areas. As discussed in Section 4.10, Public Services, without an increase in the number of event attendees, it is unlikely that there would be a substantial increase in the number of calls made to the police department or in the number of noise complaints that arise from the residential neighborhood as a result of the events held at the hotel. Furthermore, the existing CUP requires the presence of a security guard on-site during all events to control traffic, parking, and guests. As noted in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, this condition is not anticipated to change upon project approval. According to the CUP, the security guard shall carry a cellular phone, and the name and phone number of the security guard shall be provided at least one week in advance of events to the City Police Department and Community Development Director, and shall be posted on the resort gates. The presence of an on-site security guard would limit hotel guests walking through residential areas and would minimize associated noise. Nevertheless, some guests may wander away from the project site creating temporary noise outside of adjacent residences. In the project vicinity, typical distances from the edge of the roadway right of way to residences range from 16 to 43 feet. At 16 feet, normal voices are around 52 dB and raised voices are around 58 dB (FHWA, 2010). These noise levels would be temporary and would not exceed acceptable community exposure levels. Furthermore, typical contemporary residential building materials can provide approximately 30 dB of noise attenuation, which would reduce pedestrian-associated noise levels to 22 to 28 dB inside residences (HMMH, 2006). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As discussed in Section 4.9.1(d) (Regulatory Setting) above, the project site is subject to an existing CUP which includes conditions relating to noise levels at the project site. It is anticipated that the conditions in the existing CUP would fundamentally remain the same in a new CUP, although some conditions may be removed or reworded in the permit review process. Those noise-related conditions that are not anticipated to change include:

- Weddings shall be scheduled to occur only between the hours of 12:00 noon and 6:00 PM. Other types of events may be scheduled to occur between the hours of 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM. (Condition 3)
- Noise levels during events shall not exceed 70 dba as measured at the sound monitoring location shown on the site plan. A noise monitoring device shall be placed at the edge of the residential property. No public address system shall be used for events and no amplification of live music shall be allowed. The applicants shall be responsible for ensuring that decibel readings are taken, and recorded in writing, every half hour during live entertainment to ensure compliance with this condition. (Condition 6)

• All wedding/events activities shall take place 20 feet from the western property line. (Condition 13)

The proposed project would also be required to comply with "normally acceptable" noise levels for single family residential receptors (60 dBA CNEL) and multifamily residential receptors (65 dBA CNEL) as outlined in the noise compatibility matrix on Table 4.9-2. Compliance with these requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. No mitigation is required, as significant impacts have not been identified.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As noted in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. These projects are not located within the Depot Hill neighborhood. Cumulative development within Depot Hill is limited to minor additions to existing single-family residences; construction, demolition and replacement of existing single-family residences and associated accessory structures; or alterations of small multi-family dwellings. These types of improvements would generate temporary noise and vibration during construction, although such effects would be minor and limited primarily to the individual project site. Cumulative construction noise in the Depot Hill area would therefore be less than significant. As described above, impacts of construction noise from the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project would be significant but mitigable. Because project construction would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable noise environment, cumulative construction impacts would be less than significant.

Traffic noise impacts associated with cumulative development within the City would incrementally increase noise levels along roadways and could potentially subject sensitive receptors to noise exceeding City standards. Cumulative development has the potential to increase roadway generated noise throughout the City. However, the analysis under Impact N-3 includes the future cumulative development scenario, which would not result in noise levels exceeding thresholds. Therefore, cumulative traffic-related noise impacts would not be significant.

Cumulative development could result in stationary (non-traffic) operational noise increases in the project vicinity. However, based on the long-term stationary noise analysis under Impact N-4, impacts from the proposed project's operational noise would be less than significant. Additionally, based on the fact that noise dissipates as it travels away from its source, noise impacts from on-site activities and other stationary sources would be limited to the project site and vicinity. Thus, cumulative operational (non-traffic) noise impacts from related projects, in conjunction with project-specific noise impacts, would not have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable adverse effects.

4.10 PUBLIC SERVICES

4.10.1 Setting

a. Emergency Services. The following is a description of fire, police, and emergency services that would serve the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel (see Figure 4.10-1 for a map of their respective locations).

Fire Protection Services. The City of Capitola is served by the Central Fire Protection District (CFPD) of Santa Cruz County (City of Capitola, September 28, 1989). The CFPD operates an administrative office and four fire stations, located in Santa Cruz, Soquel, and Capitola. Station 4, approximately 0.7 miles west of the project site at 405 Capitola Avenue, is the closest station to the Monarch Cove Hotel property. Between October 2012 and October 2013 the CFPD responded to one call at the Monarch Cove Inn, in response to a report of downed power lines. There are 27 firefighters, 12 captains, three battalion chiefs, and 14 paramedics operating one ladder truck and four first-out engines within the CFPD. The CFPD successfully maintains a response time goal of three- to four-minutes to the proposed project site (Jeanette Devery, personal communication, September and October 2013).

Police Protection Services. The City of Capitola Police Department is located at 422 Capitola Avenue, approximately 0.7 miles west of the property, and would provide police services to the proposed project. The Capitola Police Department reported 13 calls from the Monarch Cove Inn between October 2012 and October 2013. All of the calls were Priority 3 or Priority 4 calls, calls for which no one was in immediate danger, whereas Priority 1 and 2 calls present more immediate danger. Priority 3 calls have an average response time of three minutes and thirty-five seconds; Priority 4 calls have an average response time of 17 minutes. The overall average for calls to the Monarch Cove Inn was 13 minutes. For the City of Capitola, which has calls of Priority 1-4, the average response time is nine minutes and fifty-four seconds. There are 23 police officers in the Department, including the chief and captain. Five regular patrol cars are in operation, as well as two K-9 vehicles, and one supervisor car (Traci Hernandez, personal communication, October 22, 2013).

Emergency Medical Services. The Public Health Department of the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency contracts emergency ambulance services in the County (including all incorporated cities) to American Medical Response (AMR) (Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency, November 2012). CFPD supports the paramedic services of AMR as needed. Since 1990, AMR has been the sole 24-hour Advanced Life Support (ALS) ambulance transport provider in the County. AMR maintains ten ambulance station locations throughout Santa Cruz County.¹ Between four and eight ambulances are deployed to station locations, depending on anticipated demand. AMR also deploys additional units during peak demand times, such as holidays.

The AMR station closest to the proposed project site is located at 3914 Alameda Avenue in Capitola, approximately 1.2 miles west of the property. AMR is required to have a paramedic on scene within 8 minutes or less 90% of the time, and to have an ambulance on the scene 90% of the

¹ Station locations include: Boulder Creek (San Lorenzo Valley), Santa Cruz, Capitola (Mid-County), Watsonville, Capitola/Soquel, Aptos, Felton, Dominican, Westside/Extra, All-County.

Monarch Cove Hotel EIR Section 4.10 Public Services





Nearest Locations of Emergency Service Providers

Figure 4.10-1

City of Capitola

time within 12 minutes or less. These response time requirements are consistently met (Brenda Brenner, personal communication, September 24, 2013).

Between 2012 and 2013, AMR reported receiving 11 calls from the Monarch Cove Inn (Marsha Miller Ayers, personal communication, September 30, 2013).

4.10.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. According to Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines,* significant impacts related to public services would occur if the proposed project would:

- 1) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
 - *i. Fire protection;*
 - *ii. Police protection;*
 - iii. Schools;
 - iv. Parks; and/or
 - v. Other public facilities.

As discussed in the Initial Study (see Appendix A to this EIR), the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project would not generate a substantial increase in population that would warrant the construction of new school facilities or increase demand for parks and other public facilities. Therefore, impacts related to schools, parks, and other public facilities are not discussed further in this section.

Although there are no wildland fire hazard areas in Capitola, the Eucalyptus groves that are located east of the proposed project site are especially susceptible to fire due to their high flammability. Impacts related to wildland fire hazards are discussed in the Initial Study (Appendix A) and were found to be less than significant. Impacts to stormwater drainage and water supply are discussed in Section 4.12, *Utilities*. Impacts related to emergency access are discussed in Section 4.11, *Traffic and Circulation*.

In order to determine impacts related to emergency response services, fire, police, and EMS service providers were contacted to ascertain the current average response times within their jurisdictions, estimated response times to the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project, and how many calls they receive from the current hotel property on average. For the purpose of this analysis, impacts to emergency services would be considered significant if acceptable response times could not be met, such that the construction of new facilities would be required to ensure adequate response to the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact PS-1 Demand for fire, police, and emergency medical services generated by hotel operations would not result in an exceedance of acceptable response time goals. Therefore, the construction of new facilities would not be required and impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

The proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project would involve an expansion of an existing hotel use, resulting in an incremental increase in employment in Capitola and an increase in guest rooms at the hotel. Both temporary and long-term employment opportunities would be expected to be filled from within the existing community and changes in long-term employment would be nominal (approximately five to eight additional full time employees). Therefore, the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project would not generate substantial additional population (i.e. residents or employees) that would require police, fire, or EMS services. However, the number of rooms would increase from 11 to 41, which would nearly quadruple the hotel's capacity for guests. However, the frequency, type, and sizes of events held at the hotel would not change as a result of the proposed project. Impacts of the increase in guest capacity on fire, police, and emergency medical services are discussed below.

Fire Protection Services. As described previously, CFPD currently maintains 27 firefighters, 12 captains, three battalion chiefs, and 14 paramedics and the proposed project would not require an increase in staff to serve the site. In addition, the existing equipment (one ladder truck and four reserve fire engines) are sufficient to support current demand and would be sufficient to support the demands of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase demand on fire protection services in such a way as to alter the provider's facilities or ability to provide service to other users in the City of Capitola and construction of new facilities would not be required (Jeanette Devery, personal communication, September 23, and October 17, 2013).

Police Services. As discussed previously, the Capitola Police Department reported 13 calls from the Monarch Cove Inn between October 2012 and October 2013, the subjects of the calls were as follows: noise complaints (2), party-noise complaint (1), fireworks (1), suspicious person (1), trespassing (1), follow-up (2), civil issues (2), vandalism (1), and assist calls (2) (Traci Hernandez, personal communication, October 22, 2013).

The proposed project would increase the number of rooms available for visitors. However, it would not result in an increase in the frequency, size, or duration of weddings or other outdoor events at the site, and the existing conditions placed on events are not proposed to change. Therefore, while the number of guests staying overnight on the property would increase, the number of visitors to the hotel for an event would remain unchanged. Without an increase in the number of event attendees, it is unlikely that there would be a substantial increase in the number of calls made to the police department or in the number of noise complaints that arise from the residential neighborhood as a result of the events held at the hotel. Continuing to have a security guard present during all events would reduce the risk of events that would demand an emergency service response. It should also be noted that the provision of additional rooms at the site could encourage guests attending events to remain at the hotel overnight, potentially reducing nighttime effects associated with guests traveling from the event site to their vehicles.

Given that a substantial increase in either the number of calls or in the calls' level of priority is not anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project, the City of Capitola Police Department's expected response time of approximately three and a half minutes to 17 minutes to the site (depending on the urgency of service calls) would not incur a substantial increase. As a result, the proposed project would not necessitate a need to construct new or expanded police facilities (Rudy Escalante, Capitola Police Chief, personal communication, September 26, 2013).

Emergency Medical Services. Currently, response time requirements for emergency medical services in the County are consistently met by AMR. The proposed project would not have a substantial effect on the response time to other users in the County, nor would it cause failure in meeting the requirements for paramedic or ambulance arrival times during responses to the proposed hotel (Brenda Brenner, personal communication, September 24, 2013). Given that response times would not be affected by the proposed project, the facilities themselves would also not be affected or need to be expanded. This applies to both AMR and to the CFPD, which supports the County with paramedic services. Therefore, the entirety of emergency medical services would not be substantially affected by the proposed project (B. Brenner, September 24, 2013).

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed project that would reduce impacts related to provision of fire, police, and EMS services.

<u>Mitigation Measures.</u> No mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

c. Cumulative Impacts. As noted in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. Both projects would result in an incremental increase in demand for public services, including fire, police, and EMS services. When combined with the demands of the proposed project, however, such minor increases in demand would not be anticipated to be cumulatively considerable. As future facilities are constructed, impacts would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project would incrementally increase the demand for fire, police, and EMS services. However, this impact would be less than significant and would not contribute to a significant cumulative effect. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to public services would be less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank.

4.11 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

4.11.1 Setting

a. Existing Street System. Regional access to the project site is provided via Highway 1. Highway 1 is predominantly a north-south, four-lane highway. However, in the vicinity of the project site, Highway 1 extends in an east-west direction. Highway 1 extends north and south along the coast of the State of California. It links the City of Capitola and the Monterey Peninsula to the south and the Cities of Santa Cruz, Half Moon Bay, Pacifica, and San Francisco to the north. Access to and from the project site is provided via its interchanges at Porter Street/Bay Avenue and Park Avenue.

Local access to the site is provided by El Salto Drive, Escalona Drive, Monterey Avenue, Bay Avenue, and Park Avenue. These roadways are described below.

- El Salto Drive is a two-lane east-west residential street that begins at its intersection with Central Avenue and extends eastward to the project site. El Salto Drive has permitted street parking and no sidewalks on either side of the roadway. Speed limits on El Salto Drive are 25 miles per hour (mph), although speed limits are not posted. El Salto Drive would provide primary access to the project site.
- **Escalona Drive** is a two-lane east-west residential street that begins at its intersection with Monterey Avenue and extends eastward to the project site. Escalona Drive has permitted street parking and no sidewalks on either side of the roadway. Speed limits on Escalona Drive are 25 miles per hour (mph), although speed limits are not posted. Escalona Drive would provide secondary access to the project site.
- **Monterey Avenue** is primarily a two-lane north-south roadway located west of the project site with a 25 mile per hour (mph) speed limit. Monterey Avenue begins in the south at its intersection with Esplanade, where northbound only travel is allowed to its intersection with Capitola Avenue in the north. Monterey Avenue continues north as a two-lane roadway to Kennedy Drive, which continues to Park Avenue. Monterey Avenue provides access to the project site via Escalona Drive.
- **Bay Avenue** is a two to four-lane north-south roadway located northwest of the project site. Bay Avenue begins as a two-lane roadway at its intersection with Monterey Avenue and extends northward to Center Street, where it continues northward as a four-lane roadway to Highway 1 at which point it transitions to Porter Street. Bay Avenue provides access to the project site via Monterey Avenue.
- **Park Avenue** is primarily a north-south two-lane roadway located north of the project site. Park Avenue begins at its intersection with Monterey Avenue and extends eastward and then northward to its intersection with Soquel Drive. Park Avenue provides access to the project site via Monterey Avenue.

b. Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. Bicycle facilities are divided into three classes. Class I bikeways are bike paths that are physically separated from motor vehicles and

offer two-way bicycle travel on a separate path. Class II bikeways are striped bike lanes on roadways that are marked by signage and pavement markings. Class III bikeways are bike routes and only have signs to help guide bicyclists on recommended routes to certain locations.

The *City of Capitola Bicycle Transportation Plan* (2011) describes the existing bicycle network in the vicinity of the proposed site. Class II bike lanes are provided on Park Avenue, Bay Avenue, and along Monterey Avenue from Capitola Avenue to Washburn Avenue. In addition, Class III bike routes are provided on Monterey Avenue from Washburn Avenue north to Park Avenue and on Capitola Avenue from Beulah Drive to Highway 1. The existing bicycle facilities within the study area are shown on Figure 4.11-1.

Within the project vicinity, there are no sidewalks along El Salto Drive, Escalona Drive, and Park Avenue. However, there are sidewalks along both sides of Monterey Avenue and Bay Avenue. Crosswalks are present for crossing in all-directions at every major intersection in the vicinity of the project.

c. Existing Transit Service. Existing public transit service to the study area is provided by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD). There are two bus stops located within a one-half-mile walking distance from the project site. The transit services within one half mile of the project site are described below and shown on Figure 4.11-2.

- *Local Route* 54 provides service between the Capitola Mall Transit Center and La Selva Beach. Route 54 operates one bus on weekdays that departs from the Capitola Transit Center at 5:35 pm. On weekends, Route 54 departs the Capitola Mall Transit Center for La Selva Beach at 8:00 am, 10:55 am, and 6:40 pm. After leaving La Selva Beach, Route 54 serves as an express bus back to Capitola Mall. In the project vicinity, Route 54 operates on Bay Avenue and Park Avenue.
- *Local Route 55* provides service between the Capitola Mall Transit Center and Rio Del Mar. Route 55 operates on 60-minute headways from 7:30 am to 5:30 pm on weekdays. In the project vicinity, Route 55 operates on Bay Avenue and Park Avenue.

d. Regulatory Setting

<u>City of Capitola.</u> The City of Capitola has established a minimum LOS C traffic operation standard for the roadway system outside of the Village area, and a minimum LOS D traffic operation standard for the roadway system within the Village area (Capitola's central business district).

City of Capitola General Plan. The Capitola General Plan is currently being updated. The Transportation and Circulation Element of the current General Plan, which was adopted in 1989, includes objectives and policies that address the bikeway system, pedestrian travel and level of service. Objectives and policies applicable to the project are listed below.

Monarch Cove Hotel EIR Section 4.11 Ttraffic and Circulation



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013. Additional data from Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., 2013.

Existing Bicycle Lanes

Figure 4.11-1

City of Capitola



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013. Additional data from Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., 2013.

Existing Transit Services

<u>Objective</u>	Define a minimum standard of congestion acceptable to the community which guides public investment and allowed development.
<u>Policy 1</u>	Level of Service C shall be the acceptable standard for circulation within the City with the exception of the Village area.
Policy 2	In Capitola Village and its portals, slower speeds are desirable and some delay will be acceptable. Level of Service D shall be acceptable standard in this area.
<u>Policy 3</u>	Major developments or General Plan amendments will be required to demonstrate that the desired level of service is maintained.
<u>Objective</u>	To promote a safe, efficient bicycle system as a viable mode of transportation within the City of Capitola. To the extent possible provisions for bicycles will be made on all major roads in the City. The Bikeway Plan recommended is intended to connect to the County bikeway system and to provide a system through the City and to its major attraction points.
<u>Objective</u>	To promote a safe and convenient pedestrian system of pathways and sidewalks along the major streets and activity areas in the City. A number of corridors have been identified as critical elements for a comprehensive system of pedestrian walkways or sidewalks. This system is identified in the Pedestrian Plan. This system is not intended to discourage sidewalks in other locations within the City.

City of Capitola Bicycle Transportation Plan. The Capitola Bicycle Transportation Plan was adopted in February 2011 and includes goals and objectives in support of transportation by bicycle. Goals and objectives applicable to the project are listed below.

<u>Goal</u>	Improve bicycle circulation, connectivity and access.
<u>Goal</u>	Increase bicycle ridership and replace motor vehicle trips with bicycle trips. Achieve a city-wide goal of 5% of all trips and 20% of work trips made by bicycle by 2020.
<u>Goal</u>	Improve bicycle safety.

4.11.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. The analysis below is based on a *Traffic Impact Analysis* prepared for the project by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. (Hexagon) (March 2014; refer to Appendix I).

