



Environmental Review Initial Study

Application Number: N/A

Date: October 26, 2009

Staff Planner: Todd Sexauer

I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

APPLICANT: County of Santa Cruz

APN: Countywide

OWNER: Various

SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: All

LOCATION: Countywide

SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The County of Santa Cruz (County) is proposing to amend its current Housing Element for the 2007 to 2014 planning period. State law regarding housing elements states that local and state governments have a responsibility to facilitate housing development and to make "adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community", while considering "economic, environmental, and fiscal factors and community goals set forth in the general plan." It further requires that the Housing Element to be consistent and compatible with other General Plan Elements. Additionally, Housing Elements must provide clear policy for making decisions pertaining to zoning, subdivision approval, housing allocations, and capital improvements.

A critical component of the document is identifying adequate residential sites available for a variety of housing types for all income levels, particularly focusing on the needs of low- and moderate-income households. As well, the Housing Element must address governmental constraints to housing maintenance, improvement, and development. Additionally, it needs to address conserving and improving the condition of the existing affordable housing stock, and promoting housing opportunities for all persons.

Policies and programs contained in the Housing Element are the County's action plan to achieve the required state goal of "attaining decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family," as well as a plan for addressing unique local housing goals that reflect the particular concerns of the community. Finally, as required by law, the Housing Element contains a documentation of affordable housing in the coastal zone.

**ALL OF THE FOLLOWING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ARE
EVALUATED IN THIS INITIAL STUDY.**

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Supply/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services & Utilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Natural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use, Population & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Resources & Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Cumulative Impacts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Growth Inducement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | |

DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL(S) BEING CONSIDERED

| | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Grading Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Division | <input type="checkbox"/> Riparian Exception |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rezoning | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Development Permit | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Development Permit | |

NON-LOCAL APPROVALS

Other agencies that must issue permits or authorizations:

State of California Department of Housing and Community Development

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW ACTION

On the basis of this Initial Study and supporting documents:

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

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the attached mitigation measures have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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


Matthew Johnston

10/30/09
Date

For Claudia Slater
Environmental Coordinator

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

Parcel Size: N/A

Existing Land Use: Residential, Commercial, Vacant

Vegetation: varied

Slope in area affected by project: X 0 - 30% X 31 - 100%

Nearby Watercourse: various

Distance To: varied

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Groundwater Supply: Mapped

Water Supply Watershed: Mapped

Groundwater Recharge: Mapped

Timber or Mineral: Mapped

Agricultural Resource: Mapped

Biologically Sensitive Habitat: Mapped

Fire Hazard: Mapped

Floodplain: Mapped

Erosion: Low Potential

Landslide: Mapped

Liquefaction: Mapped

Fault Zone: Mapped

Scenic Corridor: Mapped

Historic: Numerous

Archaeology: Mapped

Noise Constraint: Mapped

Electric Power Lines: No issues

Solar Access: unblocked

Solar Orientation: Good

Hazardous Materials: None

SERVICES

Fire Protection: All

School District: All

Sewage Disposal: Sewer and Septic

Drainage District: All

Project Access: N/A

Water Supply: Water Districts, Private Wells

PLANNING POLICIES

Zone District: Various

General Plan: Various

Urban Services Line:

Coastal Zone:

X Inside

X Inside

Special Designation:

X Outside

X Outside

PROJECT SETTING AND BACKGROUND:

Natural Environment

Santa Cruz County is uniquely situated along the northern end of Monterey Bay approximately 55 miles south of the City of San Francisco along the Central Coast. The Pacific Ocean and Monterey Bay to the west and south, the mountains inland, and the prime agricultural lands along both the northern and southern coast of the county create limitations on the style and amount of building that can take place. Simultaneously, these natural features create an environment that attracts both visitors and new residents every year. The natural landscape provides the basic features that set Santa

Cruz apart from the surrounding counties and require specific accommodations to ensure building is done in a safe, responsible and environmentally respectful manner.

The California Coastal Zone affects nearly one third of the land in the urbanized area of the unincorporated County with special restrictions, regulations, and processing procedures required for development within that area. Steep hillsides require extensive review and engineering to ensure that slopes remain stable, buildings are safe, and water quality is not impacted by increased erosion. The farmland in Santa Cruz is among the best in the world, and the agriculture industry is a primary economic generator for the County. Preserving this industry in the face of population growth requires that soils best suited to commercial agriculture remain active in crop production rather than converting to other land uses. Considering the defining features of the Santa Cruz County landscape, the most appropriate location for intense development and human activity are those areas without prime agricultural soils, that are generally flat to gently sloping from the coastline and extending inland one to four miles.

Outside Growth Pressures

Population growth in Santa Cruz County is also subjected to several significant outside influences, the most significant being the heavily weighted jobs to housing ratio of neighboring Santa Clara County, and a close second being the steady growth of the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) which is associated with a portion of the County's total population. Finally, the natural environment described earlier is an attraction for second homes, retirees, and above-moderate income households.

Historically, Santa Cruz has provided a housing base for major job centers located in Silicon Valley. Between 1990 and 2000 in Santa Cruz County, the number of new jobs created per housing unit built was 1.53. During that same time period, the Santa Clara County statistic was closer to 12 jobs for every new housing unit. While these ratios have no doubt shifted over the past decade, the pattern is likely similar, and Santa Clara County continues to rely on a substantial amount of its labor force living in Santa Cruz County. This relationship between Santa Cruz and Santa Clara has historically been one of the major drivers of housing demand in Santa Cruz, especially for single-family dwellings in the above moderate household income category.

UCSC continues to increase both the student body and required support staff at the direction of the State Board of Regents. While UCSC has made efforts to expand on-campus housing, these increases are largely accommodated by the surrounding communities both in the City of Santa Cruz and the unincorporated County, with a disproportionately small increase in the availability of on-campus housing for students, faculty, and staff provided by the University. Over time, the growth of UCSC will continue to provide pressure on the County's rental housing stock as students come and go each quarter, as well as on moderately priced for-sale housing for families as new faculty and staff positions are created to accommodate the growth of the student body.

As described above, the natural features of Santa Cruz County attract both tourists and new residents to the County. Santa Cruz has long been a vacation destination and continues to provide many visitor-serving land uses including recreation opportunities,

accommodations in hotels, bed and breakfast establishments, and private dwellings used as vacation rentals or second homes. As visitor-serving uses continue to expand, the County faces increased pressure to provide accommodation options for tourists, and also must address the needs of the local labor force working in the lower-paying hospitality industry. As households with discretionary income drive up demand and prices for single-family homes in the above-moderate income category, the ability of local families to secure and maintain affordable housing becomes more challenging.

Coastal Zone

Because land most suitable to development lies primarily along the coastal terrace between the agricultural land in the north and south County, a significant portion of the urban area lies within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission. Approximately one third of the urban land area in the unincorporated County is inside the Coastal Zone, and subject to the development requirements, restrictions and processing procedures associated with Coastal Development Permits. All development standards applicable in the Coastal Zone must be mutually agreed upon by the County and the California Coastal Commission, must be consistent with the Coastal Act, and must be consistent with the Local Coastal Program adding significant complexity to the process of coastal development.

County Jurisdiction

The majority of the restrictions placed on housing production in Santa Cruz County stem directly from the form of the natural landscape and associated infrastructure, and environmental and economic limitations that derive from it. The regulatory structure used to create the local land use pattern seeks to respect these existing limitations rather than creating new barriers to development. Where this is not the case, both the Board of Supervisors and staff continue to work at developing workable solutions to the ongoing need for housing production in the County.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Purpose of Housing Element

The Housing Element is one of seven required elements of the County's General Plan -- the document that guides land use planning and development activities in the unincorporated area. However, it is the only General Plan element that requires regular updates (typically every seven years) and review and certification by a state agency.

State law regarding housing elements states that local and state governments have a responsibility to facilitate housing development and to make "adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community", while considering "economic, environmental, and fiscal factors and community goals set forth in the general plan." It further requires that the Housing Element to be consistent and compatible with other General Plan Elements. Additionally, Housing Elements must provide clear policy for making decisions pertaining to zoning, subdivision approval, housing allocations, and capital improvements. State law mandates the contents of the housing element, including:

- An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting those needs;
- A statement of the community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relevant to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing; and
- A program that sets forth a five-year schedule of actions that the local government is undertaking or intends to undertake to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of the Housing Element.

A critical component of the document is identifying adequate residential sites available for a variety of housing types for all income levels, particularly focusing on the needs of low- and moderate-income households. As well, the Element must address governmental constraints to housing maintenance, improvement, and development. Additionally, it needs to address conserving and improving the condition of the existing affordable housing stock, and promoting housing opportunities for all persons.

Policies and programs contained in the Housing Element are the County's action plan to achieve the required state goal of "attaining decent housing and a suitable living environment for every California family," as well as a plan for addressing unique local housing goals that reflect the particular concerns of the community.

Finally, as required by law, the Housing Element contains a documentation of affordable housing in the Coastal Zone. That report is provided in Appendix 4.1-1 of the Housing Element.

General Plan Consistency

The County's General Plan serves as the legal framework or "constitution" for development in the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County. As such, it describes policies upon which all future permitting decisions will be based. All development-related decisions in unincorporated areas must be consistent with the General Plan. If a

development proposal is not consistent with the plan, it must be revised or the General Plan itself must be amended.

Additionally, state law requires a community's General Plan to be internally consistent. This means that the Housing Element must function as an integral part of the overall General Plan, and be consistent with each other element of the General Plan. This document has been reviewed and found consistent with the Land Use, Circulation, Conservation and Open Space, Public Safety and Noise, Parks, Recreation and Public Facilities, and Community Design elements. As well, Housing Element policies are designed to promote housing consistent with the various land use designations set forth in the Land Use Element.

Relevance of a Housing Element – What Happened as a Result of the Last Element?

In addition to addressing a series of state legal requirements, a housing element can result in tangible changes that affect the context for housing production and housing efforts in the community. While the 2006 Housing Element took years of hearings and negotiations with the state in order to achieve certification, it resulted in a number of significant outcomes. Appendix 4.1-2 of the Housing Element provides a comprehensive review of the program goals for that 2006 Element, with key highlights summarized below:

- Rezoning program of six sites (30 acres total) for higher density housing to address the needs for housing for lower income residents. These sites will provide development potential for 600 units of new housing in the community, with a high proportion protected with permanently affordability restrictions (for both rental and ownership units).
- Committing \$15 million of Redevelopment Agency housing funds to assist in the development of the newly rezoned higher density sites.
- Modifying the County's inclusionary housing policies to require greater financial contributions from developers to assist in affordable housing activities.
- Creating minimum density standards for urban infill sites to ensure that these sites are utilized at the proper densities for housing production.
- Streamlining regulations related to the construction of second units on properties. These changes have resulted in an increase of these smaller units that generally serve as more affordable rental units, serving the needs of smaller households.