Methodology.

Existing Traffic Volumes. Existing peak-hour traffic volumes were obtained by Hexagon from new peak-hour counts collected at each of the study intersections in August and September 2013. Traffic counts were collected in August to capture summer visitors to traffic in Depot Hill and the Village area. The traffic counts completed in August (August 8-11, 2014)

were conducted prior to the end of the Junior Lifeguard Program August 16, 2014. However, the August counts were completed while schools were on summer break. Traffic volume data were re-collected at a sampling of five intersections during the weekday peak hours and two roadway segments in September when schools were in session. The August and September weekday peak hour counts were then compared for the purpose of determining when the greatest amount of traffic volumes occurs. The comparison indicated that weekday peak hour traffic volumes while schools were back in session were greater than those collected during the summer. Therefore, the weekday peak hour counts collected while schools were in session in May (obtained from other recently completed traffic studies) and September 2013 were used for the reporting of weekday AM and PM existing conditions levels of service. The Saturday peak hour counts collected in August were used for the analysis of Saturday peak hour analysis.

Existing Traffic Volumes and Level of Service. The analysis of signalized study intersections is based on the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology. The evaluation of signalized intersections was completed using SYNCHRO software, which employs the 2010 HCM methodology. SYNCHRO evaluates signalized intersection operations based on average control delay time for all vehicles at the intersection. Control delay is the amount of delay that is attributed to the particular traffic control device at the intersection, and includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. The correlation between average delay and level of service for signalized intersections is shown in Table 4.11-1.

The methodology used to determine the level of service for unsignalized intersections is also SYNCHRO and the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual methodology. This method is applicable for both two-way and all-way stop-controlled intersections. For the analysis of stop-controlled intersections, the 2010 HCM methodology evaluates intersection operations on the basis of average control delay time for all vehicles on the stop-controlled approaches. For the purpose of reporting level of service for one- and two-way stop-controlled intersections, the delay and corresponding level of service for the stop-controlled minor street approach with the highest delay is reported. For all-way stop-controlled intersections, the reported average delay and corresponding level of service is the average for all approaches at the intersection. The correlation between average delay and level of service for unsignalized intersections is shown in Table 4.11-2.

The level of service (LOS) analysis at unsignalized intersections is supplemented with an assessment of the need for signalization of the intersection. The need for signalization of unsignalized intersections is assessed based on the Peak Hour Volume Warrant (Warrant 3) described in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (CA MUTCD), Part 4, Highway Traffic Signals, 2012. This method makes no evaluation of intersection level of service, but simply provides an indication whether vehicular peak hour traffic volumes are, or would be, sufficient to justify installation of a traffic signal.

LOS	Description	Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)
А	Operations with very low delay occurring with favorable progression and/or short cycle lengths.	Up to 10.0
В	Operations with low delay occurring with good progressions and/or short cycle lengths.	10.1 to 20.0
С	Operations with average delays resulting from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures begin to appear.	20.1 to 35.0
D	Operations with longer delays due to a combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high V/C ratios. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.	35.1 to 55.0
E	Operations with high delay values indicating poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high V/C ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay.	55.1 to 80.0
F	Operation with delays unacceptable to most drivers occurring due to oversaturation, poor progression, or very long cycle lengths.	Greater than 80.0

Table 4.11-1 Level of Service Definitions for Signalized Intersections Based on Control Delay

Source: Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual 2010.

Table 4.11-2 Level of Service Definitions for Unsignalized Intersections Based on Control Delay

LOS	Description	Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)
А	Operations with very low delays occurring with favorable progression.	Up to 10.0
В	Operations with low delays occurring with good progression	10.1 to 15.0
С	Operations with average delays resulting from fair progression.	15.1 to 25.0
D	Operations with longer delays due to a combination of unfavorable progression of high V/C ratios	25.1 to 35.0
E	Operations with high delay values indicating poor progression and high V/C ratios. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay.	35.1 to 50.0
F	Operations with delays unacceptable to most drivers occurring due to oversaturation and poor progression.	Greater and 50.0

Source: Transportation Research Board, 2010 Highway Capacity Manual.

Monarch Cove Hotel EIR Section 4.11 Traffic and Circulation



Study Intersections and Road Segments

Ten key study intersections were selected for evaluation of existing and future traffic operating conditions based on their potential to be affected by project-generated traffic. These intersections include the following:

- 1. Monterey Avenue and Capitola Avenue (unsignalized)
- 2. Monterey Avenue and Escalona Drive (unsignalized)
- 3. Monterey Avenue and Park Avenue (unsignalized)
- 4. Monterey Avenue and Bay Avenue (unsignalized)
- 5. Capitola Avenue and Bay Avenue (unsignalized)
- 6. Bay Avenue and Hill Street (unsignalized)
- 7. Bay Avenue and Highway 1 (signalized)
- 8. Porter Street and Highway 1 (signalized)
- 9. Park Avenue and Highway 1 (North) (signalized)
- 10. Park Avenue and Highway 1 (South) (signalized)

Three freeway segments also were selected for evaluation. These segments include:

- 1. Highway 1, between State Park drive and Park Avenue
- 2. Highway 1, between Park Avenue and Bay Avenue
- 3. Highway 1, between Bay Avenue and 41st Avenue

Some portion of potential project-related traffic would pass through each of these intersections, and their analyses reveal the expected relative impacts of the project. Traffic conditions at all of the study intersections were analyzed for the weekday AM, PM, and Saturday peak hours. The weekday AM peak hour of traffic is generally between 7:00 and 9:00 AM, the weekday PM peak hour is typically between 4:00 and 6:00 PM. It is during these periods that the most congested traffic conditions occur on a typical weekday. The Saturday peak hour between 12:00 and 2:00 PM was analyzed since it is generally the day and the time period when retail at Capitola Village and the beach related traffic are greatest.

Table 4.11-3 summarizes the existing peak hour service level calculations for the ten key study intersections based on existing traffic volumes and current street geometry. Table 4.11-4 shows the existing levels of service for the freeway segments analyzed.

Key Intersection	LOS Standard	Time Period	Control Type	Delay	LOS
Monterey Ave and Capitola Ave	D	AM PM SAT	AWSC	14.2 25.7 12.0	B D B
Monterey Ave and Escalona Dr	D	AM PM SAT	TWSC	14.2 28.2 21.2	B D C
Monterey Ave and Park Ave	С	AM PM SAT	AWSC	20.9 19.9 12.2	C C B

Table 4.11-3Existing Intersection Levels of Service Summary

Key Intersection	LOS Standard	Time Period	Control Type	Delay	LOS
Monterey Ave and Bay Ave	С	AM PM SAT	AWSC	12.0 11.4 10.6	B B B
Capitola Ave and Bay Ave	С	AM PM SAT	AWSC	20.0 20.0 21.6	с с с
Bay Ave and Hill St	С	AM PM SAT	AWSC	18.4 24.1 26.0	С С D
Bay Ave and Hwy 1 SB Ramps	С	AM PM SAT	Signal	20.8 21.5 21.5	с с с
Porter St and Hwy 1 NB Ramps	С	AM PM SAT	Signal	34.8 30.8 23.6	с с с
Park Ave and Hwy 1 NB Ramps	С	AM PM SAT	Signal	13.8 14.9 13.3	B B B
Park Ave and Hwy 1 SB Ramps	С	AM PM SAT	Signal	15.4 15.6 12.8	B B B

 Table 4.11-3

 Existing Intersection Levels of Service Summary

Signal = Signalized Intersection

AWSC = all-way stopped controlled intersection

TWSC = two-way stopped controlled intersection

Bold indicated unacceptable LOS or signal warrant met.

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., March 2014.

Table 4.11-4
Existing Freeway Segment Levels of Service Summary

				AM Peak-Hour			PM Peak-Hour			
	1.05		# of	Volume	Density	LOS	Volume	Density	LOS	
Segment	Standard	Direction	Lanes	(pc/mi/ln)			(pc/mi/ln)			
SR1 between State Park	C	WB	2	3,589	31.2	D	3,317	27.8	D	
Drive and Park Avenue	C	EB	2	2,108	16.5	B	3,788	34.1	D	
SR 1 between Park	C	WB	2	3,733	33.2	D	3,318	27.8	D	
Avenue and Bay Avenue	C	EB	2	2,565	20.3	C	3,564	30.9	D	
SR 1 between Bay	C	WB	2	4,348	44.5	E C	3,452	29.4	D	
Avenue and 41 st Avenue	C	EB	2	2,784	22.2		3,565	30.9	D	

Bold indicated unacceptable LOS.

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., March 2014.

According to the City of Capitola, LOS D is the minimum acceptable condition that should be maintained during the morning and evening peak commute hours for intersections within the Village area, while LOS C is the minimum for all other intersections within the City. As shown in Table 4.11-3, all ten key study intersections currently operate at LOS D or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours and the Saturday peak hours. The Caltrans level of service standard for freeway facilities (mainline and ramps) is stated as the transition between LOS C and D. Table 4.11-4 shows that the west bound freeway segments currently operate an

unacceptable LOS during the AM and PM peak hours while the eastbound lanes operate at an acceptable LOS during the AM peak hours and an unacceptable LOS during the PM peak hours.

Traffic Evaluation Scenarios. Traffic conditions were evaluated for the following scenarios:

- Scenario 1:Existing Conditions. Existing conditions were represented by existing
peak-hour traffic volumes on the existing roadway network. Existing
traffic volumes were obtained from recent (May, August, and September
2013) traffic counts. Traffic counts collected in August (while schools were
not in session) were compared with traffic counts collected in May and
September (while schools were in session). The comparison indicated that
traffic volumes were generally greater while schools were in session.
Therefore, the counts collected while schools were in session were used
for the reporting of existing conditions levels of service.
- *Scenario 2: Existing Plus Project Conditions.* Project-generated traffic volumes were added to existing traffic volumes to estimate existing plus project conditions. Existing plus project conditions were evaluated relative to existing conditions in order to determine potential project impacts.
- *Scenario 3: Cumulative Conditions.* Cumulative conditions were represented by future traffic volumes, at the date of project occupancy, on the roadway network. Traffic volumes under cumulative conditions were estimated by applying an annual growth factor of 1.0% over 3 years to existing traffic volumes and adding project trips. This scenario was evaluated in order to fulfill California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements.

The magnitude of traffic produced by a new development is typically estimated by applying the size of the project to the applicable trip generation rates contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. However, the ITE manual does not provide data that would truly represent the type of hotel as proposed. Therefore, the trip generation of the proposed project was estimated utilizing trip generation rates developed based on driveway counts completed at the existing project site in August 2013. For comparison and validation purposes, the trip generation rates surveyed at the project site also were compared with those recommended by ITE as well as rates developed based on driveway counts at other comparable hotels in the Monterey Bay area. Two hotels in the Monterey Bay area that included rooms and small banquet facilities similar in size to those of the proposed project were selected for surveys. Driveway counts were completed by Hexagon in October 2013 at the following two locations (refer to Appendix I):

1. Hotel Pacific

Location: 300 Pacific Street, Monterey, California Number of guest rooms: 105 Banquet room: Available

2. Hotel Abrego

Location: 755 Abrego Street, Monterey, California Number of guest rooms: 93 Banquet room: Available

The comparison of trip generation estimates based on the surveyed rates with those estimated using rates recommended by ITE indicate that the rates established based on the surveys of the existing project site result in a greater number of estimated trips for the proposed project. Therefore, the project was evaluated using the rates developed from the surveys of the existing project site since they result in a more conservative analysis than the ITE rates or rates of comparable hotels. Additionally, the surveyed rates at the project site are also more reflective of the expected mode of travel of guests to the proposed hotel.

Based on the surveyed trip rates and credit for existing site uses (11 guest rooms), the proposed project was estimated to generate a net additional 240 weekday and 387 Saturday daily trips with 16 AM peak-hour trips (8 inbound and 8 outbound), 28 PM peak-hour trips (14 inbound and 14 outbound), and 33 Saturday peak-hour trips (14 inbound and 19 outbound). The project trip generation estimates are presented in Table 4.11-5. The proposed project does not propose to increase the frequency or size of events. Therefore, the existing and future event functions are considered as part of the baseline conditions for this analysis.

Trip Distribution and Assignment. Peak hour project traffic was distributed to the transportation network based on existing travel patterns on the surrounding roadway system and the locations of complementary land uses. Table 4.11-5 shows how many additional vehicles would be entering and exiting the project site with the proposed additional rooms during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours.

Land Use	Size	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Saturday Midday Peak Hour		
		Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total
Existing Rooms	11 Rooms	3	3	6	5	5	10	5	7	12
Proposed Rooms	41 Rooms	11	11	22	19	19	38	19	26	45
Net Additional		8	8	16	14	14	28	14	19	33

Table 4.11-5 Project Trip Generation Estimates

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. March 2014

<u>Thresholds of Significance</u>. The following thresholds are based on Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Impacts would be significant if the proposed project would result in any of the following:

1) 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;

- 2) 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;
- 3) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- 4) 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;
- 5) Result in inadequate emergency access; and/or
- 6) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (*e.g.*, bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

Signalized Intersections. Both the City of Capitola and Caltrans identify a level of service standard of LOS C for their respective facilities, with the exception of those City of Capitola intersections located within the Village area. The City of Capitola LOS standard for intersections within the Village area, which include the Monterey Avenue/Capitola Avenue and Monterey Avenue/Escalona Drive study intersections, is LOS D. Neither agency has specific criteria for determining project impacts. For the purpose of this traffic analysis, the project is said to create a significant adverse impact on traffic conditions at an intersection if for either peak hour:

- The level of service at the intersection degrades from an acceptable LOS C or better (LOS D or better within the Village area) under existing conditions to an unacceptable LOS D or worse (LOS E or worse within the Village area) under existing plus project conditions, or
- The level of service at the intersection is an unacceptable LOS D or worse (LOS E or worse within the Village area) under existing conditions and the addition of project trips causes the average intersection delay to increase by three (3) or more seconds.

Unsignalized Intersections. For unsignalized intersections, according to the City of Capitola and Caltrans, a project is said to create a significant adverse impact on traffic conditions at the intersection if for any peak hour:

- All-way stop: The average overall level of service at the intersection degrades from an acceptable LOS C or better (LOS D or better within the Village area) under conditions without the project to an unacceptable LOS D or worse (LOS E or worse within the Village area) under project conditions, or
- All-way stop: The average overall intersection level of service is already at an unacceptable LOS D or worse (LOS E or worse within the Village area) without the project and the addition of project traffic causes the average overall delay to increase three (3) or more seconds, or
- One- or two-way stop: The delay on the worst approach at a one- or two-way stop-controlled intersection degrades from an acceptable LOS C or better (LOS D or better within the Village area) under conditions without the project to an unacceptable LOS D or worse (LOS E or worse within the Village area) under project conditions and the traffic volumes at the intersection under project conditions are high enough to satisfy the peak-hour volume traffic signal warrant, or

• One- or two-way stop: The delay on the worst approach at a one- or two-way stop-controlled intersection is already at an unacceptable LOS D or worse (LOS E or worse within the Village area) without the project and the traffic volumes at the intersection under project conditions are high enough to satisfy the peak-hour volume traffic signal warrant, and the addition of project traffic causes the delay on the worst stop-controlled approach to increase beyond what it was without the project.

Freeway Segments. Caltrans Guide for Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (December 2002) states that the project would create a significant adverse impact on a freeway segment during the peak hours if:

- The addition of project traffic causes the study segment to degrade from an acceptable level of service (LOS C) under existing conditions to an unacceptable level of service (LOS D or worse) under project conditions, or
- The project results in the addition of trips to a segment that is already operating at unacceptable levels.

Cumulative Impacts. Neither the City of Capitola nor Caltrans has specific criteria for determining the level of significance of cumulative impacts. For the purpose of analysis, the same impact criteria used to evaluate project impacts were applied to cumulative traffic conditions. The City of Capitola does not have specific criteria for determining a single project's contribution to a cumulative intersection impact. Therefore, for the purpose of analysis, a project's contribution to a cumulatively significant impact is deemed considerable if the proportion of project traffic represents 3% or more of the increase in total volume from existing traffic conditions.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact T-1 Traffic generated by the construction of the proposed project would increase traffic on local streets, including trips to and from the site by construction trucks and equipment. Although temporary in nature, the impact would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Construction would primarily be accomplished using diesel-powered heavy equipment. Construction activities would include clearing, excavation, and grading operations, import/export of fill material, and construction vehicle and worker travel to and from the site. This would temporarily increase traffic on local streets, including construction trucks and equipment. Traffic from these various activities would be ongoing throughout the demolition, building, and rehabilitation processes for the project site. Although temporary in nature, construction traffic impacts are considered potentially significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed project pertaining intersection operation and levels of service.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. The following mitigation measure would reduce construction traffic impacts.

- **T-1 Construction Management Plan.** Prior to issuance of building or grading permits for the project site, the project proponent shall prepare a Construction Management Plan for review and approval by City staff. The provisions of the plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - In order to minimize impacts from construction-related traffic, the project contractor shall ensure that heavy vehicle traffic from the project site only occur between the hours of 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM.
 - The project contractor shall identify and enforce truck haul routes deemed acceptable by the City for construction trucks.
 - Signs shall be posted along roads identifying construction traffic access or flow limitations due to single lane conditions during periods of truck traffic if needed.
 - Construction equipment shall be stored on the project site and construction vehicles shall not be allowed to park within the residential neighborhood during the construction phase of the project.

<u>Significance after Mitigation.</u> Impacts would be less than significant with adherence to Mitigation Measure T-1.

Impact T-2 Traffic generated by the proposed project would increase traffic volumes and incrementally reduce levels of service at each of the 10 study intersections. However, the level of service impact caused by the proposed project under "existing plus project" conditions would not exceed City or Caltrans thresholds at these intersections. Therefore, impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

As previously presented in Table 4.11-3, the ten study area intersections currently operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours except for the Monterey/Escalona and Monterey/Capitola which operate at LOS D on weekday afternoons and the Bay Avenue and Hill Street intersection, which operates at LOS D on Saturdays. The City of Capitola has a minimum standard of LOS D for intersections within the Village area and LOS C for all other intersections in the City. Table 4.11-6 shows the existing and existing plus project ICU (or delay) and levels of service for study area intersections during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours. As shown therein, all study intersections are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under existing plus project conditions. The unsignalized study intersection of Bay Avenue and Hill Street currently operates and is projected to continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS D during the Saturday peak hour under existing plus project conditions. However, the results indicate that the addition of project traffic at the intersection would not increase the delay by three or more seconds, and therefore impacts would be less than significant.