These and other policies and programs contained in the 2006 Housing Element had a significant impact in terms of addressing the needs for affordable housing in the community. In order to accomplish similar outcomes for this document, it is important to clearly identify both state-required and locally-defined housing needs and develop programs that effectively address those needs.

California's Housing Element law requires that each city and county develop local housing programs designed to meet its "fair share" of housing needs for all income groups. The "fair share" allocation seeks to ensure that each jurisdiction accepts

responsibility for the housing needs of not only its current residents, but also for those households who might be reasonably expected to reside within the jurisdiction. A jurisdiction's "fair share" of regional housing need is the number of additional dwelling units that would be required to accommodate the anticipated growth in households, replace expected demolitions and conversions of housing units to non-housing uses, and achieve a future vacancy rate that allows for the healthy functioning of the housing market.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

California Government Code Sections 65583 (a) (1) and 65584 require that a Housing Element include "documentation of projections and a quantification of the locality's existing and projected housing needs for all income levels...[including] the locality's share of the regional housing need." The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) creates estimates for the overall housing unit demand for the two-county Monterey Bay region (i.e., Monterey and Santa Cruz counties). This is known as the "Regional Housing Construction Need" and is expressed as the number of housing units that should be planned for over a 7.5-year period to accommodate the needs of households in each income category. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) then distributes that regional number to each of the local jurisdictions (i.e., cities and counties) in the region. This is the "Regional Housing Needs Allocation" (RHNA), in which each city and county is assigned its "fair-share" of HCD's projected overall housing need, broken down by the number of units needed in each of the four income categories, so that lower income households will be proportionately and fairly distributed throughout the region.

Table 1 shows the AMBAG adopted RHNA estimates for housing demand in each jurisdiction within Santa Cruz County, and for the entire Monterey Bay region. AMBAG has projected a need for 1,289 total new housing units in the unincorporated area of the County during the 7.5-year planning period between January 1, 2007 and June 30, 2014. AMBAG's determination included the distribution of housing units by income category as established by HCD's regional allocation.

Relationship to Historical Housing Production

The RHNA is required to be used as the basis for the Housing Element in each local jurisdiction's General Plan, thereby ensuring that cities and counties have established planning and zoning policies that *allow* for the development of an adequate number of housing units across income categories. But the state cannot require that the RHNA units actually be *built*, as actual housing production is a function of the market, the economy and many other factors.

While the current AMBAG RHNA indicates that 1,289 new housing units will be required during the 2007-14 Housing Element planning period (i.e., an average of 172 units per year), the production of such units will occur as private parties assemble the land and financing necessary to build them and only if the market will support that production. To put the RHNA number into perspective, 2,007 permits for new residential units were issued in Santa Cruz County over the last 10 years (i.e., an average of 201 units per year from Jan. 1999 through Nov. 2008).

| Table 1: AMBAG Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 2007-14 Planning Period | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Income Group | Total Housing Units Required | Above Moderate Income Units | Moderate Income Units | Low Income Units | Very Low Income Units |
| <i>Required Percentage</i> | 100% | 42% | 19% | 17% | 22% |
| Regional Total | 15,130 | 6,335 | 2,870 | 2,545 | 3,380 |
| Monterey County | 11,915 | 4,989+ | 2,260 | 2,004 | 2,662 |
| Santa Cruz County | 3,215 | 1,346 | 610 | 541 | 718 |
| Unincorporated Santa Cruz County* | 1,289 | 539 | 245 | 217 | 288¹ |
| City of Capitola | 143 | 60 | 27 | 24 | 32 |
| City of Santa Cruz | 672 | 282 | 127 | 113 | 150 |
| City of Scotts Valley | 188 | 78 | 36 | 32 | 42 |
| City of Watsonville | 923 | 387 | 175 | 155 | 206 |

Note: 1) Subsequent to AMBAG's determination, the County split the Very Low Income Goal into two categories: Very Low Income (144 units) and Extremely Low Income (144 units), as required by state law.

Source: County of Santa Cruz, 2009.

However, as stated above, the actual development of housing is largely dependent on market forces and economic conditions. During 2008, the County experienced a significant decrease in the number of permits issued for new housing units. Given the economic conditions in 2008-2009, including foreclosures and the difficulty in obtaining financing, it remains to be seen to what extent economic forces will continue to affect the actual production of housing units over the course of the planning period.

Affordable Housing Objectives

Table 2 indicates that excess capacity exists within the County's zoning and other land use regulations to accommodate far more units than is required to meet the RHNA goals for the 2007-14 planning period. In addition to total potential units, assumptions were made with regard to the level of affordability that could be realized for the various land use capacities.

- **Available Sites – Urban Less Than 14.5 units/acre.** Projected development on these sites was assumed to be primarily affordable to above-market households. The number of units that could be constructed was based on permits being issued consistent with the 0.5% growth rate that has occurred for several years. Based on historic distributions, those were spread among urban and rural sites. Finally, it was assumed that 15% of projects of seven or more units would be priced at levels affordable for moderate income households, and that projects of 5 or 6 units would be contributing financially to the County's affordable housing fund. This pattern is supported by historic construction figures, and in fact is relatively conservative, given that some 100% affordable projects have been built at these densities over the years. In fact, a 19 unit 100% moderate income project is currently in the development review process.