Internetion	LOS	Time Desired	Existing Conditions		Existing Plus Project			
Intersection	Standard	Time Period	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Change in Delay	
Monterey Ave	D	AM	14.2	B	14.2	B	0.0	
and Capitola		PM	25.7	D	25.9	D	0.2	
Ave		SAT	12.0	B	12.0	B	0.0	
Monterey Ave	D	AM	14.2	B	14.4	B	0.2	
and Escalona		PM	28.2	D	30.5	D	2.3	
Dr		SAT	21.2	C	22.8	C	1.6	
Monterey Ave and Park Ave	С	AM PM SAT	20.9 19.9 12.2	C C B	21.4 20.6 12.6	C C B	0.5 0.7 0.4	
Monterey Ave and Bay Ave	С	AM PM SAT	12.0 11.4 10.6	B B B	12.2 11.7 10.9	B B B	0.2 0.3 0.3	
Capitola Ave and Bay Ave	С	AM PM SAT	20.0 20.0 21.6	с с с	20.5 20.9 22.8	С С С	0.5 0.9 1.2	
Bay Ave and Hill St	С	AM PM SAT	18.4 24.1 26.0	С С D	18.8 24.9 27.3	С С D	0.4 0.8 1.3	
Bay Ave and	С	AM	20.8	C	20.9	C	0.1	
Hwy 1 SB		PM	21.5	C	21.9	C	0.4	
Ramps		SAT	21.5	C	21.8	C	0.3	
Porter St and	С	AM	34.8	C	34.9	C	0.1	
Hwy 1 NB		PM	30.8	C	31.0	C	0.2	
Ramps		SAT	23.6	C	23.9	C	0.3	
Park Ave and	С	AM	13.8	B	13.8	B	0.0	
Hwy 1 NB		PM	14.9	B	14.9	B	0.0	
Ramps		SAT	13.3	B	13.3	B	0.0	
Park Ave and	С	AM	15.4	B	15.4	B	0.0	
Hwy 1 SB		PM	15.6	B	15.6	B	0.0	
Ramps		SAT	12.8	B	12.8	B	0.0	

Table 4.11-6 Existing Plus Project Intersection Capacity Analysis

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., March 2014

Neighborhood Traffic.

Depot Hill residents have expressed concern that the additional traffic generated by the project may significantly increase traffic volumes on neighborhood streets that provide access to the project site and worsen perceived existing traffic issues within the neighborhood including speeding along Escalona Drive and unsafe pedestrian/bicycle travel throughout the neighborhood.

An evaluation of traffic related impacts to residential streets within the Depot Hill neighborhood was completed by Hexagon Transportation Consultants. However, unlike the intersection level of service analysis methodology, which has established impact thresholds, the analyses contained in this discussion are based on professional judgment in accordance with the standards and methods employed by the traffic engineering community. Several studies have been completed regarding the impacts of traffic on residential neighborhoods. The variables affecting these impacts include traffic volumes, type, or makeup, of traffic (i.e. passenger cars, trucks, motorcycles, emergency vehicles, etc.), traffic speed, perception of through traffic as a percentage of total traffic, adequacy of street alignment (i.e., horizontal and vertical curvature), accident experience, on-street parking, residential dwelling setbacks from the street, pedestrian traffic, and street pavement conditions (which would add to traffic noise as the pavement deteriorates). Other factors that may be a contributor to neighborhood nuisance levels include socioeconomic status of the neighborhood and expectations of the residents regarding traffic volumes.

Existing Neighborhood Roadway Characteristics. Ingress and egress from the Depot Hill neighborhood is provided exclusively via the Escalona Drive intersection with Monterey Avenue. The roadways within the neighborhood only serve the residents and existing hotel use and provide no secondary outlet tot the surrounding roadway system. Therefore, there is no cut-through or commercial traffic present within the neighborhood.

The roadway system in Depot Hill consists of relatively long and narrow streets built in a grid system with housing on both sides. Streets within the Depot Hill neighborhood are narrow and do not have sidewalks. El Salto Drive, Escalona Drive, and Central Avenue within the neighborhood are less than 35 feet wide with other minor streets as narrow as 25 feet wide. There are no posted speed limits on the streets within the neighborhood. Parking is currently permitted on both sides of most streets where physically possible, thus providing travel ways of only 10 to 20 feet. The narrow travel ways do not meet typical street standards for two-way travel. As such, pedestrian and bicycle travel along the streets is inhibited due to the narrow street widths and lack of sidewalks along the streets.

<u>Estimated Project Traffic.</u> Escalona Drive and El Salto Drive serve as the primary east/west roadways through the Depot Hill neighborhood and also provide direct access to the project site. Access to the project site is currently provided only via El Salto Drive. The proposed project would maintain the existing access from El Salto Drive along with a new access point from Escalona Drive. As such, it can be expected that both Escalona Drive and El Salto Drive would see an increase in traffic due to the project. In addition, the net additional project traffic that is projected to be added to El Salto Drive accounts for a shift in a portion of existing site traffic to Escalona Drive. Therefore, traffic conditions along three streets in the Depot Hill neighborhood were evaluated: (1) El Salto Drive, (2) Escalona Drive, (3) and <u>Central</u> Avenue. Central Avenue runs north-south between Escalona Drive and the cliffs. The other two streets run east-west between Central Avenue and the project site. With the exception of the hotel uses on the project site, the streets only serve residential land uses.

The effects of project traffic on the streets was evaluated based on field observations, the collection of traffic volume data collected in August and September 2013, and projections of the additional project generated traffic. Table 4.11-7 presents a summary of existing and projected traffic volumes along each of the studied streets within the Depot Hill neighborhood.
Location	Direction	Existing Volun	j ADT nes	ADT Proje	ct Trips	Existing Plus Project ADT Volumes			
Location	Direction	Weekday	Sat.	Weekday	SAT	Weekday	Sat.		
El Salto Drive, East of Livermore Avenue	EB WB Total	40 48 88	69 73 142	54 54 108	88 88 176	94 102 196	157 161 318		
El Salto Drive, between Sacramento Avenue and Livermore Avenue	EB WB Total	119 125 244	172 166 338	54 54 108	88 88 176	173 179 352	260 254 514		
El Salto Drive between Saxon Avenue and Oakland Avenue	EB WB Total	152 156 308	169 147 316	72 72 144	116 116 232	224 228 452	285 263 548		
Escalona Drive between Saxon Avenue and Oakland Avenue	EB WB Total	449 456 905	543 536 1079	48 48 96	78 78 156	497 504 1001	621 614 1235		
Escalona Drive between Central Avenue and Saxon Avenue	EB WB Total	568 617 1185	624 597 1221	60 60 120	97 97 194	628 677 1305	721 694 1415		
Central Avenue between Escalona Drive and Cliff Avenue	EB WB Total	413 440 853	561 573 1134	60 60 120	97 97 194	473 500 973	658 670 1328		

Table 4.11-7Neighborhood Street Traffic Volumes

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, March 2014.

General guidelines regarding threshold volumes pertaining to residential streets have been recommended within several studies and reference material including the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). There is variation in these accepted threshold volumes, but in general, it is recommended that residential streets carry no more than 2,000 to 4,000 ADT (Average Daily Traffic). The HCM recommended maximum ADT range for level of service C on local streets is 1,500-1,600 vehicles. The addition of the estimated daily trips from the proposed project would result in daily volumes along streets within the Depot Hill neighborhood that will be well below the accepted LOS C volume range. The greatest amount of project traffic will be added to El Salto Drive (a net additional 144 weekday and 232 Saturday daily trips). If all the project traffic were to occur during a 12-hour period (6:00 am – 6:00 pm) rather than a 24-hour period, the daily project trips would equate to a maximum of one project trip every five minutes on weekdays. Similarly, on Saturdays, the daily project trips would equate to one project trip every three minutes.

Based on the characteristics of these streets, the traffic count data and the estimated project traffic, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Traffic volumes on all three streets are fairly low, well below 1,500 vehicles per day on most segments. Traffic volumes under 1,500 vehicles per day are considered acceptable for neighborhood streets.
- The streets are narrow (~ 35 feet wide) with parking on both sides, which discourages speeding.
- The average observed traffic speeds are well below the speed limit of 25 mph at most locations.

Collision History. The collision history at the Monterey Avenue and Escalona Drive intersection also was investigated to provide context for discussions of traffic and pedestrian safety. The City of Capitola Police Department indicated that there were no reported accidents at the Monterey Avenue and Escalona Drive intersection over the past three years (Hexagon, 2014). Therefore, based on the lack of reported collisions, there is no significant issue with accidents at the Monterey Avenue and Escalona Drive intersection. (There are potential geometric improvements that could be implemented at the intersection to improve sight distance, lane alignment, and pedestrian/bicycle travel through the intersection.)

Based on the analysis above, the project would not cause any significant impacts to neighborhood traffic or traffic safety under existing plus project conditions and no mitigation is required. This discussion focuses solely on the impact caused by the proposed project under existing conditions. It does not take any growth or additional proposed projects into account. For a discussion of the impacts caused by the proposed project and additional growth in the area, see Impacts T-6 through T-8.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed project pertaining intersection operation and levels of service.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Operational traffic impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact T-3 Traffic generated by the proposed project would increase traffic volumes and incrementally reduce levels of service at four of the six studied freeway segments. The level of service impact caused by the proposed project under "existing plus project" conditions at these four segments would exceed Caltrans thresholds. Therefore, impacts would be Class I, *significant and unavoidable*.

Traffic volumes for existing plus project conditions on each of the studied freeway segments were developed by adding the project trips to existing condition volumes. The project trips were assigned to the freeway system in the same manner as with intersections. The freeway segment analysis indicates that each of the freeway segments analyzed is projected to operate at an unacceptable LOS D or worse in the peak commute direction during the AM and PM peak hours under existing plus project conditions. As shown in Table 4.11-8, the project would not result in additional peak hour trips on State Route 1 between Park Avenue and Bay Avenue in

either direction; therefore, no impact would occur to these two segments. The project would, however, result in the addition of peak hour trips to the other four of the six segments. Based on Caltrans impact criteria, the addition of any new trips to the identified freeway segments would create a significant adverse traffic impact. Freeway segment analysis is presented in Table 4.11-8.

Existing Regulatory Requirements. There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed project pertaining intersection operation and levels of service.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. There are no feasible mitigation measures available that would reduce the freeway impacts of the proposed project.

Significance After Mitigation. Caltrans has identified improvements to Highway 1 via the Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane widening project, including the studied freeway segments. However, since it is not feasible for an individual development project to bear responsibility for implementing such extensive transportation system improvements due to constraints in acquisition and cost of right-of-way, and no comprehensive project to add the HOV lanes has been developed by Caltrans for individual projects to contribute to, the significant impacts on the directional freeway segments identified above must be considered significant and unavoidable.

Impact T-4 El Salto Drive and Escalona Drive would provide access to the proposed project. New driveways would also be constructed for internal site circulation. Traffic created by the proposed project and emergency services would be adequately served by these access points and driveways. Therefore, impacts to access and internal circulation would be Class III, *less than significant*.

Hexagon (2013) performed a review of the project site plan to determine if adequate site access would be provided and to identify any access or circulation issues that should be improved (refer to Appendix I). The proposed project site would take primary access via El Salto Drive and secondary access via Escalona Drive.

El Salto Drive. Vehicle access to the project site is currently provided via El Salto Drive. There are no proposed changes to the location of the existing access from El Salto Drive. El Salto Drive would provide access to the main building and reception area and upper level of the below-grade parking garage. The driveway would serve seven inbound trips and seven outbound trips during the AM peak hour, 11 inbound trips and 11 outbound trips during the PM peak hour, and 11 inbound trips and 16 outbound trips during the Saturday peak hour.

Escalona Drive. The Escalona Drive entrance would be established near the northeastern corner of the project site. Access to the lower level of the below-grade parking garage would be provided along Escalona Drive. The driveway would serve four inbound trips and four outbound trips during the AM peak hour, eight inbound trips and eight outbound trips during the PM peak hour, and 8 inbound trips and 10 outbound trips during the Saturday peak hour.

	LOS Standard	Direction	# of Lanes	Existing Conditions				Project Trips		Existing Plus Project Conditions								
Segment				AM Peak Hour (pc/mi/In)			PM Peak	PM Peak Hour (pc/mi/ln)			РМ	AM Peak Hour (pc/mi/In)			PM Peak Hour (pc/mi/ln)			Change
				Volume	Density	LOS	Volume	Density	LOS	Volume	Volume	Volume	Density	LOS	Volume	Density	LOS	Density
SR 1 between State Park Drive and Park Avenue	C C	WB EB	2 2	3,589 2,108	31.2 16.5	D B	3,317 3,788	27.8 34.1	D D	2 2	4 4	3,591 2,110	31.2 16.5	D B	3,321 3,792	27.8 34.1	D D	0.0 0.0
SR 1 between Park Avenue and Bay Avenue	C C	WB EB	2 2	3,733 2,565	33.2 20.3	D C	3,318 3,564	27.8 30.9	D D	0 0	0 0	3,733 2,565	33.2 20.3	D C	3,318 3,564	27.8 30.9	D D	0.0 0.0
SR 1 between bay Avenue and 41 st Avenue	C C	WB EB	2 2	4,348 2,784	44.5 22.2	E C	3,452 3,565	29.4 30.9	D D	4 4	8 8	4,352 2,788	44.6 22.3	E C	3,460 3,573	29.5 31.0	D D	0.1 0.1

Table 4.11-8Existing Plus Project Freeway Segment Levels of Service

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, March 2014.

(Please see Section 6.0, *Alternatives*, for a description of an alternative access scenario and a discussion of the associated impacts and considerations. In the alternative access scenario, the project site would be accessed from Park Avenue.)

The review of these access points found that they are designed to allow sufficient capacity for the anticipated number of trips to the project site (Hexagon, 2014). In regard to parking, the proposed project is not expected to exacerbate existing parking congestion during holiday and peak tourist season. Additionally, the *Traffic Impact Analysis* (Hexagon, 2014) did not identify any deficiencies in the proposed access points in terms of providing adequate emergency access. The Central Fire Protection District (CFPD) reviewed the proposed site plan and physically visited the site to test vehicle access and have approved emergency fire access to the site. Pursuant to the CFPD required installation of "no parking" signage along the connector road between El Salto Drive and Escalona Drive, impacts would be less than significant.

Internal Site Circulation. As proposed, on-site circulation would not present any deadend aisles. Therefore, continuous circulation through the project site would be possible. An onsite connection between El Salto Drive and Escalona Drive would provide for internal circulation within the project site itself. Impacts would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. The CFPD reviewed the proposed site plan and physically visited the site to test vehicle access. They have conditionally approved emergency fire access to the site. Pursuant to final CFPD review and installation of "no parking" signage along the connector road between El Salto Drive and Escalona Drive, per CFPD conditions, impacts would be less than significant.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant, mitigation would not be required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

Impact T-5 The project would generate a small amount of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit trips. These trips would not exceed the capacity of the facilities in the area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, or transit service. Impacts would be Class III, *less than significant*.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation. It is reasonable to assume that bicycle trips could comprise no more than 5% of the travel mode share to the site during the peak commute periods (Hexagon, 2014). This is used to determine the amount of bicycle trips that could be expected in the area. The trip generation for the project did not assume any bicycle trips. This would equate to approximately one to two new bicycle trips during each of the peak hours. The project is located within approximately 0.5 miles of existing bike lanes that are provided along Park Avenue and Monterey Avenue/Bay Avenue. The volume of additional bicycle trips generated by the project would not exceed the bicycle-carrying capacity of streets surrounding the site, and the increase in bicycle trips would not require new off-site bicycle facilities. The project is proposing to provide 27 bicycle parking spaces on-site and a separate bicycle entrance into the below-grade parking area.

It is reasonable to assume that pedestrian trips would comprise no more than 2% of the travel mode share to the site during the peak commute periods. This would equate to no more than one new pedestrian trip during the peak hours. The volume of additional pedestrian trips generated by the project would not necessitate improvements to the surrounding pedestrian facilities. However, the project is proposing on-site improvements to facilitate better public/neighborhood access to the project site and enhance pedestrian circulation within the project site with the addition of new pathways that would provide access to the back of the project site and scenic views. Guests may wish to walk around the surrounding neighborhood, which would increase the pedestrian traffic in the area. Pedestrians may use the shoulder of surrounding streets and the trail along the cliff.

It should be noted that streets within the surrounding Depot Hill Neighborhood do not have sidewalks and the streets are narrow. El Salto Drive, Escalona Drive, and Central Avenue within the neighborhood are less than 35 feet wide with other minor streets as narrow as 25 feet wide. Parking is currently permitted on both sides of most streets where physically possible, thus providing travel ways of only 10 to 20 feet. The narrow travel ways do not meet typical street standards for two-way travel. As such, pedestrian and bicycle travel along the streets is inhibited due to the narrow street widths and lack of sidewalks along the streets. This is an existing condition that would not be impacted by the construction and operation of the proposed project.

Traffic Calming Measures. Though the evaluation of the effects of project traffic on residential streets identified no direct impacts, it is evident that the existing conditions along streets within the neighborhood are of concern to residents. In order to improve the traffic situation within the Depot Hill neighborhood, several measures as described below could be considered for implementation along each of the streets to minimize the effects of the additional project. However, the measures are not necessary to mitigate potentially significant impacts of project traffic on the streets, because impacts would be less than significant. The measures should be evaluated as part of a traffic calming study for the neighborhood. The primary differences between a typical traffic engineering study and a traffic calming study is that a traffic calming study generally includes (1) more neighborhood involvement and (2) considers "quality of life" issues in addition to traffic capacity and safety issues. Generally, traffic calming is considered in a residential neighborhood when (1) the volume of traffic on a neighborhood street is incompatible with the surrounding land uses and/or roadway design or (2) the speed of traffic on a neighborhood street is excessive or unsafe. The traffic calming study would need to include the evaluation of all streets within the neighborhood to ensure that the implementation of traffic calming measures do not result in adverse effects on other street locations within the neighborhood. There are no established procedures for the application of traffic calming devices and criteria for device installation vary widely by jurisdiction.

• *Reduce Landscaping Conflicts.* Landscaping obscures existing signage at intersections at a number of locations in the neighborhood. This reduces the time that drivers unfamiliar to the area have to perceive and react to the signage and other vehicles. Where possible, the landscaping should be trimmed back around intersections to improve driver sight distance between (1) vehicles and signage, and (2) vehicles and other vehicles/bikes/pedestrians. Where landscaping cannot be removed to improve the visibility of stop signs, "Stop Ahead" warning signs should be considered.