Table 2: Summary of Housing Objectives by Affordability Level for Planning Period 2007-2014 to Address Required Regional Housing Needs

| | Land Use Capacity (from 4.6) | 2007-2014 Total Units | Extremely Low Income | Very Low Income | Low Income | Moderate Income | Above Moderate |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Housing Element Goal (from RHNA) | N/A | 1,289 | 144 | 144 | 217 | 244 | 540 |
| Permits Issued (1/1/07 - 12/31/08) | | | | | | | |
| 1. Market Rate units - permits issued | N/A | 137 | | | | | 137 |
| 2. Second Units - permits issued | N/A | 71 | | | 20 | 20 | 31 |
| 3. Parkhurst Terrace (deed restricted) | N/A | 68 | | 62 | 5 | 1 | |
| 4. Cabrillo Commons (deed restricted) ¹ | N/A | 5 | | | | 5 | |
| SUBTOTAL | | 281 | | 62 | 25 | 26 | 168 |
| Available sites for planning period | | | | | | | |
| 1. Urban sites < 14.5 du/acre ² | 2,249 | 978 | | | | 84 | 894 |
| 2. Urban sites 14.5-17.4 acres ³ | 176 | 88 | | | | 44 | 44 |
| 3. Urban sites (20 du/acre) ⁴ | 610 | 610 | 155 | 155 | 300 | | |
| 4. Rural Units ⁵ | 2,796 | 525 | | | | | 525 |
| 5. Mixed Use, Vacant Sites ⁶ | 155 | 70 | | | | 35 | 35 |
| 6. Mixed Use - Underutilized Sites ⁶ | 899 | 30 | | | | 15 | 15 |
| 7. Second Units - urban ⁷ | 4,857 | 93 | | 15 | 15 | 30 | 33 |
| 8. Second Units - rural ⁷ | 3,026 | 151 | | 23 | 23 | 44 | 61 |
| 9. Agricultural Employee Housing | 2,423 | 35 | 17 | 18 | | | |
| SUBTOTAL | | 2,668 | 172 | 211 | 338 | 252 | 1,607 |
| TOTAL POTENTIAL | 17,191 | 2,949 | 172 | 273 | 363 | 278 | 1,777 |
| REQUIRED BY RHNA | N/A | 1,289 | 144 | 144 | 217 | 244 | 540 |
| (OVER)/UNDER GOAL | N/A | (1,660) | (28) | (129) | (146) | (34) | (1,235) |

Notes:

¹ Includes 3 deed-restricted units sold by developer, and 2 units with deed restrictions that were purchased by Redevelopment Agency (RDA) for sale as moderate units.

² Above moderate units are limited by local ordinance, and are expected to average 258 units per year for the remaining 5.5 years of the planning period, based upon an annual growth rate of 0.5%. Of the 258 units projected annually, it is anticipated that 67% will be allocated to urban areas, and 33% will be allocated to rural areas. The number of affordable units, which are not subject to the allocation system, are based on 15% of projects of seven or more units (projects of 5 or 6 units contribute an in-lieu fee). Projections for moderate units are based on buildout estimates, excluding density bonus units.

³ Units constructed at densities of 14.5-17.4 units per acre are anticipated to be 50% affordable to moderate income households and 50% above moderate income.

⁴ Density of 20 units per acre meets the state's criteria for units affordable to lower income households.

⁵ Rural units are not anticipated to be affordable to low or moderate income households due to generally lower densities. Affordable rural units are not subject to the permit allocation system. (see note 2).

⁶ Estimate for mixed-use residential units based upon an average rate of applications for the past 3 years, included approved units (35 units) and pending projects (49 units), with an anticipated 10% increase due to new programs encouraging mixed-use developments. Percentage of units anticipated on vacant or underutilized sites is based upon the number of applications for vacant or underutilized sites during the past 3 years.

⁷ Estimate for second units is based on number of second unit permits issued in 2007 and 2008, with a projected 25% increase due to elimination of restrictions on units. Projections for number of urban and rural units projected based upon the percentage of urban and rural sites available for second units.

Source: County of Santa Cruz 2009.

- **Available Sites – Urban 14.5-17.4 units/acre.** Given that state law presumes that sites with densities of 20 units per acre are affordable for lower income households, it is reasonable to assume that units in this density range would be affordable to moderate income households. Nonetheless, the Housing Element conservatively assumes that only 50% of such units would be affordable to such households, with the balance priced for above moderate-income households.
- **Available Sites – Urban 20 units/acre.** Created in June of 2007, the Regional Housing Need Combining District was established by the 2000-2007 Housing Element as the tool for Santa Cruz County to meet its goal of providing 30.5 acres of land for housing at a density of 20 units per acre. This combining district has been applied to 6 sites located throughout the urban areas of the County, which results in a total of 30.5 acres of land and will provide 610 housing units. It is assumed that 50% of these sites would be available for housing affordable for low-income households, with the balance split between the very low and extremely low income categories. In fact, a 100% affordable project was recently approved and funded on the first of these sites, which will be affordable rental housing for very low-income households. The Redevelopment Agency (RDA) has set aside a minimum of \$15 million to assist in financing affordable housing on these six sites.
- **Available Sites – Rural Areas.** The total residential build-out capacity of the General Plan Land Use Plan for the rural areas of the County (outside the Urban Services Line) was estimated at 2,796 housing units. The projected units for the planning period are consistent with historic building permit allocations for the rural areas. Because there are not full urban services available for development on these parcels, development of affordable housing is not generally expected in the rural areas. Additionally, the lack of services, amenities and conveniences often desired by residents in affordable housing are scarce in the rural area. As such, all units are conservatively assumed to be above moderate income pricing.
- **Available Sites – Commercial Mixed Use Projects.** As is discussed in Section 4.6, mixed-use development is allowed in PA (Professional and Administrative Office), C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) and C-2 (Community Commercial) zones. In these zones, residential use is allowed in 50% of the square footage of the structure(s), or in up to 67% of the structure if the units are deed restricted as 100% affordable. There are more than 130 suitably zoned sites in the County with the potential for mixed-use development, including both vacant and underutilized properties. Conservative projections of development on these sites have been made. Based upon the rate of applications approved for mixed-use projects during the past 3 years (2006 through 2008) and recent changes to the mixed use regulations, it is very conservative to anticipate the development of 15-20 residential units per year as part of mixed-use projects, conservatively projected at 100 residential units during the remainder of the planning period (see Table 2). The estimate of 100 potential units is well below the potential overall capacity in the County for 1,054 residential units in potential mixed-use projects. Of the units projected as part of mixed-use development projects during

the planning period, it is presumed that 50%, or 50 units, would be affordable to moderate-income residents, with the balance for above moderate-income households.

- **Available Sites – Second Units.** The County has aggressively pursued second units as a strategy to provide affordable housing in the community. To this end, second units are allowed in rural residential areas on lots greater than 1 acre, in all urban residential zone districts, and on agricultural parcels outside the Coastal Zone. In conformance with AB 1866, the County requires only a building permit for second unit construction. Additionally, in 2008 the County removed rent and occupancy restrictions on second units. It is anticipated that these policy changes will increase the rate of second unit construction in the planning period. Because of the regulatory changes, a 25% increase in the rate of development of second units is expected during the remainder of the planning period. Given the average of 36 second unit permits that were issued each year in 2007 and 2008, it is assumed that an average of 44 second unit permits may be issued annually in 2009 through June of 2014. Due to their smaller size and configuration, second units should be affordable to all income levels. Therefore, second units are divided among from the very low to above moderate income levels. Table 2 reflects this distribution.
- **Agricultural Employee Housing.** It is projected that, through the efforts of the proposed programs in this Section, 25-50 agricultural employee housing units will be created in the planning period. It is assumed that these will address housing needs for extremely low and very low-income farmworker households.

Local Housing Needs (Local Recommendations)

The state's RHNA goals primarily focus on the larger regional needs for new housing production, with some attention to potential income levels that the new housing could serve. In addition, only zoning-related opportunities are included in the RHNA objectives, even though there are a wide range of initiatives that are currently underway and new initiatives that are anticipated over the planning period that are not reflected in the RHNA numbers. The RHNA objectives therefore are not a direct reflection of the real housing needs of a community or active local measures that can be taken to address our housing challenges. Therefore, in many cases the units described in Table 3 are in addition to the RHNA numeric goals. As a result, the following objectives have been included to address local housing needs beyond the RHNA requirements.

The following describes those local efforts in more detail:

- **Substantial Rehabilitation.** Anticipated units are described in two main categories:
 - **Mobile Home Parks:** Includes 125 completed units (2007-09) in three mobile home parks (Pleasant Acres and Pacific Family in the unincorporated County

Table 3: Local Affordable Housing Initiatives 2007-2014

| Program/Project Activity | Estimated No. of Units or Households Served | Owner-occupied (O) or Rental (R) | Target Income Groups (as % of Co. median) | Potential Special Populations |
|--|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | EL = Extremely Low: < 30% VL = Very Low: 30-50% E = Low: 50-80% M = Moderate: 80-120% | Eld = Elderly LF = Large Family FW = Farmworker H = Homeless D = Disabled FHH = Female Head of HH |
| SUBSTANTIAL REHABILITATION (UNITS) | | | | |
| Mobile Home Park Reconstruction | 300 | O | VL, L | Eld, LF, D, FHH |
| Mobile Home Unit Replacements | 100 | O | VL, L | Eld, LF, D, FHH |
| Multi-Family Rehab | 250 | R | VL, L | LF, D, FHH, H |
| SUBTOTAL | 650 | | | |
| NEW CONSTRUCTION (UNITS) | | | | |
| Funded Projects | 207 | R, O | VL, L, M | LF, FW, D, FHH |
| Additional Sites | 310 | O | L, M | Eld, LF, FW, H, D, FWW |
| SUBTOTAL | 517 | | | |
| ACQUIRING & PRESERVING AFFORDABILITY RESTRICTIONS (UNITS) | | | | |
| First Time Homebuyer Program | 160 | O | L, M | FW, FHH |
| Acquiring At Risk Units | 130 | O | VL, L, M | Eld, LF, FW, D, FHH |
| SUBTOTAL | 290 | | | |
| AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMS DIRECTLY FUNDED OR OVERSEEN BY RDA* (HOUSEHOLDS) | | | | |
| Eviction Protection | 720 | R | EL | Eld, LF, FW, H, D, FHH |
| Transitional Housing - families | 87 | R | EL | LF, FHH, FW, H, D |
| Gemma Transitional Housing for formerly incarcerated women | 18 | R | EL | H, D, FHH |
| Board and Care Rental Subsidy Program | 43 | R | EL | D |
| Former Foster Youth Housing Assist. | 56 | R | EL | H, D, FHH |
| Last Month's Rent and Security Deposits | 175 | R | EL, VL | Eld, LF, |
| Continuum of Care/Housing Action Partnership | 548 | R | EL | Eld, LF, FW, H, D, FHH |
| Mental Health Supportive Housing Rental Subsidies | 35 | R | EL | D |
| SUBTOTAL | | | | |
| All Contracts & Programs (see Housing Element Appendix 4.7-1) | 1,682 | O, R | EL, VL, L | ELD, LF, FW, D, FHH, H |
| TOTAL Potential Units/Households Served During 2007-2014 Planning Period | 3,139 | | | |

Note:

*Only reflects programs directly administered by the Planning Department or RDA. Does not include other County-sponsored activities or community agencies that support similar programs or provide similar services.