- *Monterey Avenue and Escalona Drive Capital Improvement Project.* The City could consider long-term improvements to the intersection of Monterey Avenue/Escalona Drive as a possible Capital Improvement Project (CIP). Improvements could include, but not limited to, removing the islands at the intersection along Escalona Drive or installation of a traffic circle to improve ingress and egress from the neighborhood as well as improve pedestrian and bicycle flow through the intersection. Improving the intersection would require a design study that considers removal of landscaping, medians, lane narrowing, additional right of way, or any combination of these.
- *Street Narrowing.* This is typically considered to reduce vehicle speeds. However, all streets except Escalona Drive are already very narrow and speeds are generally much lower than those found on typical residential streets. Further narrowing at intersections would preclude truck access. Curb extensions get hit by vehicles regularly, which creates noise and damages vehicles. Street narrowing measures may be applicable along Escalona Drive and Central Avenue since they are wider than other streets in the neighborhood.
- *Traffic Circles.* Traffic circles force vehicles to slow down in advance of intersections. Installation of traffic circles have the potential to reduce the number of collisions and would maintain low travel speeds through the intersections. However, most of the intersections within the neighborhood are too small to accommodate traffic circles and speed is generally not a problem in the intersection. In addition, traffic circles would cause a loss of parking spaces, are very expensive (ranging from approximately \$25,000 to \$45,000 each), and limit the access for large vehicles, including fire trucks. The Fire Department, would need review and approve the installation of traffic circles at the intersections within the neighborhood because these measures could result in an increase in emergency response times.
- *Bulb-Outs*. An alternative measure would be to narrow the roadways at the intersections by extending the curb radius into the street. Curb extensions are commonly referred to as bulb-outs. However, given that, the streets within the neighborhood do not have sidewalks or curbing, the implementation of bulb-outs will require the installation of new curbing, striping or extension of landscape extensions. Bulb-outs typically shorten the pedestrian crossing lengths, keep the vehicle speeds low and allow better pedestrian visibility around parked cars. However, bulb-outs are expensive (about \$20,000 per intersection and require maintenance), result in a loss of on-street parking, and also impede emergency response vehicles and other trucks.
- *Stop-Signs.* All intersections, with the exception of El Salto Drive/Hollister Avenue and El Salto Drive/Livermore Avenue, within the neighborhood have stop-controlled approaches. When warranted, intersections can be controlled by stop signs. These regulatory signs assign the right-of-way at intersections and require motorists to stop and check traffic before crossing. Although the installation of stop signs at the El Salto Drive/Hollister Avenue and El Salto Drive/Livermore Avenue intersections would not be warranted based on the traffic volumes or accident history, we are of the opinion that installing (two-way) stop signs should be considered because of the inadequate sight distances. Visibility at the intersection corners is very limited, especially when there are cars parked near street corners.

Typically, the stop signs would be placed on the minor (lower volume) street, which would be Hollister and Livermore avenues. The stop signs would require the traffic on Hollister and

Livermore Avenues to slow down and come to a complete stop. The travel speeds on El Salto Drive are likely to increase because it will have the right-of-way and does not have to slow down as much compared to the current situation. In addition, residents should be aware that (a) drivers may not come to a complete stop, or stop at all, at low volume intersections such as these, (b) vehicle acceleration and deceleration near stop signs will increase noise levels, and (c) placing stop signs at intersections could cause an increase in travel speeds. Studies have shown that motorists tend to accelerate to higher speeds to make up for the time lost at stop sign. Other studies have found that vehicle speeds will decrease within 200 feet of a stop-controlled intersection, but speeds will remain unchanged or increase between intersections.

As listed above in Section 4.11.1(d) (Regulatory Setting), the City of Capitola General Plan and the City of Capitola Bicycle Transportation Plan contain policies to ensure the expansion and safe use of the bicycle system in the City of Capitola. The project does not propose any new bicycle or pedestrian pathways that could conflict with any of these policies.

Transit Service. The *Traffic Impact Analysis* (Hexagon, 2014) assumed a 3% transit mode share. This means that 3% of the guests going to the hotel could use public transit, bicycle paths, or walk to the site. Using the assumption of 3% transit mode share, the project would create up to one new transit rider during the peak hours. This new rider could be accommodated by the available capacity of the two local bus routes, which have stops located within a one-half-mile walking distance of the site. Thus, no improvements to the existing transit facilities would be needed in conjunction with the proposed project.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements that pertain to bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and transit services.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. As impacts would be less than significant, mitigation would not be required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

c. Cumulative Impacts.

Impact T-6 The proposed project plus cumulative growth would add vehicle trips to local roads and intersections. At the intersection of Bay Avenue and Hill Street these impacts would be Class II, *less than significant with mitigation.*

As stated in Chapter 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two cumulative projects proposed in the City of Capitola. These include a senior residential facility and a recreational park. These two projects would not generate a large volume of traffic in the project area due to their location, scale and the nature of the proposed uses. Cumulative development projects within the Depot Hill area are limited to minor additions to existing single-family residences; construction, demolition and replacement of existing single-family residences and associated accessory structures; or alterations of small multi-family dwellings. Because these improvements are made to existing structures and developed lots, the impact on traffic is minimal.

In order to more accurately determine the cumulative future traffic scenario for the proposed project, the roadway network was assumed to be the same as described under existing conditions. Traffic volumes under cumulative conditions were conservatively estimated by applying an annual growth rate of 1.0% to the existing volumes over three years, then adding the project trips. Growth factors are commonly used to estimate potential traffic growth resulting from future projects where there are few to no known pending projects (such is the case within the City of Capitola). A comparison of traffic counts collected in 2008 with those collected in 2013 indicate at most a 3% increase in traffic volumes over five years. The purpose of analyzing cumulative conditions is to assess the future traffic conditions that would occur at the time that the proposed development becomes occupied. For this analysis, the assumed occupancy date is 2016.

The results of the intersection level of service and signal warrant analyses under cumulative conditions are summarized in Table 4.11-9. As shown in the table, the results indicate that the cumulative growth in traffic volumes would result in the degradation of levels of service at the Bay Avenue and Hill Street intersection from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS D during the weekday PM and Saturday peak hours under cumulative, with and without project, conditions.

As discussed above under *Methodology and Significance Thresholds*, for the purpose of this analysis, a project's contribution to a cumulatively significant impact is deemed considerable if the proportion of project traffic represents 3% or more of the increase in total volume from existing traffic conditions to cumulative traffic conditions. The proposed project would account for more than 3% of total projected traffic volume growth at this intersection. Therefore, the proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable level of service impact at this intersection.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to cumulative traffic impacts.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. The following mitigation measure is required to reduce the project's contribution to the cumulative traffic impact at the Bay Avenue and Hill Street intersection.

T-6 Fair Share Contribution. Prior to issuance of final occupancy permits for the proposed project, the project proponent shall either pay into the City's Transportation Impact Fee Program, if adopted, or consult with the City of Capitola to determine the project's fair share of the improvements to the intersection of Bay Avenue of Hill Street.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Mitigation Measure T-6 would reduce impacts to the Bay Avenue and Hill Street intersection. Impacts would be less than significant.

			Existing (Conditions	Cumu	lative No	o Project	Cumulative With Project				
Intersection	LOS Standard	Time Period	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Change in Delay	Delay	LOS	Change in Delay	% Volume Increase	
Monterey Ave and Capitola Ave	D	AM PM SAT	14.2 25.7 12.0	B D B	14.9 29.1 12.4	B D B	0.7 3.4 0.4	14.9 29.3 12.5	B D B	0.7 3.6 0.5	- -	
Monterey Ave and Escalona Dr	D	AM PM SAT	14.2 28.2 21.2	B D C	14.6 30.0 22.2	B D C	0.4 1.8 1.0	14.8 32.4 23.8	B D C	0.6 4.2 2.6	- - -	
Monterey Ave and Park Ave	С	AM PM SAT	20.9 19.9 12.2	C C B	22.9 21.9 12.6	C C B	2.0 2.0 0.4	23.5 22.7 13.0	C C B	2.6 2.8 0.8	- - -	
Monterey Ave and Bay Ave	С	AM PM SAT	12.0 11.4 10.6	B B B	12.4 11.7 10.9	B B B	0.4 0.3 0.3	12.6 12.0 11.1	B B B	0.6 0.6 0.5	- -	
Capitola Ave and Bay Ave	С	AM PM SAT	20.0 20.0 21.6	ССС	21.8 21.6 23.5	ССС	1.8 1.6 1.9	22.4 22.7 25.0	ССС	2.4 2.7 3.4	-	
Bay Ave and Hill St	С	AM PM SAT	18.4 24.1 26.0	C C D	19.6 26.5 29.0	C D D	1.2 2.4 3.0	20.1 27.6 30.6	C D D	1.7 3.5 4.6	- 25% 29%	
Bay Ave and Hwy 1 SB Ramps	С	AM PM SAT	20.8 21.5 21.5	C C C	21.3 22.1 22.0	C C C	0.5 0.6 0.5	21.4 22.5 22.3	C C C	0.6 1.0 0.8	- -	
Porter St and Hwy 1 NB Ramps	С	AM PM SAT	34.8 30.8 23.6	C C C	36.3 32.6 24.6	D C C	1.5 1.8 1.0	36.4 32.9 24.9	D C C	1.6 2.1 1.3	6% - -	
Park Ave and Hwy 1 NB Ramps	С	AM PM SAT	13.8 14.9 13.3	B B B	14.1 15.3 13.6	B B B	0.3 0.4 0.3	14.2 15.4 13.6	B B B	0.4 0.5 0.3	- -	
Park Ave and Hwy 1 SB Ramps	С	AM PM SAT	15.4 15.6 12.8	B B B	15.7 15.8 12.9	B B B	0.3 0.2 0.1	15.7 15.8 12.9	B B B	0.3 0.2 0.1	-	

Table 4.11-9Cumulative Intersection Capacity Analysis

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc., March 2014

Impact T-7 The proposed project plus cumulative growth would add vehicle trips to local roads and intersections. At the intersection of Porter Street and Highway 1 these impacts would be Class I, *significant and unavoidable*.

The results of the intersection level of service and signal warrant analyses under cumulative conditions are summarized above in Table 4.11-9. As shown in the table, cumulative growth in traffic volumes would result in the degradation of levels of service at the Porter Street and Highway 1 intersection from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS D during the weekday PM and Saturday peak hours under cumulative, with or without project, conditions.

As discussed above under *Methodology and Significance Thresholds*, for the purpose of this analysis, a project's contribution to a cumulatively significant impact is deemed considerable if the proportion of project traffic represents 3% or more of the increase in total volume from existing traffic conditions to cumulative traffic conditions. The proposed project would account for more than 3% of total projected traffic volume growth at this intersection. Therefore, the proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable level of service impact.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to cumulative traffic impacts.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Improvements to the Porter Street/Bay Avenue interchange (the location of the Porter Street and Highway 1 NB ramps) as part of the Highway 1 HOV Lane widening project have been identified and are currently being studied. These improvements would include modifying the existing interchanges at 41st Avenue and Porter Street/Bay Avenue into a single interchange to improve safety and traffic operations. Environmental evaluation of the project is underway. However, no funding has been identified for the completion of the project. There is no mechanism in place for the project proponent to contribute to the funding of this improvement therefore no mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. Since there is no mitigation available for this intersection, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact T-8 The proposed project plus cumulative growth would add vehicle trips to freeway segments in the area. These impacts would be Class I *significant and unavoidable*.

Traffic volumes for cumulative conditions on each of the studied freeway segments were developed by adding the projected growth in volume and project trips to existing condition volumes. The project trips were assigned to the freeway system in the same manner as with intersections. The freeway segment analysis indicates that each of the freeway segments analyzed is currently and projected to continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS D or worse in the peak commute direction during the AM and PM peak hours under cumulative no project conditions. The addition of cumulative trips (both cumulative with and without project trips) collectively would create a significant adverse traffic impact on each of the segments identified to operate at unacceptable levels. The freeway segment analysis is presented in Table 4.11-10.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements</u>. There are no existing regulatory requirements applicable to cumulative traffic impacts.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Caltrans has identified improvements to Highway 1 via the Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane widening project, including the studied freeway segments. However, since it is not feasible for an individual development project to bear responsibility for implementing such extensive transportation system improvements due to constraints in acquisition and cost of right-of-way, and no comprehensive project to add the HOV lanes has been developed by Caltrans for individual projects to contribute to, the significant impacts on the directional freeway segments identified above must be considered significant and unavoidable.

<u>Significance After Mitigation</u>. As stated above, there are no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce the cumulative impact to freeway segments. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

This page intentionally left blank.

				Existing Conditions					Cumulative No Project					Project Trips			Cumulative with Project Conditions									
				AM Peak Hour (pc/mi/ln) PM F		PM Pea	PM Peak Hour (pc/mi/In)		ļ	AM Peak Hou	r (pc/mi/l	n)	PM Peak Hour (pc/mi/ln)		AM	РМ	AM Peak Hour (pc/mi/ln)		ni/In)	PM Pea	M Peak Hour (pc/mi/ln)					
Segment	LOS Standard	Direction	# of Lanes	Volume	Density	LOS	Volume	Density	LOS	Volume	Density	LOS	Change in Density	Volume	Density	LOS	Change in Density	Volume	Volume	Volume	Density	LOS	Volume	Density	LOS	Change in Density
SR 1 between State Park Drive and Park Avenue	C C	WB EB	2 2	3,589 2,108	31.2 16.5	D B	3,317 3,788	27.8 34.1	D D	3,697 2,171	32.7 17.0	D B	1.5 0.5	3,417 3,902	29.0 35.9	D E	1.2 1.8	2 2	4 4	3,699 2,173	32.7 17.0	D B	3,421 3,906	29.0 35.9	D D	1.2 1.8
SR 1 between Park Avenue and Bay Avenue	C C	WB EB	2 2	3,733 2,565	33.2 20.3	D C	3,318 3,564	27.8 30.9	D D	3,845 2,642	35.0 20.9	D C	1.8 0.6	3,418 3,671	29.0 32.3	D D	1.2 1.4	0 0	0 0	3,845 2,642	35.0 20.9	D C	3,418 3,671	29.0 32.3	D D	1.2 1.4
SR 1 between bay Avenue and 41 st Avenue	C C	WB EB	2 2	4,348 2,784	44.5 22.2	E C	3,452 3,565	29.4 30.9	D D	4,478 2,868	47.6 23.0	F C	3.1 0.8	3,556 3,672	30.8 32.4	D D	1.4 1.5	4 4	8 8	4,482 2,872	47.7 23.1	F C	3,564 3,680	30.9 32.5	D D	1.5 1.6

Table 4.11-10Cumulative Conditions Freeway Segment Levels of Service

Source: Hexagon Transportation Consultants, October 2013.

7

This page intentionally left blank.

4.12 UTILITIES

4.12.1 Setting

a. Water Supply. Water supply for the City of Capitola, including existing supply to the subject site, is provided by the Soquel Creek Water District (SqCWD). The SqCWD service area, existing supply infrastructure, a description of the water supplies available to the District, and the current requirements applicable to the proposed project are described below.

<u>Soquel Creek Water District</u>. Founded in 1961, the SqCWD encompasses seven miles of shoreline along Monterey Bay, and extends from one to three miles inland into the foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains (refer to Figure 4.12-1). The SqCWD serves a population of approximately 37,720 (SqCWD, 2011), 9,988 of which is within the City of Capitola (California Department of Finance, January 2013). The City of Capitola is the only incorporated area within the SqCWD. The SqCWD currently receives 100% of its water from groundwater aquifers in the Soquel-Aptos area. SqCWD relies entirely on groundwater from the Purisima Formation and the Aromas Red Sands aquifers, as shown in Figure 4.12-2. The Aromas Red Sands aquifer underlies the southern third of the SqCWD's service area and does not serve the City of Capitola. The Purisima Formation underlies the City of Capitola. This formation is in overdraft conditions and is impacted by saltwater intrusion (SqCWD, 2011).

SqCWD's water supply system consists of 18 groundwater production wells, 15 of which are currently active, approximately 130 miles of pipeline, and 18 water storage tanks. The groundwater production wells are shown in Figure 4.12-2. The total estimated production capacity of the system is about 7 million gallons per day (MGD), and the total storage capacity is 7.5 million gallons. According to the SqCWD's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (2011), SqCWD does not project having surplus water supply available through the year 2030.

SqCWD, in cooperation with the City of Santa Cruz, has considered the development of a 2.5 MGD seawater desalination plant, which would function as a backup water supply in times of drought. To date, a one-year pilot study and feasibility studies for intake, brine disposal and pre-treatment have been completed to inform the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). As of October 2013, the Draft EIR for the desalination plant project had been released for public review and comment. However, the future of the desalination project has become uncertain and the SqCWD is re-evaluating other alternatives (SqCWD, September 2013).

Water Demand Offset Program. SqCWD's Water Demand Offset (WDO) Program was adopted in 2003. The program was designed with the intention of allowing new development without further impacting the overdrafted groundwater basin, by requiring proposed development to offset its water use. All proposed new development in SqCWD's service area, including the proposed project, is required to be in compliance with the WDO Program, at the discretion of the SqCWD.

The WDO Policy (SqCWD Resolution No. 13-17) requires certain development projects to offset 1.6 times the amount of their projected water demand to result in a "zero impact" condition on the District's water supply. Projects subject to the resolution include development projects



Soquel Creek Water District



Production Wells and Service Areas

requiring a new water service and development projects with an existing water service that are undergoing a change in use that is expected to increase water demand.

The WDO requirement for new development is based on the SqCWD water use factor for the development type (e.g., single-family home, apartment, condominium, motel/hotel, office, retail store, restaurant, etc.) and the size of the proposed development. For existing development projects undergoing a change in use where water use is expected to increase, WDO requirements for the new proposed use are calculated the same way as for a new development. Credit is applied for the existing or greatest annual use since 2003. A project is required to offset the difference in projected water demand between an existing use or former use and a proposed new use or intensified use. Therefore, for an existing use proposing an increased demand for water, the WDO requirement is based on the net increase of water demand.

An offset multiplier of 1.6 is applied to the WDO requirement so that an applicant offsets 160% of a project's projected water demand. To assure the WDO requirement is properly calculated for a given project, a project applicant must first contact SqCWD and present proposed building plans. This typically occurs during discretionary approval review (Shelly Flock, personal communication, October 15, 2013).

Previously, applicants were able to purchase WDO credits through the SqCWD and then apply this reduced amount of water supply to their proposed project's water demand. However, as of October 2013, the SqCWD no longer makes WDO credits available for applicants to purchase (SqCWD, October 2013). Therefore, in order to meet the WDO requirement, future applicants must locate and install off-site water-saving retrofits (e.g., toilet replacements, turf removal, etc.). SqCWD estimates that opportunities to earn credits for retrofitting off-site toilets within its service area have become increasingly limited, with approximately 85% of toilets in its service area having already been retrofitted (Shelly Flock, personal communication, October 15, 2013). However, opportunities exist for credits through turf removal activities (e.g. replacing school playing fields with artificial grass, thereby reducing the water demand for such areas) (Shelly Flock, personal communication, October 23, 2013).

In addition, SqCWD guidelines also include a District-approved list of other water-saving retrofits that may be completed at ether on- or off-site locations to qualify for offset credit and the requirements for completing retrofits. This includes, but is not limited to: ultra-high efficiency toilets, showerheads, and faucets; waterless urinals; hot-water recirculation systems; graywater plumbing or connections; and/or elimination of turf landscaping). An applicant must request pre-approval for any proposed retrofit type that is not on the SqCWD's approved list. District staff evaluates the proposed retrofit and if approved, provides the applicant with the amount of offset that can be obtained for performing the retrofit. A calculated percentage of expected water to be saved would then be subtracted from the project's overall water demand, which lowers the WDO offset.

Applicants may not begin performing retrofits and collecting offsets for a development project until a building permit (or a tentative map) has been granted. Once the WDO requirement has been met, changing the ownership of the site or minor details of the project will not affect the offset credit that has been approved. However, changes in water use or additions to the project may require additional water demand calculations. When retrofit credits collected are more than the required WDO requirement, the applicant cannot sell or transfer unused credits from a project.

SqCWD Indoor and Landscape Water Use Efficiency Ordinances. The SqCWD Board of Directors approved the Indoor and Landscape Water Use Efficiency Ordinances at a public meeting held on August 17, 2010, as SqCWD Ordinance No.'s 10-01 and 10-02, respectively. The Ordinances require indoor and outdoor water conservation devices, features, and practices in all new development and certain existing development, as a condition for obtaining new or expanded water service, or in the case of certain existing development, receiving continued water service. All proposed new development in SqCWD's service area, including the proposed project, is required to be in compliance with the Indoor and Landscape Water Use Efficiency Ordinances, at the discretion of the SqCWD.

Go Green Credit Program. An applicant may exceed the minimum requirements of the SqCWD Indoor and Landscape Water Use Efficiency Ordinances by installing advanced water conservation devices, features, and practices in accordance with SqCWD's Go Green Credit Program. SqCWD guidelines allow applicants to add these "green building components" to a project in order to receive a lowered WDO requirement. Applicants for new projects, including the proposed project, may lower their ultimate water factor (demand) by coordinating proposed on-site green building components for their proposed development with the SqCWD. If SqCWD determines the Go Green Credit Program to be applicable for a proposed project, the ultimate WDO offset amount would be reduced by a percentage amount determined by SqCWD (Shelly Flock, personal communication, October 23, 2013).

b. Wastewater. Wastewater conveyance for the City of Capitola is provided by the Santa Cruz County Sanitation District (SCCSD). An overview of the SCCSD is provided below.

Santa Cruz County Sanitation District. The SCCSD was formed as an autonomous district in 1973, and encompasses the City of Capitola, the unincorporated community of Live Oak, portions of the unincorporated communities of Aptos and Soquel, and other unincorporated parts of Santa Cruz County. The purpose of the SCCSD is to construct and maintain pipelines transporting waste from the SCCSD service area to the City of Santa Cruz Wastewater Treatment Facility, located at Neary Lagoon, approximately five miles west of the project site. The SCCSD also provides instruction, services, and monitoring for environmental compliance. The SCCSD funds its capital improvement projects through collection of sewer service fees, grants, bond sales, and various state and federal loan programs.

The City of Santa Cruz Wastewater Treatment Facility has a permitted capacity of 17 MGD, and approximately 8.5 to 9 MGD is currently being used (Dan Seidel, personal communication, October 28, 2013). The SCCSD service area generates approximately 5 to 6 MGD of the total average flow to the City of Santa Cruz Wastewater Treatment Facility, and has rights of up to 8 MGD (SCCSD, 2013). Table 4.12-1 displays the capacity and flow projections for the City of Santa Cruz Wastewater Treatment Facility. Based on the figures presented therein, the City of Santa Cruz Wastewater Treatment Facility would have a remaining capacity of 6.22 MGD in 2020.

Table 4.12-1Treatment Capacity and Flow Projections for Wastewater Treatment Facilitiesin Santa Cruz County (million gallons per day)

	Permitted	Flov	Average			
I reatment Facility/Areas Served	Capacity	2010	2015	2020	Annual Increase	
City of Santa Cruz Wastewater						
Treatment Facility						
City of Santa Cruz						
City of Capitola						
Live Oak	17.00	10.25	10.50	10.78	0.5%	
Soquel						
Aptos						
CSA 57 – Graham Hill						
UC Santa Cruz						

Source: City of Santa Cruz, 2009.

c. Solid Waste. The City of Capitola has a franchise agreement with Green Waste Recovery for the collection of refuse, recycling, and yard waste. Solid waste collected in the City of Capitola is transferred to the Monterey Peninsula Class III Landfill located in the City of Marina, approximately twenty miles southeast of the project site, and operated by the Monterey Regional Waste Management District. Other nearby landfills include the City of Santa Cruz Landfill, the City of Watsonville Landfill, and Buena Vista Landfill. Table 4.12-2 shows the remaining capacity and closure date for the nearby landfills.

Table 4.12-2Remaining Capacity of Landfills in the Project Vicinity

	Remaining Capacity (cubic yards)	Estimated Closure Date
Landfill Serving the Project		
Monterey Peninsula Class III Landfill	48,560,000	February 28, 2107
Other Nearby Landfills		
City of Santa Cruz Sanitary Landfill	6,150,000	January 1, 2052
City of Watsonville Landfill	2,009,550	December 31, 2029
Buena Vista Drive Sanitary Landfill	3,303,649	July 1, 2031

Source: CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System Database, Facility Site Listings. Accessed July 23, 2013.

d. Stormwater Drainage. The project site is bounded by the coastal bluff along its southern perimeter with Escalona Drive located along the northern perimeter. The coastal blufftop is approximately 95 feet above the beach below and consists of about 28 feet of marine terrace deposits overlying weakly cemented sandstone bedrock. The site is partially paved, partially landscaped, and developed with the existing structures of the Monarch Cove Inn, including an historic Victorian structure. Gravel pathways link the cottages and buildings.

The Santa Cruz County Flood Control District, the Water Conservation District, and the City of Capitola provide stormwater drainage for Capitola. The City of Capitola maintains its street drainage systems and relies on the County to provide major storm drain services. The infrastructure associated with flood protection and stormwater drainage includes underground systems, above ground drainage ditches and water courses, pump stations, catch basins, and

outfalls. Stormwater from project site drains into the adjacent Escalona Gulch. Escalona Gulch is located along the eastern boundary of the site and drains out into Monterey Bay.

4.12.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds. In accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines,* a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in any of the following conditions:

- 1) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board;
- 2) 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;
- 3) 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;
- 4) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources;
- 5) 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;
- 6) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal need; and/or,
- 7) Be incompliant with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

As discussed in the Initial Study (Appendix A), the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on wastewater generation or conveyance, nor would the project result in a significant impact related to solid waste generation. As such, these potential impacts are not further discussed in this section.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Impact U-1 The proposed project would result in an increase in water demand at the site over existing conditions. Despite current water supply deficiencies and uncertain future water supply sources, compliance with SqCWD retrofit requirements, included herein as mitigation, would reduce impacts to a Class II, *significant but mitigable*, level.

Water required for operation of the proposed project would include water for landscaping maintenance, bathrooms, housekeeping, a proposed catering kitchen, and laundry service. As previously described, the project site is served by the SqCWD. According to the SqCWD's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the SqCWD does not have water available to serve new or intensified development. Because the project would increase water demand compared to existing conditions, this represents a potentially significant impact.

The addition of 30 new rooms would nearly quadruple the amount of rooms on the site, representing a substantial increase in water demand compared to existing conditions. In addition, the proposed project would include an approximately 345 square foot (sf) kitchen

facility, which would be used for catering of on-site events. Although the number, size, and types of events are not proposed to change, the addition of this facility represents an increase in water demand on the site because food preparation and associated water use for these events would now occur on-site.

To estimate the project's increase in water demand, SqCWD's water demand factors for both hotels (0.122 acre feet per year [AFY]/room) and restaurants (1.154 AFY/1,000 square feet) were used (SqCWD, July 2013). The demand factor for hotels includes the anticipated water use for landscaping. It should be noted that the demand factor for the proposed kitchen facility is considered a conservative estimate of water demand, given that the proposed kitchen would not be used on a daily basis, as would a restaurant kitchen.

As shown in Table 4.12-3, the addition of 30 hotel rooms would represent an increased water demand of 3.7 AFY, while the proposed kitchen facility would generate an estimated 0.4 AFY, for a net increase of 4.1 AFY over existing conditions at the site.

	Size	Demand Factor	Demand (AFY)	WDO Offset (Demand x 160%)	Net Demand (Demand- Offset)
Existing	11 rooms	0.122 AFY/room	1.3	-	-
Proposed Rooms	30 rooms	0.122 AFY/room	3.7	-	-
Proposed Kitchen	345 sf	1.154 AFY/1,000 sf	0.4		
Total			5.4		
Net			4.1	-6.6	-2.5

Table 4.12-3 Water Demand

Source: New Water Demand Offset Form, Soquel Creek Water District, July 2013.

Prior to project approval, the applicant would be required to comply with SqCWD's WDO offset program. As described above, this would include offsetting 1.6 times the net increase in water demand. As shown in Table 4.12-3, this equates to approximately 6.6 AFY. If the applicant complies with this requirement, the post-WDO net demand of the project would be a decrease of approximately 2.5 AFY compared to existing conditions.

According to the SqCWD (Shelly Flock, personal communication, October 23, 2013), this level of WDO offset would be feasible, and could be met through a combination of off-site toilet retrofits and/or turf replacement. In addition, the applicant may elect to lower the WDO offset requirement (calculated here as -6.6 FY) by exceeding minimum indoor and landscaping efficiency requirements in accordance with the SqCWD's Go Green Credit Program, as described previously. By installing pre-approved green measures (for example, ultra-high efficiency toilets, showerheads, and faucets; waterless urinals; hot-water recirculation systems; graywater plumbing or connections; and/or elimination of turf landscaping), a calculated percentage of expected water to be saved would be subtracted from the project's overall water demand, which lowers the WDO offset.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As discussed above, the proposed project would be required to comply with SqCWD's Indoor and Landscape Water Use Efficiency Ordinances, which require installation of indoor and outdoor water conservation devices, features, and

practices as a condition for obtaining new or expanded water service. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the WDO offset program. As calculated herein, this may require the applicant to offset up to 6.6 AFY through off-site toilet retrofits and/or turf replacement. The amount of the WDO offset may be reduced, depending on the inclusion of pre-approved green measures in accordance with SqCWD's Go Green Credit Program. The final WDO offset amount would be calculated and approved by the SQCWD.

Although SqCWD does not have water available to serve new or intensified development, such as that proposed by the project, compliance with these existing requirements would result in a net decrease in water demand within the District service area of up to 2.5 AFY. According to the SqCWD (Shelly Flock, personal communication, October 23, 2013), achieving the required level of offset is feasible. Thus, despite the lack of additional water for new and expanded development, compliance with existing requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. Although compliance with existing SqCWD requirements would result in a net decrease in water use, these existing requirements have not been widely applied within the SqCWD service area for a project of this size. Therefore, the requirements are reiterated herein as mitigation to ensure they are implemented prior to project development.

U-1 Water Demand Offset. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a water demand offset plan to the satisfaction of the Soquel Creek Water District to ensure that proposed water demand offsets comply with District requirements.

Following issuance of building permits but prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the project applicant shall achieve water offsets in accordance with SqCWD requirements. This shall be achieved through installation of off-site water-saving retrofits (including toilet retrofits and/or turf replacement). Installation of onsite water-saving retrofits that exceed the requirements of the Indoor and Landscape Water Use Efficiency Ordinances (including, but not limited to: ultra-high efficiency toilets, showerheads, and faucets; waterless urinals; hot-water recirculation systems; graywater plumbing or connections; and/or elimination of turf landscaping) may also be used to reduce on-site water demand at the site and thus the requirement for off-site retrofit measures. On-site measures shall be approved in advance of installation by the SqCWD and factored into the calculation of the off-site retrofit requirements. The final offsite offset amount shall be subject to review and approval by the SqCWD prior to implementation.

<u>Significance After Mitigation.</u> Impacts would be less than significant pursuant to compliance with existing SqCWD requirements and mitigation identified herein.

Impact U-2 The proposed project would include upgrades to drainage, water quality, and stormwater management systems on the project site. Impacts related to the need for additional facilities, the construction of which could have environmental impacts, would be Class III, *less than significant*.

The proposed project would increase the site's impervious area from 15,878 square feet to 23,550 square feet. To manage stormwater runoff, the project would include low impact development (LID) elements, including porous paving, perforated sub-drain pipes on the paved entry drive, and a 450 square foot water detention rain garden (refer to Figure 2-8 in Section 2.0, *Project Description*). In addition, the project would include 1,133 cubic feet of detention and proposes to meet the County of Santa Cruz Design Criteria for stormwater detention basins. The project also proposes to comply with the Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region (Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB] Resolution No. R3-2012-0025, September 6, 2012). In accordance with these requirements, a combination of LID treatments and the proposed detention system would provide 48 hour extended detention for water quality treatment for the 85th percentile 24-hour rainfall event.

Compliance with applicable County and RWQCB standards would ensure that the project would not require the construction of additional stormwater drainage facilities beyond what is already proposed, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, impacts related to stormwater drainage facilities would be less than significant.

<u>Existing Regulatory Requirements.</u> As described above, the proposed project would be required to comply with the County of Santa Cruz Design Criteria for stormwater detention basins and RWQCB Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region. Compliance with these standards would ensure that the project would not require the construction of additional stormwater drainage facilities beyond what is already proposed, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, impacts related to stormwater drainage facilities would be less than significant.

<u>Mitigation Measures</u>. No mitigation measures beyond existing regulatory obligations are required.

Significance After Mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. Cumulative Impacts.

Water Supply. As noted in Section 3.0, *Environmental Setting*, there are two proposed projects within the City as of February 2014: Villa Capitola and McGregor Park. Both projects would be anticipated to incrementally increase water demand. However, like the proposed project, all future development in the SqCWD service area would be required to comply with existing SqCWD requirements, including the Indoor and Landscape Water Use Efficiency Ordinances and the WDO offset program. For the proposed project, compliance with these requirements would result in a net water demand decrease of up to 2.5 AFY. These existing requirements have been reiterated herein as mitigation for the project. Thus, project-level

impacts would be significant but mitigable, and would not contribute to a significant cumulative effect. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

Stormwater Drainage. As described above, there are two cumulative projects in the City of Capitola, neither of which are located within the drainage area of the proposed project. Cumulative development projects within the Depot Hill area are limited to minor additions to existing single-family residences; construction, demolition and replacement of existing single-family residences and associated accessory structures; or alterations of small multi-family dwellings. These improvements could increase impervious surface area, thereby necessitating the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. The impacts of these facilities would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis, and individual projects would be required to comply with applicable standards related to stormwater drainage. Further, as noted under Impact U-2, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to stormwater drainage facilities to stormwater drainage facilities impacts related to stormwater drainage.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED DISCUSSIONS

5.1 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

Section 15126(d) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires a discussion of a proposed project's potential to foster economic or population growth, including ways in which a project could remove an obstacle to growth. Growth does not necessarily create significant physical changes to the environment. However, depending upon the type, magnitude, and location of growth, it can result in significant adverse environmental effects. The proposed project's growth inducing potential is therefore considered significant if it could result in significant physical effects in one or more environmental issue areas. The most commonly cited example of how an economic effect might create a physical change is where economic growth in one area could create blight conditions elsewhere by causing existing competitors to go out of business and buildings to be left vacant for extended periods.

5.1.1 Monarch Cove Hotel Project Site

The proposed project would involve the construction of two buildings and an increase from 11 hotel rooms to 41 hotel rooms on site. The project would also involve the demolition of two small cottages, an existing L-shaped building (consisting of garage spaces and the hotel office), and an outdoor deck. The completion of this project would incrementally increase the number of visitors to the hotel and the City of Capitola, but would not require an extension of infrastructure or roads, or expansion of infrastructure that could facilitate development on additional properties. Occupants of the hotel would be temporary, and the proposed project does not include any new housing, roads, or other growth infrastructure.

The proposed hotel would generate short-term employment opportunities during construction and long-term employment opportunities associated with the operation and maintenance of the hotel. However, both temporary and long-term employment opportunities would be expected to be filled from within the existing community and long-term employment would be nominal (up to eight additional full time employees). Therefore, construction of the project and operation of the 41-room hotel would not be considered growth inducing and impacts related to direct or indirect population growth would be less than significant.

5.1.2 Removal of Obstacles to Growth

The proposed project would be located in a developed residential area, generally served by existing infrastructure. The Initial Study (Appendix A) found that the project would not create the need for any upgrades to the area's existing water, sewer, circulation and drainage connection infrastructure that would facilitate development beyond the project site. However, if any such improvements were necessary, they would be sized to accommodate the project's contribution to existing service needs.

The proposed project would not provide for any capacity-increasing transportation and circulation improvements. No new roadways are proposed. The project constitutes infill development within an urbanized area and does not require the extension of new infrastructure through undeveloped areas.

The proposed project does not include changes in land use or zoning designations, nor does it include changes in density limits, which are contained in adopted City regulations and policies. Therefore, the proposed project would not facilitate growth in the surrounding area by removing any land use, zoning, or density restrictions, which could currently be considered obstacales to such growth.

5.2 IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require that EIRs evaluating projects involving amendments to public plans, ordinances, or policies contain a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes. CEQA also requires decisionmakers to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve a project. This section addresses non-renewable resources, the commitment of future generations to the proposed uses, and irreversible impacts associated with the proposed project.

Conversion of the project site from an 11 room inn to a 41 room hotel would likely result in a long-term commitment of the site to an increased level of use and number of visitors. These actions would alter the urban built environment in ways that have been found in this EIR to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The project would involve the use of building materials and energy, some of which are non-renewable resources. Consumption of these resources would occur with any development in the region and are not unique to the project. Resources that would be consumed as a result of project implementation include water, electricity, and fossil fuels during construction and operations; however, the amount and rate of consumption of these resources would not result in significant environmental impacts or the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. Compliance with all applicable building codes, as well as City policies, and the mitigation measures identified in this EIR would ensure that all natural resources are conserved to the extent feasible.

CEQA also requires decision makers to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve a project. The analysis contained in this EIR identifies the following Class I, *significant and unavoidable* impacts relative to the implementation of the proposed project:

- Traffic generated by the proposed project would increase traffic volumes and incrementally reduce levels of service at four of the six studied freeway segments. The level of service impact caused by the proposed project under "existing plus project" conditions at these four segments would exceed Caltrans thresholds. Therefore, impacts would be Class I, *significant and unavoidable*.
- The proposed project plus cumulative growth would add vehicle trips to local roads and intersections. At the intersection of Porter Street and Highway 1 these impacts would be Class I, *significant and unavoidable*.
- The proposed project plus cumulative growth would add vehicle trips to freeway segments in the area. These impacts would be Class I *significant and unavoidable*.

6.0 ALTERNATIVES

As required by Section 15126.6 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, this EIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the project's significant environmental effects. Per the *State CEQA Guidelines*, project alternatives should include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the project's significant environmental effects. The project applicant's objective is to expand the capacity of the Monarch Cove Inn from its current occupancy of 11 guest rooms into a 41-room boutique hotel providing attractive overnight accommodations and special-purpose event space serving families and organizations locally and from outside the area who are seeking a quiet retreat-type atmosphere.

Four alternatives are analyzed herein, including the CEQA-required "no project" alternative and three alternate development scenarios for the site. This section also identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The following alternatives are evaluated:

- Alternative 1: No Project
- Alternative 2: Reduced Project
- Alternative 3: Alternative Access
- Alternative 4: Modified Project (No Events)

Table 6-1 provides a summary comparison of the development characteristics of the proposed project and the alternatives. A more detailed description of the alternatives is included in the impact analysis for each alternative.