Source: County of Santa Cruz 2009.

and the Riverside Park in Watsonville) and 175 units in two new parks during the planning period; Mobile Home Unit replacements: includes 29 completed units and 18 additional per year for the remainder of the planning period.

- Special needs populations anticipated to be served are elderly, large families, disabled and female head of households.
- Multi-Family Rehab: Includes 109 completed units (Bay Street senior apartments in Capitola, including 5 Mental Health Services Act [MHSA] homeless/senior units) and 150 additional units projected over the remainder of the planning period.
 - Special needs populations anticipated to be served include large families, disabled, female head of households, and homeless.
- **New Construction.** Anticipated units are described in two main categories:
 - Funded projects anticipated to be built in the planning period include the Tannery Arts Housing Project (100 units in the City of Santa Cruz), the Minto Road Housing Project (88 units outside the City of Watsonville), and the Canterbury Park Townhome Project (in Aptos).
 - Special needs populations anticipated to be served by these projects are large families, farm workers, disabled, female head of households.
 - It is anticipated that about 50% of the remaining R-zoned sites will be developed (with 250 units) and 60 units will be assisted on other new development sites over the balance of the planning period.
 - Special needs populations anticipated to be served by these projects are elderly, large families, farm workers, disabled, female head of households.
- **Acquiring and Preserving Affordability Restrictions.** This category includes two main components:
 - RDA's First Time Homebuyer Program provides financial assistance to income-eligible households. Thus far in the planning period, 56 households have been assisted; it is anticipated that 104 additional households will be served over the balance of the planning period.
 - Special needs populations anticipated to be served by these projects are farm workers, disabled, female head of households.
 - Ten Measure J units have been preserved to date in the planning period, and it is anticipated that an additional 20 will occur in the balance of the planning period. Additionally, while it is difficult to project, given the number of larger rental projects with expiring rental restrictions, it is anticipated that assistance will be required to protect affordability of 100 of those critical rental units.
 - Special needs populations anticipated to be served by these projects are elderly, farm workers, disabled, and female head of households.

- **Housing Assistance Programs.** The County and the RDA manage a number of housing assistance programs to assist lower income and special needs populations. These programs generally do not create or protect units, but they are designed to assist households in need. It is anticipated that 488 households will be assisted on an annual basis over the course of the planning period. (A detailed description of these programs is provided in Appendix 4.7-1 of the Housing Element.

Goals, Policies, and Programs

In order to meet the aggressive objectives contained in both Tables 2 and 3, it is critical to define clear policies to govern land use decisions – whether to protect current zoning designations or to expedite the processing of an affordable housing project. The policy framework sets forth six primary housing goals, organized around the state's required programs, as follows:

- **Goal 1: Identify Existing Sites for New Housing and Opportunities for Additional Sites**
- **Goal 2: Encourage and Assist in the Development of Housing**
- **Goal 3: Remove Unnecessary Governmental Constraints to Housing**
- **Goal 4: Preserve and Improve Existing Housing Units and Expand Affordability Within the Existing Housing Stock**
- **Goal 5: Promote Equal Opportunity and Production of Special Needs Housing Units**
- **Goal 6: Promote Energy Efficiency in Existing and New Residential Structures**

Each of these goals is implemented through a set of policies (generally regulatory in nature) and programs (activities to continue, modify or initiate). These goals, policies and programs are described below.

Goal 1: Identify Existing Sites for New Housing and Opportunities for Additional Sites

The following policies are intended to implement Goal 1:

- **Policy 1.1** Require that zoning designations for undeveloped and underdeveloped sites zoned at densities appropriate for lower income housing (extremely low, very low, and low) needed to meet the 2007-14 RHNA goals be maintained through the 2007-14 planning period. In the event that any of the sites are rezoned to a lower density, units must be replaced through suitable rezoning of alternative sites.
- **Policy 1.2** Require that current multi-family housing (RM) zoning designations on other sites (in addition to those discussed in Policy 1.1) be maintained to encourage construction of attached housing units.

The following programs are intended to implement Goal 1:

- **Program 1.1** Explore opportunities for rezoning other appropriate urban sites to RM zoning and increasing densities on current RM zoned sites to densities more appropriate for attached housing.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: 2012-14
- **Program 1.2** Explore options for expanding affordable housing opportunities in the rural portions of the County, including mixed use and other projects, primarily within established village areas.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing

Goal 2: Encourage and Assist in the Development of Housing

The following policies are intended to implement Goal 2:

- **Policy 2.1** Require that developments that are proposed on RM zoned sites be designed and permitted as attached housing projects, unless unusual site conditions exist on the site that renders such designs impractical. In such instances, the decision-making body must make special findings relative to unique site circumstances to support the existence of the unusual site conditions.
- **Policy 2.2** Require that development only be approved at or above the minimum density for the General Plan density designation, unless special findings are made by the Board of Supervisors.
- **Policy 2.3** Exempt housing projects that contain 100% apartment units from the County's inclusionary housing requirements, as an incentive to create more rental housing in the community.
- **Policy 2.4** Require developers of subdivisions on R-1 zoned properties (designated for single-family detached housing) to evaluate the potential for including second units (detached or attached) as part of development proposals.
- **Policy 2.5** Require that developers meet the County's inclusionary housing requirements, as enumerated in Chapter 17.10 of the County Code and updated from time to time (except as provided in Policy 2.4).
- **Policy 2.6** Implement the state's Density Bonus Program for projects providing additional affordable units through updating local ordinances, and revise ordinances as necessary to comply with new legislation.

The following programs are intended to implement Goal 2:

- **Program 2.1** Maintain increased RDA Set-Asides for the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund where financially feasible.
 - Responsible Entity: RDA
 - Timeframe: 2007-14

- Program 2.2 Continue to maximize leveraging of funds when collaborating with developers of affordable housing (for-profits and non-profits) and maximize long-term affordability restrictions to promote the development of a variety of housing types to meet the needs of all Santa Cruz County Households, including those that are Extremely Low-Income. Funds will continue to be leveraged from federal, state, and private sources, thereby maximizing the impact of RDA dollars.
 - Responsible Entity: RDA, Board of Supervisors, Planning Department
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 2.3 Maintain RDA funding support, and augment if necessary, for the six sites rezoned as part of the 2006 Housing Element to 20 unit/acre densities to address the needs of lower income households. (The initial funding commitment was for \$15 million.)
 - Responsible Entity: RDA
 - Timeframe: 2007-14
- Program 2.4 Improve community understanding of the issues related to affordable housing and the benefits of compact communities in terms of resource conservation and community vitality through developing a community-based educational program.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department
 - Timeframe: 2010-12
- Program 2.5 Explore expanding local funding sources to assist in the financing of affordable housing, including transfer taxes, bonds for affordable housing projects and other opportunities.
 - Responsible Entity: County Administrator (CAO), Board of Supervisors, Planning Department
 - Timeframe: 2010-14
- Program 2.6 In order to encourage the development of Single-room Occupancy's (SRO's), develop an ordinance that would allow that new units that are 500 square feet of habitable area or smaller in size be counted, for the purpose of calculating density on RM zoned sites within the Urban Services Line, as 0.5 unit.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: 2010-2014

Goal 3: Remove Unnecessary Governmental Constraints to Housing

The following policies are intended to implement Goal 3:

- **Policy 3.1** Maintain current policies that require affordable housing projects to receive priority processing through both the discretionary and building permit processes.
- **Policy 3.2** Require that, to the extent that they are needed to provide for adequate building permits for new homes to meet the Regional Housing Needs Goals for market rate housing, unused Measure J building permit allocations must be rolled forward to be available in the following year. Allow that "rolled forward" permit allocations would expire at the end of the year.

The following programs are intended to implement Goal 3:

- **Program 3.1** Revise procedures (and regulations, if necessary) to streamline and simplify building and development permit processes and regulations, particularly focused on small-scale residential structures and non-conforming structures and uses.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 3.2** Revise land use regulations to encourage second units through removal of income, rent and occupancy restrictions, and once adopted, promote public awareness of those changes through the zoning counter and public brochures.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: 2008
- **Program 3.3** Explore options for reducing infrastructure requirements and related costs for Second Units through working with water and fire agencies to remove the requirement for separate water meters for Second Units and related actions.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Utility & Fire Districts
 - Timeframe: 2010-12
- **Program 3.4** Work with local utility districts to ensure compliance with the state law requirement that all public sewer and water providers provide priority to and retain sufficient capacity for affordable housing projects.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department and Utility Districts
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 3.5** Support additional incentives that will expand the opportunities for increased residential uses within mixed use developments in the County, such as flats above retail uses, including expanding the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Ordinance to facilitate such uses. Potential incentives include defining nodes/corridors where mixed use projects would be strongly encouraged or required and exploring reduced parking and other standards for mixed use projects.

- Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
- Timeframe: 2009
- **Program 3.6** Explore the structure of an overlay district for encouraging mixed use projects and defining corridors and nodes for implementing such a program.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: 2012-14
- **Program 3.7** Explore creating a construction legalization program to legalize unpermitted Second Units and other existing residential structures.
 - Responsible Entity: Board of Supervisors, Planning Department
 - Timeframe: 2011-12
- **Program 3.9** In cooperation with the County's cities, monitor the countywide jobs/housing balance, including development that results in job or housing growth and include this data in periodic reports to the Board of Supervisors.
 - Responsible Entity: Mayor's Select Committee
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 3.10** Cooperate with the County's cities and other public agencies in resolving regional infrastructure issues including transportation, water supply, and sewage treatment.
 - Responsible Entity: Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing

Goal 4: Preserve and Improve Existing Housing Units and Expand Affordability within the Existing Housing Stock

The following programs are intended to implement Goal 4:

- **Program 4.1** Retain existing regulatory programs regarding Mobile Homes, including: mobile home rent control, land use restrictions to limit conversions of mobile home parks to other uses, and regulations related to sham conversions.
 - Responsible Entity: Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 4.2** Retain the Condominium Conversion Ordinance (County Code Chapter 14.02) to protect rental housing stock.
 - Responsible Entity: Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 4.3** Develop methods to streamline and simplify the land use regulations as they apply to non-conforming residential structures.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors

- Timeframe: 2010-11
- Program 4.4 Continue to implement programs intended to assist low income households to maintain quality units in mobile home parks through the RDA's mobile home Coach Change-out Program and the Mobile Home Rehabilitation Program.
 - Responsible Entity: Redevelopment Agency, Planning Department
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 4.5 Maintain a central database that includes an inventory of affordable housing, affordable housing stock characteristics, and household and unit data for the County's affordable housing units, including inclusionary units and other affordable units built by non-profit and for-profit developers. Make such information available to interested parties who may need it for funding applications and program descriptions or for those seeking affordable housing opportunities.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 4.6 Explore regulatory options for recognizing and legalizing hotels/motels that have over time been converted to permanent occupancy.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: 2012-14
- Program 4.7 Continue to develop strategies to preserve all affordable units with expiring restrictions, including Measure J units and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) -assisted affordable housing units.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, RDA, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 4.8 Continue to implement the Affordable Housing Preservation Program to preserve the affordability restrictions of individual affordable units faced with foreclosure by acquiring units prior to the trustee sale or other actions.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 4.9 Continue the County First Time Homebuyer Loan Program and the Rental/Mortgage Assistance Program.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, RDA
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 4.10 Continue to require that tenants' security deposits earn interest that is payable to the tenant on an annual basis or at the time tenancy ceases.