6.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT

6.1.1 Alternative Description

This alternative assumes that the proposed hotel expansion and associated improvements are not implemented. Thus, the project site would continue to be occupied by the existing 11-room Monarch Cove Inn, which consists of nine rooms in the historic Victorian structure, two guest cottages used as sleeping rooms, and an outside deck that is used to host special events. Site access would continue to be via El Salto Drive. The hotel would continue to operate under an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP) that limits events to a maximum of 40 guests Monday through Thursday and 75 guests Friday through Sunday; requires the use of shuttles from an off-site parking area for larger events; limits weddings or events to no more than one per day, two per week, and six per month; requires adherence to the City Municipal Code standards for noise limits and use of amplified sound; and requires a security guard to be present on-site during all events to control traffic, parking, and guests.

6.1.2 Impact Analysis

This alternative would involve no change to the project site's physical characteristics and thus would have no environmental impacts. The proposed project's significant, but mitigable impacts related to demolition of the two on-site cottages and modification of nesting bird and

monarch butterfly habitat would be avoided. Other project impacts would be avoided as well, including the proposed project's significant traffic impacts. Overall, this alternative's impacts would be reduced compared to those of the proposed project. However, this alternative would not meet the primary project objective of expanding the capacity of the Monarch Cove Inn.

	Alternative											
Characteristic	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Alternative Access	Alternative 4: Modified Project (No Events)							
Demolition	Two cottages, ^a L-shaped building, outdoor deck	None	L-shaped building	Two cottages, ^b L-shaped building, outdoor deck	Two cottages, ^b L-shaped building, outdoor deck							
Relocation	Victorian building (temporarily during construction), two cottages ^a	None	Victorian building (temporarily during construction), Two cottages	Victorian building (temporarily during construction), Two cottages	Victorian building (temporarily during construction), Two cottages							
New Buildings	lew Buildings 2 (both 2-story)		1 (2-story);	2 (both 2-story)	2 (both 2-story)							
Hotel Rooms												
New (Net)	30	0	11	30	40							
Total	41	11	22	41	51							
New Parking	2-level, below grade parking garage with 56 stalls and 27 bicycle spaces; 4 surface spaces	2-level, below grade parking garage with 56 stalls and 27 None bicycle spaces; 4 surface spaces		2-level, below grade parking garage with 56 stalls and 27 bicycle spaces; 4 surface spaces	2-level, below grade parking garage with 58 stalls and 27 bicycle spaces; 4 surface spaces							
Site Access	Primary from El Salto Drive; secondary from Escalona Drive	No change	Primary from El Salto Drive; secondary from Escalona Drive	Primary from Park Avenue; secondary from Escalona Drive	Primary from El Salto Drive; secondary from Escalona Drive							

 Table 6-1

 Comparison of Project Alternatives Buildout Characteristics

a. Although the project applicant has proposed to demolish the two existing guest cottages, mitigation contained in this EIR would require the cottages to be preserved and relocated within the project site (refer to Section 4.4, Cultural Resources). It is assumed that the relocated cottages will not be used as sleeping rooms.

b. As with the proposed project, mitigation would require that these two cottages be relocated on-site under this alternative. It is assumed that the relocated cottages will not be used as sleeping rooms.

6.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: REDUCED PROJECT

6.2.1 Alternative Description

This alternative would involve an expansion of the Monarch Cove Inn from its current 11 rooms to 22 rooms, representing a 46% reduction in overall rooms as compared to the proposed project and a 63% reduction in new rooms (11 versus 30). To accommodate the 11-room expansion, it is

anticipated that the existing L-shaped building (garage spaces and hotel office) would be demolished, but that the outdoor deck and two cottages proposed for demolition as part of the project would be preserved, relocated on-site and continued to be used as hotel sleeping rooms. As such, events would continue to occur primarily outside under this alternative, as an indoor pavilion would not be constructed. One new two-story building with 11 rooms would be built, bringing the total number of on-site hotel rooms to 22. Parking would be provided in a surface parking lot with 28 stalls and 14 bicycle spaces (half of what is proposed as part of the two-level below grade garage included in the project). The surface parking lot would be constructed in lieu of proposed landscaping. Similar to the proposed project, primary site access would be from El Salto Drive, with secondary access provided from Escalona Drive.

Because of the limited size of the expansion under this alternative, the hotel would maintain its current character in lieu of the proposed conversion to a "boutique" hotel. As such, this alternative would not include such amenities as valet parking, 24-hour concierge service, enhanced landscaping, and possibly trails for ADA and neighbor access.

The purpose of this alternative is to reduce overall impacts associated with the size of the proposed hotel expansion and to reduce potential historic resource impacts associated with demolition of the two existing on-site cottages that are proposed for demolition.

6.2.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics. This alternative would reduce the intensity of on-site development as compared to the proposed project and would therefore incrementally reduce the potential for impacts related to changes in visual character and increased light and glare. Notably, the number of mature trees to be removed may be reduced under this alternative. On the other hand, this alternative would replace some proposed landscaped areas with surface parking. In addition, the hotel would retain its current character in lieu of the upgrade in quality to a "boutique" hotel proposed as part of the project. Lighting impacts may be slightly lower than those of the proposed project due to the reduced intensity of development. However, this alternative would replace subterranean parking with surface parking, which would offset the reduction in light from site structures.

As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the proposed project's impacts relative to views, visual character, and light/glare would not be significant with implementation of standard City requirements related to building height, landscaping, architectural character, and lighting. This alternative's aesthetic impact may be incrementally lower than that of the proposed project in some ways and greater in others. Overall, aesthetic and light/glare impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project. Light/glare impacts would be potentially significant, but the mitigation measure required for the proposed project would apply and would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

b. Air Quality. Under this alternative, both construction-related and operational emissions would be reduced as compared to those of the proposed project due to the 63% reduction in new rooms (net increase of 11 new rooms versus a net increase of 30 new rooms under the proposed project). Overall air pollutant emissions would be expected to decline commensurately. However, as discussed in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, neither construction-related

emissions nor operational emissions of the proposed project would exceed Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) significance thresholds. Therefore, as with the proposed project, this alternative's impact would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

c. Biological Resources. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have potentially significant impacts related to the removal of on-site trees and associated disturbance of potential habitat for monarch butterflies, nesting birds, and special status species such as California red-legged frog, hoary bat, and pallid bat. The overall number of tree removals may be slightly reduced from the 14 trees to be removed by the proposed project due to the overall reduction in site development. Nevertheless, biological resource impacts would be significant and all mitigation required for the proposed project would apply. Measures include preconstruction surveys, tree protection, and tree replacement. As with the proposed project, these measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

d. Cultural Resources. Unlike the proposed project, this alternative specifies that cottages 1 and 2 are to be preserved and relocated on-site. Therefore, this alternative would avoid the proposed project's significant, but mitigable impact related to demolition of those historic structures. Although the proposed project's impact can be mitigated to a less than significant level (by requiring relocation rather than demolition), this alternative's historic resource impact would be less than significant, and therefore reduced when compared to the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, this alternative would have potentially significant impacts to as yet undiscovered on-site archaeological and paleontological resources. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project and would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

e. Geology. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have potentially significant impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil; however, adherence to local, state, and federal stormwater regulations, coupled with incorporation of recommendations from the geotechnical report (as required as a condition of project approval), would ensure these impacts would be less than significant.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This alternative would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, both during construction and in the long term. Because of the 63% reduction in new hotel rooms, the increase in GHG emissions would be reduced commensurately. As with the proposed project, emissions would not be significant and mitigation would not be required.

g. Hydrology and Water Quality. As with the proposed project, this alternative would result in potential impacts related to erosion/sedimentation and water quality during construction and operation. Although the number of rooms would be reduced, this alternative would construct surface parking in lieu of landscaping. Therefore, total ground disturbance and associated impervious surfaces may increase when compared to the proposed project. Impacts related to construction-related erosion and sedimentation and increased stormwater runoff due to the increase in impervious surfaces would be greater than for the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would be subject to local, state, and federal

requirements pertaining to control of runoff and water quality, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts would be greater than those of the proposed project, but would remain less than significant.

h. Land Use and Planning. Because this alternative would reduce the level of on-site development, this alternative would be consistent with most applicable environmental policies of the Capitola General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Ordinance. However, this alternative would replace proposed landscaping with a paved parking lot. City Municipal Code Section 17.30.140 requires that 50% of the project site consist of landscaped or open space areas. As described in Section 4.8, *Land Use and Planning*, under the proposed project, 52.1% of the project site would be either landscaped or open space. Because the proposed landscaped area would be replaced with a surface parking lot with 28 stalls and 14 bicycle spaces, this alternative would likely not achieve the 50% requirement. Impacts related to policy consistency would therefore be greater than for the proposed project, and new mitigation would be required to redesign the alternative to achieve the landscaping requirement.

i. Noise. Like the proposed project, this alternative would generate temporary noise and vibration impacts during construction and long-term noise impacts associated with operation of the hotel. The duration and intensity of construction-related noise and vibration would be somewhat lower under this alternative due to the overall reduction in building area and elimination of the subterranean parking garage. Nevertheless, noise impacts would be potentially significant and the mitigation measures required for the proposed project would apply. With mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Long-term increases in noise would be somewhat lower than those of the proposed project due to the 63% reduction in new rooms. Traffic noise generation would be commensurately lower and, as with the proposed project, traffic noise impacts would be less than significant. Day-today on-site noise would be reduced to some degree because of the overall reduction in rooms and on-site activity. On the other hand, under this alternative, parking would be provided in a surface parking lot and events at the hotel would continue to be outdoors since no indoor pavilion would be constructed. Therefore, although noise associated with parking and periodic events is not anticipated to be significant, noise levels from these components would be higher than under the proposed project. Overall, similar to the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

j. Public Services. This alternative would incrementally increase demand for police, fire, and emergency services. However, because the increase in on-site rooms would be 63% lower than the proposed project, the increase in demand would be commensurately lower as well. As with the proposed project, no new or expanded facilities would be required. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

k. Traffic and Circulation. This alternative would generate an estimated 6 new AM peak hour trips, 10 PM peak hour trips, 12 Saturday midday peak hour trips. This is lower than the 16 new AM peak hour trips, 28 new PM peak hour trips, and 33 new Saturday midday peak hour trips that would be generated by the proposed project. Consequently, this alternative's impact to the local circulation system would be lower than that of the proposed project; however, the significant impacts related to local streets and freeway segments and cumulative

traffic conditions would likely still occur, but to a lesser extent, and the identified mitigation measures would be required. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would not have significant impacts related to site access or policies, plans, or programs supporting bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and transit service.

1. Utilities. This alternative would increase on-site water demand by an estimated 1.3 acre-feet per year (AFY), which is about 65% lower than the 3.7 AFY increase associated with the proposed project. Nevertheless, as with the proposed project, water supply impacts would be potentially significant. Mitigation required for the project (water offsets in accordance with SqCWD requirements) would apply and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would increase overall impervious surface area onsite. This could incrementally increase storm water runoff from the site, but as with the proposed project, this alternative would include low impact development (LID) elements and on-site detention in accordance with City and County requirements. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, this alternative's impact would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

6.3 ALTERNATIVE 3: ALTERNATIVE ACCESS

6.3.1 Alternative Description

The development characteristics of this alternative would be the same as those of the proposed project. Two existing small cottages, an existing L-shaped building (consisting of garage spaces and the hotel office), and an outdoor deck would be demolished and replaced by a new hotel that would include three buildings: two new buildings, and an existing building to remain, as described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*. As with the proposed project, this alternative would involve a net increase of 30 hotel rooms, bringing the overall number of rooms on-site to 41. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would also include a two-level, below grade parking garage with 56 parking stalls and 27 bicycle parking spaces. Four additional surface parking spaces would also be included near the entrance to the main building.

The only change for this alternative compared to the proposed project is the primary access point. Rather than continuing to provide primary access from El Salto Drive (the current condition), this alternative would relocate the main project driveway to Park Avenue, as shown on Figure 6-1. As a result of the driveway relocation, reconfiguration of on-site circulation would be required. The exact location of the alternative driveway has not been determined, but the driveway would need to extend roughly 200 feet and presumably would be located in the heavily wooded area between the project site and Park Avenue.¹ Specific considerations for this driveway are discussed below.

¹ It should be noted that the exact location of an alternative access driveway has not been determined <u>for analysis of this conceptual alternative</u>, and that the location presented herein, on parcels 036-151-18 and 036-141-23, is intended for informational purposes only.



Basemap Source: Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2013. Site Plan Source: Thacher & Thompson Architects, November 2013.
Property Acquisition. The alternative driveway alignment would extend through two existing off-site parcels: assessor's parcels 036-151-18 and 036-141-23. These parcels are zoned Public Facility-Park Combining District and R-1 Single-Family Residence, respectively. In addition, the alternative driveway alignment may require demolition of an existing accessory structure on Parcel 036-141-23.

Constructing a driveway through this area would require the acquisition of an easement from the adjoining property owner(s), or purchasing the right-of-way. This would rely on the agreement of existing property owners to sell or allow an easement to be recorded for this purpose on their property, which is outside of the control of both the project applicant and the City, and thus cannot be assured.

New At-Grade Railroad Crossing. The alternative access driveway would require a new atgrade crossing of an existing rail line. The rail line in this location is currently owned by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). The rail line (the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line) historically transported lumber, quarried material, and agricultural products out of the Santa Cruz area. Incoming freight included coal and gypsum for delivery to the cement factory located in Davenport. Following the closure of the Davenport cement plant in 2010, freight business on the rail line was reduced by 90 percent. Currently, there is no daily freight service on the rail line outside of the Watsonville/Pajaro area, and passenger rail service is limited to seasonal operations between the City of Santa Cruz and Davenport. Thus, the rail line adjacent to the project site is currently inactive. However, there is potential for freight and/or passenger rail service along this rail line in the future.

New at-grade rail crossings require evaluation and approval by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Rail Crossings Engineering Section (RCES). The authority to construct a new public rail crossing is typically granted by the CPUC through a formal application process outlined in the Rules of Practice and Procedure. Rule 3.7 therein specifies that applications to construct a public road, highway, or street across a railroad must be made by the municipal, county, state, or other governmental authority which proposes the construction. Applications must contain the following information:

- *a)* The rail milepost and either a legal description of the location of the proposed crossing or a location description using a coordinate system that has accuracy comparable to a legal description.
- *b)* Crossing identification numbers of the nearest existing public crossing on each side of the proposed crossing.
- *c) If the proposed crossing is at-grade,*
 - (1) a statement showing the public need to be served by the proposed crossing;
 - (2) a statement showing why a separation of grades is not practicable; and
 - (3) a statement showing the signs, signals, or other crossing warning devises which applicant recommends be provided at the proposed crossing.
- d) A map of suitable scale (50 to 200 feet per inch) showing accurate locations of all streets, roads, property lines, tracks, buildings, structures or other obstructions to view for a distance of at least 400 feet along the railroad and 200 feet along the highway in each direction from the proposed crossing. Such map shall show the character of surface or pavement and width of same, either existing or proposed, on the street or road adjacent to the proposed crossing and on each side thereof.

- *e)* A map of suitable scale (1,000 to 3,000 feet per inch) showing the relation of the proposed crossing to existing roads and railroads in the general vicinity of the proposed crossing.
- *f)* A profile showing the ground line and grade line and rate of grades of approach on all highways and railroads affected by the proposed crossing.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is also involved in grade crossing safety issues, setting standards and providing guidelines for the assessment of safety at a grade crossing and for grade crossing design. These FHWA standards and guidelines include the appropriate use and placement of traffic control devices at and on the approaches to a grade crossing, and the effective integration of grade crossing signals with the other signs, signals and markings on the approaching roadways to ensure the safety of motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. The FHWA *Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Handbook* (2007) states that "opening a new public highway-rail crossing should…consider public necessity, convenience, safety, and economics. Generally, new grade crossings, particularly on mainline tracks, should not be permitted unless no other viable alternatives exist and, even in those instances, consideration should be given to closing one or more existing crossings. If a new grade crossing is to provide access to any land development, the selection of traffic control devices to be installed at the proposed crossing should be based on the projected needs of the fully completed development."

It should also be noted that there is an existing at-grade crossing at Wesley Street/Grove Lane, approximately 300 feet east of the anticipated crossing location for this alternative. The proximity of this existing crossing would require design consideration by the CPUC and FHWA, as applicable, during the evaluation and approval process.

If the access alternative is treated as a private roadway, the at-grade crossing would be subject to Public Utilities Code Section 7537, which states:

The owner of any lands along or through which any railroad is constructed or maintained,² may have such farm or private crossings over the railroad and railroad right of way as are reasonably necessary or convenient for ingress to or egress from such lands, or in order to connect such lands with other adjacent lands of the owner. The owner or operator of the railroad shall construct and at all times maintain such farm or private crossing in a good, safe, and passable condition. The commission shall have the authority to determine the necessity for any crossing and the place, manner, and conditions under which the crossing shall be constructed and maintained, and shall fix and assess the cost and expense thereof.

In addition, Section 7538 of the Public Utilities Code states:

At every farm or private grade crossing of a railroad where no automatic grade crossing protective device is in place there shall be installed, as a means of protecting the crossing, one or more stop signs of the type described in Section 21400 of the Vehicle Code or of such other design as the commission may prescribe unless, after a hearing, the commission shall find that the installation of such sign or signs at a particular crossing would create a hazard or dangerous condition that would not otherwise exist. At any grade crossing where stop signs are installed or

² It should be noted that the alternative access would be located on parcels that are not owned by the project applicant. Therefore, close coordination with the existing property owner(s) would be required if a private crossing is considered.

in place, before traversing such crossing the driver of any vehicle shall stop such vehicle not less than 10 nor more than 50 feet from the nearest rail of the track and while so stopped shall listen, and look in both directions along the track, for any approaching train or other equipment using such rails. The vehicle shall remain standing while any train or other equipment using such rails is approaching the crossing and is close enough to constitute a hazard. A driver of any vehicle who fails to keep his vehicle standing while any train or equipment using such rails is approaching the crossing and which is so close as to constitute a hazard is guilty of a misdemeanor.

The process of obtaining approval for a new at-grade rail crossing is outside of the control of both the project applicant and the City, and thus cannot be assured.

Multi-Use Trail Crossing. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) is proposed to be constructed adjacent to the existing rail right-of-way. In this location, the MBSST Network is planned to include an approximately eight-foot wide paved, multi-use path on the coastal side of the tracks, with two foot shoulders and a minimum six to eight foot buffer between the trail and the rail line (RTC, November 2013). If both the trail and driveway are constructed, a new at-grade crossing of this multi-purpose trail would be necessitated. This would require coordination with the RTC and the City of Capitola.

Sight Distance. Park Avenue is a two-lane roadway with striped shoulders and a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour (mph). A minimum of 155 feet of sight distance is required for a roadway with travel speeds of 25 mph, based on the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guidelines. However, travel speeds along Park Avenue near the potential access point are closer to 30-35 mph, which requires a minimum sight distance of 200-250 feet. Based on field observations, approximately 50 feet of sight distance to the west (towards Washburn Avenue) would be provided at the potential access point along Park Avenue. Existing trees along the south side of Park Avenue and the elevation change of Park Avenue restrict sight distance to the west.

6.3.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics. On-site development under this alternative would be the same as that of the proposed project; therefore, changes to on-site visual character and light and glare conditions would be the same. Light/glare impacts would be potentially significant, but the mitigation measure required for the proposed project would apply and would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

By relocating the main project driveway to Park Avenue, this alternative would require additional grading and removal of trees within the property between the project site and Park Avenue. This would incrementally increase overall aesthetic changes and the removal of additional trees within this wooded area would be a potentially significant impact. Replacement of removed trees per the required biological resource impact mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

b. Air Quality. Under this alternative, long-term operational emissions would be the same as those of the proposed project, but construction-related emissions would increase

incrementally due to the additional grading and construction of a new driveway. Nevertheless, construction-related emissions would not exceed MBUAPCD significance thresholds. Therefore, as with the proposed project, this alternative's impact would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

c. Biological Resources. Given the heavily wooded nature of this area, substantial tree removal would be required, which could result in indirect impacts to the adjacent monarch butterfly habitat and nesting birds. Construction of the driveway could also result in indirect impacts to the nearby ravine and small intermittent stream; these potential indirect impacts to special status species such as California red-legged frog, hoary bat, and pallid bat would also increase when compared to the proposed project. Biological resource impacts would be potentially significant and would be greater than those of the proposed project. All mitigation required for the proposed project would apply. Measures include pre-construction surveys, tree protection, and tree replacement. The number of replacement trees would be substantially higher than required for the proposed project. Overall, impacts would be greater than for the proposed project, and may be significant.

d. Cultural Resources. On-site development associated with this alternative would be the same as that of the proposed project. Therefore, like the proposed project, this alternative would have a significant, but mitigable impact related to demolition of the two historic on-site cottages. The mitigation measure required for the proposed project (relocation rather than demolition of the cottages) would be required for this alternative. It is assumed that the relocated cottages would no longer be used as sleeping rooms but rather for hotel related uses, such as spa rooms. As with the proposed project, mitigation would reduce this alternative's historic resource impact to a less than significant level.

As with the proposed project, this alternative would have potentially significant impacts to as yet undiscovered on-site archaeological and paleontological resources. Because of the additional grading required for the new project driveway, the potential for disturbance of archaeological and paleontological resources would be incrementally higher. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project and would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

e. Geology. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have potentially significant impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil. These impacts may increase as a result of the additional required grading and site preparation; however, adherence to local, state, and federal stormwater regulations, coupled with incorporation of recommendations from the geotechnical report, would ensure these impacts would be less than significant.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Like the proposed project, this alternative would generate GHG emissions, both during construction and in the long term. Operational emissions would be the same as those of the proposed project, but construction-related emissions would increase incrementally due to the construction of the new project driveway. Nevertheless, as with the proposed project, emissions would not be significant and mitigation would not be required.

g. Hydrology and Water Quality. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in potential impacts related to erosion/sedimentation and water quality during

construction as well as long-term changes in site hydrological conditions. On-site impacts would be the same as those of the proposed project, but overall changes would be slightly greater due to the construction of a new project driveway connecting the project site to Park Avenue. Nevertheless, similar to the proposed project, compliance with local, state, and federal requirements pertaining to control of runoff and water quality would reduce this alternative's impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation would not be required.

h. Land Use and Planning. As with the proposed project, the hotel development associated with this alternative would be consistent with applicable environmental policies of the Capitola General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Ordinance. This alternative would require substantial tree removal within this area for reasons other than good forestry practice, disease, or safety. Therefore, this alternative may be inconsistent with Section 17.95.060 of the Capitola Municipal Code. Impacts related to policy consistency would therefore be greater than for the proposed project, and may be considered significant.

i. Noise. Like the proposed project, this alternative would generate temporary noise/vibration impacts during construction and long-term noise impacts associated with operation of the hotel. The duration and intensity of construction-related noise and vibration would be somewhat higher under this alternative due to the construction of the new project driveway. Noise impacts would be potentially significant and the mitigation measures required for the proposed project would apply. As with the proposed project, these measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Long-term increases in noise would be about the same as those of the proposed project since the overall number of rooms would be the same. However, this alternative would divert project-generated traffic from El Salto Drive to Park Avenue. This would reduce overall traffic noise for the residential neighborhood adjacent to El Salto Drive, but would increase impacts to residences along Park Avenue. Thus, although the impact would be relocated away from Depot Hill, the overall impact of traffic noise would be similar. Similar to the proposed project, the operational impact of this alternative would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

j. Public Services. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would incrementally increase demand for police, fire, and emergency services. Because the increase in on-site rooms would be the same that of the proposed project, the increase in public service demand would also be the same. As with the proposed project, no new or expanded facilities would be required. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

k. Traffic and Circulation. The analysis of traffic and circulation impacts associated with this alternative is based on a *Traffic Impact Analysis* prepared for the project by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. (Hexagon) (March 2014; refer to Appendix I).

The evaluation of the alternative Park Avenue access point assumes that the connection to Park Avenue would be the only access point to the project site and that its exiting access point at El Salto Drive would be closed. As such, the alternative access point to Park Avenue would eliminate existing hotel traffic as well as traffic associated with the proposed project on streets within the Depot Hill neighborhood. The change in project traffic distribution results in minor changes at the following three intersections:

- Monterey Avenue and Escalona Drive
- Monterey Avenue and Park Avenue
- Monterey Avenue and Bay Avenue

However, the alternative Park Avenue access would have no significant effect on the distribution of traffic on other roadways and the remainder of the study intersections. Project trips at each of the effected intersections and Park Avenue access point are presented in Figure 11 in Appendix I. An evaluation of the potential Park Avenue access point was completed and includes an evaluation of intersection level of service, signal warrants, and sight distance at the access point. Results of the analysis indicate that the Park Avenue access point would have minimal effect on each of the intersections evaluated. The Park Avenue access point would operate at LOS C conditions during the AM and PM peak hours and LOS B during the Saturday peak hour under existing plus project and cumulative plus project conditions. Peak hour signal warrant analysis indicates that the Park Avenue access point is not projected to have traffic volumes that meet the thresholds that warrant signalization. Overall, traffic impacts associated with this alternative would be less than significant, with the exception of freeway segment impacts and the Porter Street/Highway One intersection, which would remain significant and unavoidable.

The process for determining the adequacy of available sight distance at the Park Avenue access point is as follows:

- The minimum stopping sight distance associated with the posted speed limit, using the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, Exhibit 3-1 is calculated
- The available sight distance for each driveway is measured out in the field
- The available sight distance is compared to the minimum stopping sight distance to determine if sufficient sight distance is available.

Park Avenue is a two-lane roadway with striped shoulders and a posted speed limit of 25 mph. A minimum of 155 feet of sight distance is required for a roadway with travel speeds of 25 mph, based on the AASHTO Guidelines. However, travel speeds along Park Avenue near the potential access point are closer to 30-35 mph, which requires a minimum sight distance of 200-250 feet. Based on field observations, sight distance at the alternative access point to Park Avenue (Figure 6-1) would be only approximately 50 feet to the west (towards Washburn Avenue), well under the standard. Existing trees along the south side of Park Avenue and the elevation change of Park Avenue restrict sight distance to the west.

It is likely that the speeds and limited sight distance along Park Avenue would result in unsafe conditions for vehicles entering and exiting the potential Park Avenue access point. Therefore, a full access point along Park Avenue is not recommended. It may be possible to provide limited access along Park Avenue by restricting turn movements to right-turns only in and out of the access point. The turn restrictions would reduce the amount of conflicting traffic at the intersection. However, limited access would require removal of existing trees along the south side of Park Avenue and implementation of enhanced warning signage and lighting near the

access point. Thus, impacts associated with sight access would be greater than for the proposed project, and impacts would be significant but mitigable.

1. Utilities. Like the proposed project, this alternative would increase on-site water demand by an estimated 3.7 AFY. Water supply impacts would be the same as those of the proposed project and would be potentially significant. Mitigation required for the project (water offsets in accordance with SqCWD requirements) would apply and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would increase overall impervious surface area onsite. The new project driveway would incrementally increase impervious surface area and associated runoff as compared to the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include LID elements and on-site detention in accordance with City and County requirements. With implementation of these requirements, this alternative's impact would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

6.4 ALTERNATIVE 4: MODIFIED PROJECT (NO EVENTS)

6.4.1 Alternative Description

This alternative would make a trade-off of event space for additional hotel rooms. According to the project applicant, this alternative would be feasible because the additional rooms would generate peak-season revenue that would offset the loss of non-peak season room bookings that would occur because of the event space. The proposed Main building would be redesigned internally to accommodate the additional rooms, through the replacement of the Pavilion room with ten additional guest rooms. Key features of this alternative are:

- 10 rooms added to the Main building by converting Pavilion space to hotel rooms, bringing the total number of on-site guest rooms to 51
- Minor reconfiguration of the building footprint with building coverage increased from 14,728 SF to 16,254 SF
- The proposed Pavilion room would become a 2-story element to accommodate guest rooms
- Catering kitchen eliminated
- Small board room retained for breakfast area
- Bayview building and other elements retained
- Parking would increase from 60 to 62 spaces (58 below ground and 4 surface)
- No events

This alternative is shown on Figure 6-2. Like the proposed project, this alternative would involve a "boutique" facility that includes all of the amenities proposed as part of the project. Site access would be the same as for the proposed project.

The purpose of this alternative is to reduce neighborhood compatibility conflicts (e.g., traffic and noise) associated with large events such as weddings. Day-to-day activity would increase to some degree, though, due to the overall increase in on-site rooms.

6.4.2 Impact Analysis

a. Aesthetics. The overall intensity and type of development under this alternative would be slightly greater than, but about the same as that of the proposed project; therefore, impacts related to changes in visual character and increased light and glare would be similar. The number of mature trees to be removed is anticipated to be about the same (14). Day-to-day lighting impacts would be about the same as those of the proposed project, but the elimination of on-site events would eliminate light/glare impacts related to periodic special events. Overall aesthetic impacts would be about the same as those of the proposed project. Light/glare impacts would be potentially significant, but would be reduced to a less than significant level with the mitigation measure required for the proposed project.

b. Air Quality. Like the proposed project, this alternative would generate both construction-related and operational air pollutant emissions. Construction-related emissions would be about the same as those of the proposed project and would be less than significant. Because of the 33% increase in new on-site rooms (40 new rooms versus 30 new rooms under the proposed project), day-to-day operational air pollutant emissions would be commensurately greater. However, operational emissions would continue to be well within MBUAPCD significance thresholds. In addition, this alternative would avoid emissions associated with special events. Overall air quality impacts would be about the same as those of the proposed project and mitigation would not be required.

c. Biological Resources. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have potentially significant impacts related to the removal of on-site trees and associated disturbance of potential habitat for monarch butterflies, nesting birds, and special status species such as California red-legged frog, hoary bat, and pallid bat. Overall tree removals and associated impacts would be about the same as those of the proposed project since the intensity of on-site development would be similar. As with the proposed project, biological resource impacts would be significant. All mitigation required for the proposed project, including preconstruction surveys, tree protection, and tree replacement, would apply and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

d. Cultural Resources. On-site development associated with this alternative would be similar to that of the proposed project and would remove the historic cottages 1 and 2. Therefore, as with the proposed project, this alternative's impact would be significant. The mitigation measure required for the proposed project (relocation rather than demolition of the cottages) would reduce this alternative's historic resource impact to a less than significant level. It is assumed that the relocated cottages would not be used as sleeping rooms but, rather, for other hotel uses such as spa rooms.

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would have potentially significant impacts to as yet undiscovered on-site archaeological and paleontological resources. Mitigation measures required for the proposed project would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.



PROJECT DATA					
TOTAL SITE AREA:	61,892 SF				
LESS AREA BELOW CLIFF:	6,374 SF				
NET DEVELOPABLE:	55,518 SF				
AVERAGE BUILDING HEIGHT:	30 FT				
EXISTING GUEST ROOMS:	9				
NEW PROPOSED GUEST ROOMS:	42				
TOTAL GUEST ROOMS:	51				
AREA CALCULATIONS					
BUILDING COVERAGE:	16,254 SF	29.3%			
TERRACES, FOUNTAINS, PLANTERS:	3,137 SF	5.7%			
LANDSCAPE:	24,370 SF	43.9%			
PERVIOUS PAVED DRIVEWAY:	5,653 SF	10.2%			
CONCRETE SIDEWALKS & DRIVEWAYS:	6,104 SF	11%			
RIGHT OF WAY					
POROUS PAVING:	2,617 SF	12.7%			
CONCRETE DRIVEWAY AND RAMP:	2,494 SF	12.2%			
ASPHALT:	450 SF	2.2%			
LANDSCAPE PLANTING:	14,950 SF	72.9%			
PARKING					

GARAGE UPPER LEVEL:	26 SPACES
GARAGE LOWER LEVEL:	32 SPACES
UNCOVERED:	4 SPACES
TOTAL SPACES:	62 SPACES
STANDARD SPACES:	38 SPACES
H.C. ACCESSIBLE SPACES:	2 SPACES
TANDEM SPACES:	22 SPACES
TOTAL SPACES:	62 SPACES
CLASS 1 BIKE PARKING:	16 SPACES
CLASS 2	11 SPACES
TOTAL BIKE PARKING:	27 SPACES



Architects, November 2013

e. Geology. Like the proposed project, this alternative would have potentially significant impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil; however, adherence to local, state, and federal stormwater regulations, coupled with incorporation of recommendations from the geotechnical report, would ensure these impacts would be less than significant.

f. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This alternative would generate GHG emissions, both during construction and in the long term. Construction-related emissions would be similar to those of the proposed project. Because of the 33% increase in new on-site rooms, day-to-day operational GHG emissions would be commensurately higher than those of the proposed project. Nevertheless, emissions would continue to be less than significant. In addition, GHG emissions associated with on-site special events would be eliminated. Overall impacts would be similar to those of the proposed project and less than significant. Mitigation would not be required.

g. Hydrology and Water Quality. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in potential impacts related to erosion/sedimentation and water quality during construction as well as long-term changes in site hydrological conditions. Overall, hydrological and water quality impacts would be about the same as those of the proposed project. Both this alternative and the proposed project would be subject to local, state, and federal requirements pertaining to control of runoff and water quality, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation would not be required.

h. Land Use and Planning. As with the proposed project, this alternative would be consistent with applicable environmental policies of the Capitola General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Zoning Ordinance. Impacts related to policy consistency would be less than significant.

i. Noise. Like the proposed project, this alternative would generate temporary noise/vibration impacts during construction and long-term noise impacts associated with operation of the hotel. The duration and intensity of construction-related noise and vibration would be about the same as that of the proposed project. Noise impacts would be potentially significant and the mitigation measures required for the proposed project would apply. As with the proposed project, required mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Day-to-day operational noise would be somewhat greater than that of the proposed project due to the 33% increase in new on-site rooms. Traffic noise generation would be commensurately higher; nevertheless, traffic noise impacts would remain less than significant. The elimination of special events would reduce the potential for periods of elevated noise and disturbance to neighbors. Although these events generally are not anticipated to create significant noise impacts, this potential impact would be avoided under this alternative. Overall, operational noise impacts would be about the same as those of the proposed project and would be less than significant. Mitigation would not be required.

j. Public Services. This alternative would incrementally increase day-to-day demand for police, fire, and emergency services. On the other hand, eliminating special events would eliminate the potential for period demand associated with such events. Neither this alternative

nor the proposed project would require new or expanded facilities. Impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

k. Traffic and Circulation. This alternative would generate an estimated 21 new AM peak hour trips, 37 new PM peak hour trips, and 44 new Saturday midday peak hour trips. This is greater than the 16 new AM peak hour trips, 28 PM new peak hour trips, and 33 new Saturday midday peak hour trips that would be generated by the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative's day-to-day impact to the local circulation system would be somewhat greater than that of the proposed project; the significant impacts identified for the proposed project would remain and the mitigation identified would be required. This alternative would eliminate traffic impacts associated with special events so would avoid periodic traffic issues associated with such events. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not have significant impacts related to site access or policies, plans, or programs supporting bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and transit service.

1. Utilities. This alternative would increase day-to-day on-site water demand by an estimated 4.9 AFY, which is about 32% greater than the 3.7 AFY increase associated with the proposed project. On the other hand, this alternative would eliminate water demand associated with special events. As with the proposed project, water supply impacts would be potentially significant. Mitigation required for the project (water offsets in accordance with SqCWD requirements) would apply. Although the required offset would be greater than under the proposed project, this mitigation measure would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

This alternative would increase overall impervious surface area on-site in a manner similar to that which would occur under the proposed project. This could incrementally increase storm water runoff from the site; however, as with the proposed project, this alternative would include LID elements and on-site detention in accordance with City and County requirements. Similar to the proposed project, thee requirements would reduce this alternative's impact to a less than significant level and mitigation would not be required.

6.5 ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS

In certain circumstances, CEQA requires the examination of alternative locations for proposed projects. However, in the case of the proposed project, one of the specific objectives is to expand the existing Monarch Cove Inn. Therefore, an alternative location would not achieve this basic objective. Moreover, the project applicant does not have access to other similar sites that could house the Monarch Cove Inn and, given that the project involves the expansion of an existing facility, building an entirely new facility on a different site would likely increase, rather than reduce, overall environmental impacts. Consequently, examination of alternative locations is not warranted.

6.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

This section evaluates the impact conclusions for the proposed Monarch Cove Hotel project and the four alternatives under consideration. It then identifies the environmentally superior alternative for each issue area. In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, if the No Project

alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the alternative among the remaining scenarios that is environmentally superior must also be identified.

Table 6-2 shows whether each alternative's environmental impact is greater, lesser, or similar to the proposed project for each issue area.

Based on the comparison provided in Table 6-2, the No Project alternative (Alternative 1) is considered environmentally superior, since it would result in 12 superior effects (+) and five equivalent (=) effects, when compared to the proposed project. Because the No Project Alternative would not change on-site conditions, it would eliminate most of the anticipated environmental effects of the project. However, this alternative would not accomplish any of the objectives of the proposed project, including: expanding the capacity of the Monarch Cove Inn; providing attractive overnight accommodations; and providing special-purpose event space in a quiet retreat-type atmosphere (refer to Section 2.0, *Project Description*, for a full list of project objectives).

Among the remaining alternatives, the Reduced Project alternative (Alternative 2) would have the least environmental impact, and can be considered environmentally superior to the proposed project for nine (9) effects. Because this alternative would reduce the number of rooms by 63% (from 30 new rooms under the proposed project to just 11 new rooms), it would reduce aesthetic impacts of proposed development; generate fewer vehicle trips and reduce associated impacts to traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise; limit the extent of construction, thereby reducing construction-related effects of air quality, noise, and traffic; and would require less ground disturbance, reducing associated impacts to cultural resources, geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality. In addition, because this alternative would include relocation of two on-site cottages as part of the project, it would eliminate the need for mitigation requiring such relocation.

While the Reduced Project alternative would reduce most environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, it would replace proposed landscaping with a paved parking lot, thus increasing impervious surfaces and associated runoff. In addition, the increased paving would result in inconsistency with City Municipal Code Section 17.30.140, which requires that 50% of the project site consist of landscaped or open space areas. Lastly, because of the limited size of the expansion under this alternative, the hotel would maintain its current character in lieu of the proposed conversion to a "boutique" hotel. As such, this alternative would not include such amenities as valet parking, 24-hour concierge service, enhanced landscaping, and possibly trails for ADA and neighbor access. Because of the proposed project, including: expanding the capacity of the Monarch Cove Inn to a 41-room boutique hotel; and providing a retreat-type atmosphere (refer to Section 2.0, *Project Description*, for a full list of project objectives).

The remaining two development alternatives would have impacts that are greater or generally equal to those of the proposed project, and would generally not be considered environmentally superior to the project (refer to Table 6-2).

Issue	Alternative 1: No Project	Alternative 2: Reduced Project	Alternative 3: Alternative Access	Alternative 4: Modified Project (No Events)
Aesthetics	+	=/+	=/-	=
Air Quality	=/+	=/+	=/-	=/-
Biological Resources	+	=/+	=/-	=
Cultural Resources	+	+	=/-	=
Geology	+	=	-	=
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	=/+	=/+	=/-	=/-
Hydrology and Water Quality	=/+	-	=/-	=
Land Use and Planning	+	-	-	=
Noise	+	=/+	=	=
Public Services	=/+	=/+	=	=
Traffic/ Circulation	=/+	=/+	-	=
Utilities	+	=/+	=	=/-
Overall	+	=/+	=/-	=

Table 6-2 **Impact Comparison of Alternatives**

+ Superior to the proposed project (reduced level of impact) - Inferior to the proposed project (increased level of impact)

= /+ slightly superior to the proposed project in one or more aspects, but not significantly superior

= / - slightly inferior to the proposed project in one or more aspects, but not significantly inferior

= Similar level of impact to the proposed project

7.0 REFERENCES AND REPORT PREPARERS

7.1 **REFERENCES**

7.1.1 Bibliography

Addicott, W.O., Barron, J.A., and Miller, J.W. (1978). Marine late Neogene near Santa Cruz, California, in Addicott, W.O., ed., Neogene biostratigraphy of selected areas in the California Coast Range. Field conference on marine Neogene of California, International Geological Correlation Programme, Project 114, June 21-24, 1978: U. S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 78-446.

Architectural Resources Group. (October 2013). Historic Resources Technical Report.

- Bass, Ron, Herson, Albert I., and Bogdan, Kenneth M. (1999). *CEQA Deskbook*. Solano Books, Point Arena, California.
- Bowman & Williams. (April 19, 2013). Preliminary Stormwater Drainage Report.
- Brabb, E.E. (1997). Geologic Map of Santa Cruz County, California. U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report, OF-97-489. 1:62,500.
- Breschini, Gary and Haversat, Trudy. (1980). *Preliminary Archaeological Report and Archaeological Management Recommendations for CA-MNT-170, on Pescadero Point, Monterey County, California*. Archaeological Consulting, Salinas, California.
- Breschini, Gary and Haversat, Trudy. (1997). 1997 *Linguistics and Prehistory: A Case Study from the Monterey Bay Area. In Contributions to the Linguistic Prehistory of Central and Baja California.* Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory.
- Broadbent, Sylvia M. (1972). *The Rumson of Monterey: An Ethnography from Historical Sources*. *Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility*. pp. 14:45-94.
- Bulger, J. B., N. J. Scott, and R. B. Seymour. (2003). *Terrestrial activity and conservation of adult California red-legged frogs Rana aurora draytonii in coastal forests and grasslands*. Biological Conservation 110:85-95.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). (October 21,2009). *Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC)* in the *BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM) No. 2008-009*. Available: <u>http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/info/regulations/Instruction_Memos_and_Bulletins/national_instructio_n/20080/im_2008-009.html</u>

California Air Resources Board. *Advanced Clean Cars Webpage*. Accessed September 24, 2013. Available: http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/consumer_info/advanced_clean_cars/consumer_acc.htm

- California Air Resources Board. *Aerometric Data Analysis and Measurement System (ADAM), summaries from 2010 to 2012*. Accessed September 24, 2013. Available: <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam</u>.
- California Air Resources Board. *Ambient Air Quality Standards*. June 4, 2013. Available: <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf</u>
- California Air Resources Board. *Greenhouse Gas Inventory Data 2020 Emissions Forecas*. Accessed August 29, 2013. Available: <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/forecast.htm</u>
- California Air Resources Board. *Greenhouse Gas Inventory Data 2000 to 20011.* Accessed August 29, 2013. Available: <u>http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm</u>
- California Climate Change Center. (2006) Climate Scenarios for California.
- California Climate Change Center. (May 2009). *The Impacts of Sea-Level Rise on the California Coast.*
- California Department of Conservation. (July 1, 2009). *Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, Soquel Quadrangle.*
- California Department of Finance. (May 2013). *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State – January 1, 2012 and 2013.* Accessed November 19, 2013. Available: <u>http://www.dof.ca.gov/Research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-1/view.php</u>
- California Department of Fish and Game. (2011). *Special Animals List.* Biogeographic Data Branch, California Natural Diversity Database. Sacramento, California.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2003). *California Natural Diversity Data Base*. RareFind, Version 3.1.0 (updated October 31, 2013). Biogeographic Data Branch. Sacramento, California.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2013a). *Biogeographic Information and Observation System*. Accessed April 2013. Available: <u>http://bios.dfg.ca.gov</u>
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2013b). *Special Vascular Plants, Bryophytes, and Lichens List*. Biogeographic Data Branch, California Natural Diversity Database. January 2013. Sacramento, California.
- California Department of Water Resources. (October 2008). *Managing an Uncertain Future: Climate Change Adaption Strategies for California's Water*. Available: <u>http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/docs/ClimateChangeWhitePaper.pdf</u>
- *California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2 User's Guide*. Accessed July 2013. Available: <u>http://www.aqmd.gov/caleemod/doc/UsersGuide.pdf</u>

- California Energy Commission. (March 2009). *Environmental Health and Equity Impacts from Climate Change and Mitigation Policies in California: A Review of the Literature*. Available: http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CEC-500-2009-038/CEC-500-2009-038-D.PDF
- California Energy Commission. (March 2009). Inventory Draft 2009 Biennial Report to the Governor and Legislature, Staff Draft Report.
- California Environmental Protection Agency. (April 2010). *Climate Action Team Biennial Report,* Final Report.
- California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). (March 2006). *Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature*. Available: <u>http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/climate_action_team/reports/2006-04-</u> <u>03_FINAL_CAT_REPORT_EXECSUMMARY.PDF</u>
- California Natural Resources Agency. (December 2009). *California Climate Adaptation Strategy*, Available: <u>http://www.energy.ca.gov/2010publications/CNRA-1000-2010-010/CNRA-1000-2010-010.PDF</u>
- California Office of Planning and Research. (Ocrober 2003). General Plan Guidelines.
- Capitola, City of. (2011). Bicycle Transportation Plan.
- Capitola, City of. (September 2013). *Draft General Plan*. Available: <u>http://www.plancapitola.com/PDF/CapitolaGeneralPlan_PublicReview-Sept6.pdf</u>
- Capitola, City of. (September 1989). General Plan.
- Capitola, City of. (2012). *City of Capitola General Plan Update*. Available: <u>http://www.plancapitola.com/index.htm</u>
- Capitola, City of. (June 1981). *Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan*. Available: http://www.plancapitola.com/PDF/LCP%20Land%20Use%20Plan.pdf
- Capitola, City of. *Municipal Code*. Accessed October 2013. Available: <u>http://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Capitola/mobile/index.pl?pg=Capitola08/</u> <u>Capitola0834.html</u>
- Center for Ocean Solutions. (2013). *Coastal Erosion: Climate Change and Monterey Bay*. Accessed at: <u>http://www.centerforoceansolutions.org/montereybay/impacts/coastal-erosion</u>
- Cultural Landscape Foundation. Website. Accessed October 2013. Available: <u>http://www.tclf.org</u>
- Diblee, T.W. and J.A. Minch. (2005). *Geologic Map of the Laurel Quadrangle Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties, California*. Dibblee Geological Foundation, Map DF-166. 1:24,000

Dietz, S. and Jackson, T. L. (1981). *Report of Archaeological Excavations at Nineteen Archaeological Sites for the Stage 1 Pacific Grove-Monterey Consolidation Project of the Regional Sewerage System*. Archaeological Consulting and Research Services, Santa Cruz, California.

Entomological Consulting Services, Ltd. (2013). Report on Overwintering Monarch Butterflies.

- Fredrickson, David A. (1974). *Cultural Diversity in Early Central California: A View from the North Coast Ranges*. Journal of California Anthropology.
- Hamb, M. (2013). *Tree Resources Evaluation and Construction Impacts Analysis*. Unpublished Technical Report.
- Haro, Kasunich and Associates, Inc. (August 2013). *Geotechnical Investigation*.
- Harrington, John P. (1933). Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for the Years 1931-1932 49:2-3.
- Harris, J. (1988-1990a). Life History Account Hoary Bat (Lasiurus cinereus). In: Life history accounts for species in the California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) System: originally published in: Zeiner, D.C., W.F.Laudenslayer, Jr., K.E. Mayer, and M. White, eds. 1988-1990. California's Wildlife. Vol. I-III. California Depart. of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.
- Harris, J. (1988-1990b). Life History Account Pallid Bat (Antrozous pallidus). In: Life history accounts for species in the California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) System: originally published in: Zeiner, D.C., W.F.Laudenslayer, Jr., K.E. Mayer, and M. White, eds. 1988-1990. California's Wildlife. Vol. I-III. California Depart. of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California.
- Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc. (HMMH). (2006). *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, Final Report.
- Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. (October 2013). *Monarch Cove Hotel Development Traffic Impact Analysis*.
- Historic American Landscapes Survey, Northern California Chapter, *Landscapes Inventory List*, 2013. Accessed October 11, 2013. Available: <u>http://halsca.org/landscapes.htm</u>
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (Februrary 2007). *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis, Summary for Policymakers.*
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (1997). *Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, [Kroeze, C.; Mosier, A.; Nevison, C.; Oenema, O.; Seitzinger, S.; Cleemput, O. van; Conrad, R.; Mitra, A.P.; H.U., Neue; Sass, R.], Paris: OECD, 1997.*
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2007). "Summary for Policymakers," In: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M.Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2007.

Jones, Deborah A. (1992). *The Forager-Collector Model and Monterey Bay Prehistory. In Essays on the Prehistory of Maritime California*, edited by Terry L. Jones, Publication No. 10, pp. 105-113. Center for Archaeological Research at University of California, Davis.

Kirk, Anthony. (2001). Evaluation of a Proposed Project to Construct a Wall at Monarch Cove Inn.

- Lehmann, Susan. (April 29, 2002). *Review of Historical Evaluation for the Property Located at 709 El Salto Drive Capitola.*
- Madrid, V.M., Stuart, R.M., and Verosub, K.L. (1986). *Magnetostratigraphy of the late Neogene Purisima Formation*, Santa Cruz County, California: Earth and Planetary Science Letters, v. 79, p. 431-440.
- Margolin, Malcolm. (1978). *The Ohlone Way: Indian Life in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay Area*. Heyday Books, Berkeley, California.
- Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District. (February 2013). Agenda Item No. 19: Receive an Informational Report on the Status of Developing Greenhouse Gas Emissions Thresholds for Evaluating Projects Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Provide Direction to Staff on Next Steps. Available: http://www.mbuapcd.org/mbuapcd/pdf/Board_Reports/02202013/19.pdf
- Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District. (Februrary 2008). CEQA Air Quality Guidelines.
- Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District. (April 2013). Triennial Plan Revision 2009-2011.
- National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). (September 2010), *Annual Greenhouse Gas Index*. Available: <u>http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/aggi/</u>
- National Park Service. (1997). *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior.
- National Park Service. (1997) *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form.* Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior.
- National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). (2013). *National List [of Hydric Soils]*. Available: <u>http://www.soils.usda.gov/use/hydric/</u>
- Parmesan, C. (2004), Ecological and Evolutionary Responses to Recent Climate Change.
- Parmesan C, Galbraith H. (2204). *Observed Ecological Impacts of Climate Change in North America*, Arlington, VA: Pew Cent. Glob. Clim. Change.
- Perry, F.A. (1977). Fossils of Santa Cruz County: Santa Cruz, Calif., Santa Cruz City Museum.
- Perry, F.A. (1993). *Fossil invertebrates and geology of the marine cliffs at Capitola, California*: Santa Cruz, Calif., Santa Cruz Museum Association.

- Powell, C.L., II, (1998). *The Purisima Formation and related rocks (upper Miocene–Pliocene), greater San Francisco Bay area, central California – Review of literature and USGS collections* (now housed at the Museum of Paleontology, University of California, Berkeley): U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 98-594, 101 p.
- Powell, Charles L., II, Barron, John A., Sarna-Wojcicki, Andrei M., Clark, Joseph C., Perry, Frank A., Brabb, Earl E., and Fleck, Robert J. (2007). *Age, stratigraphy, and correlations of the late Neogene Purisima Formation, central California Coast Ranges*: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1740, 32 p. [http://pubs.usgs.gov/pp/2007/1740/].

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (November 2013). Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Survey.

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District. (April 2012). *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Available: <u>http://www.slocleanair.org/images/cms/upload/files/CEQA_Handbook_2012_v1.pdf</u>

Santa Cruz, City of. (September 2011). General Plan 2030 Draft EIR.

Santa Cruz, City of. (June 26, 2012). General Plan 2030.

- Santa Cruz County, City of Capitola. (November 2010). *Stormwater Management Program Annual Report*. Available: <u>http://www.cityofcapitola.org/sites/default/files/fileattachments/General/page/2536/swm p-nov_2010a.pdf</u>
- Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Services Department. (2012). *Primary Groundwater Recharge Areas Map.* Accessed December 2013. Available: <u>http://scceh.com/Home/Programs/WaterResources/WaterSupply/PrimaryWaterSources/</u> <u>GroundwaterRecharge.aspx</u>
- Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission. (2013). *Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition*. Available: <u>http://www.sccrtc.org/projects/rail/rail-line-purchase/</u>
- Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission. (2013). *Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan*. <u>http://www.sccrtc.org/projects/multi-modal/monterey-bay-sanctuary-scenic-trail/mbsst-master-plan/</u>
- Sawyer, J.O., T. Keeler-Wolf and J.M. Evens. (2009). *A Manual of California Vegetation* (2nd Ed.). California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, California.
- Shipley, William F. (1978). Native Languages of California. In California, edited by Robert F. Heizer, Vol. 8, pp. 80-90. Handbook of the North American Indians. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Smithsonian Institution. Archives, Manuscripts, Photographs Catalog, Smithsonian Institution Research Information System (SIRIS). Accessed October 2013. Available: <u>http://www.siris-archives.si.edu/ipac20/ipac.jsp?session=1Q38C94K41477.40153&profile=all&menu=search&submenu=power&ts=1238794641494#focus</u>

- Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. (2010). *Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources.*
- Sonoma State University. *Northwest Information Center*. Available: <u>http://www.sonoma.edu/nwic/</u>
- Soquel Creek Water District. (September 24, 2013). *Comments on Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Monarch Cove Hotel Project at 620 El Salto Drive, Capitola* [NOP comment letter].
- Soquel Creek Water District. (July 2013). *New Applicant Water Offset Form*. Available: <u>http://soquelcreekwater.org/content/new-water-connections</u>
- Soquel Creek Water District. (September 2011). 2010 Urban Water Management Plan.
- Swift, Carolyn. (June 2004). Historic Context Statement for the City of Capitola.
- Terex, website. (Accessed February 13, 2014). Atriculated Dump Trucks. Available at: <u>http://www.terex.com/construction/en/products/new-equipment/trucks/articulated-trucks/index.htm</u>
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (August 2007). United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Available: <u>http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/convention/status_of_ratification/applicatio</u> <u>n/pdf/unfccc_conv_rat.pdf</u>
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. (November 2011). Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol at its sixteenth session. Available: <u>http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/durban_nov_2011/decisions/application/pdf/awgkp_o</u> utcome.pdf
- University of California, Berkeley. *Library Database*. Accessed October 11, 2013. Available: <u>http://www.sunsite.berkeley.edu: 9876/index.html?ql=a&charset=iso-8859-1&style=LibraryWeb</u>
- U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. (August 2010). *Annual Energy Review 2009*. Available: <u>http://www.eia.gov/aer/envir.html</u>
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration. (August 2006). *Construction Noise Handbook*. Available: <u>http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/</u>
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration. (May 2006). *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*. Available: http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (December 2007). *Climate Change Technology Program* (*CCTP*). (December 2007). Available: <u>http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/policy/cctp.html</u>
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (April 2012). *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2010, U. S. EPA #430-R-11-005. Available:* <u>http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/usinventoryreport.html</u>
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service. (2013). *Critical Habitat Portal*. Available: <u>http://criticalhabitat.fws.gov/</u>

Watsonville, City of. (2012). General Plan.

Western Regional Climate Center. (2013). *Recent Climate in the West.* Available: <u>http://www.wrcc.dri.edu</u>.

7.1.2 Persons Contacted

Brenda Brenner. AMR. September 2013.

Jeanette Devery. Central Fire Protection District. September-October 2013.

Marsha Miller Ayers. American Medical Response. September 2013.

Richard Grunow. City of Capitola. September 2013.

Traci Hernandez. City of Capitola Police Department. September- October 2013.

Dan Seidel. City of Santa Cruz. October 2013.

Shelley Flock. Soquel Creek Water District. October 2013.

Amy Clymo. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. October 2013.

7.2 **REPORT PREPARERS**

This EIR was prepared by the City of Capitola, with the assistance of Rincon Consultants, Inc. Consultant staff involved in the preparation of the EIR are listed below.

<u>Rincon Consultants, Inc.</u> Stephen Svete, AICP, LEED AP ND, Principal in Charge Megan Jones, MPP, Senior Program Manager/Project Manager Abe Leider, AICP CEP, Supervising Planner and Senior Project Manager Bryce Ternet, MA, Senior Planner Christina McAdams, Associate Planner Sara Kopp, Associate Planner Sarah Richman, MESM, Associate Planner Hannah G. Haas, BA, Archaeologist Robert Ramirez, MA, RPA, Archaeologist Wade Sherman, GIS/IT Analyst Kevin Howen, GIS/IT Analyst

<u>Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.</u> Robert del Rio, T.E., Vice President & Principal Associate

<u>Architectural Resources Group</u> Matthew Davis, AICP, Associate This page intentionally left blank.