- Responsible Entity: Board of Supervisors
- Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 4.11** Maintain programs to assist lower income residents in securing housing entry costs (rental deposit and security costs) and short term rental assistance when the tenant faces eviction due to lack of rent payment as a result of one-time cash-flow problems.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 4.12** Maintain the existing requirements that owners of units deemed uninhabitable must pay relocation assistance to affected tenants.
 - Responsible Entity: Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 4.13** Explore options for regulating the conversion of existing housing units to vacation rentals in order to limit the impact of such conversions on the stock of housing and on the integrity of single-family neighborhoods.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: 2012-14
- **Program 4.14** Explore program options available to replace housing units removed by non-residential development.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: 2011-2013
- **Program 4.15** Explore opportunities to expand the housing rehabilitation program to address dilapidated housing in existing neighborhoods.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors, RDA
 - Timeframe: 2011-2013

Goal 5: Promote Housing Equal Opportunity and Production of Special Needs Housing Units

The following policies are intended to implement this goal:

- **Policy 5.1** Maintain the provisions in County Code (Section 18.10.128), which provide for reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities seeking fair access to housing in the application of the County's zoning regulations.
- **Policy 5.2** Continue to implement County Code Section 13.10.631(c)4, which allows existing substandard farm worker housing to be reconstructed or rebuilt and maintained as affordable units for low and very low income households.
- **Policy 5.3** Continue to implement County Code Section 13.10.685 relating to the conversion of Recreational Vehicle (RV) parks to permanent occupancy.

The following programs are intended to implement Goal 5:

- Program 5.1 Apply Program 2.6 (requiring that units that are 500 square feet of habitable area or smaller in size be counted, for the purpose of calculating density under the General Plan and County ordinances on RM zoned sites, as 0.5 unit) in a manner that expands housing opportunities for special needs housing populations.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 5.2 Continue to seek all available sources of financing for affordable housing opportunities for the special needs households in the County. Specifically target the following known sources:
 - Governor's Homeless Initiative
 - Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program
 - Mobilehome Park Resident Ownership Program (MPROP)
 - Multifamily Housing Program (MHP)
 - CalHome
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Health Services Agency
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 5.3 Review policies that affect group homes, transitional housing, and the full range of licensed healthcare programs and facilities in order to:
 - Determine whether or not local land use regulations can be changed to encourage additional use of residences or construction of new facilities for these purposes;
 - Determine long term sustainability of existing group home facilities for lower income individuals and consider providing incentives needed to sustain existing facilities and develop additional facilities to meet the County's needs; and
 - Ensure that local requirements conform to state land use law regarding group homes, transitional housing and shelters, especially the number of beds triggering a discretionary permit.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department
 - Timeframe: 2010-12
- Program 5.4 Continue support of programs to address the needs of local homeless populations, including:
 - Supporting and funding the Emergency Winter Shelter Program which provides shelter to homeless persons during the winter months;

- Supporting efforts of the Countywide Continuum of Care Coordinating Group to address the housing and service needs of people who are homeless. These include emergency, transitional and permanent supported housing, and supportive services such as employment support, case management, and treatment for health, substance abuse, and mental illnesses; and
- Identifying potential sites for and potential financial contributions to the construction of transitional facilities and replacing the National Guard Armory in Santa Cruz County in accordance with the priorities established in the Ten Year Strategic Plan for the Homeless.
- Responsible Entity: Human Services Department, Housing Authority, Planning Department
- Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 5.5 Explore options for increasing the supply of permanent, affordable, and accessible housing for people with disabilities, including:
 - Encouraging housing projects sponsored by the County to maintain separate waiting lists for accessible units ensuring they are offered first to people who need units adapted for use by people with physical disabilities;
 - Encouraging housing developers, including developers of affordable housing projects to build units that meet the needs of physically disabled households; and
 - Partnering with the Mental Health Services Act Housing Fund along with the Continuum of Care process, and the Housing Action Partnership.
- Responsible Entity: Health Services Agency, Human Services Department, Planning Department, Redevelopment Agency, Commission on Disabilities
- Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 5.6 Sustain and expand residential facilities and other affordable housing options available to foster children, youth who are aging-out of the foster care system and other children and youth in need of special services.
- Responsible Entity: Human Services Department, Housing Authority, Planning Department
- Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 5.7 Continue to support programs that address the needs of the local elderly populations through:
 - Supporting the Shared Housing Program for seniors and other households in Santa Cruz County;
 - Continuing to provide information on "Home Equity Conversion," currently provided by the Santa Cruz County Housing Authority;

- Exploring options for retaining existing housing for the elderly and nursing homes;
 - Exploring options for expanding the inventory of nursing homes/board and care homes in new locations;
 - Retaining and maintaining existing senior-only mobile home parks in the County and facilitate improvements to ensure retention of senior-only status, and encourage maintenance of existing mobile homes consistent with state and federal laws; and
 - Encouraging senior housing by increasing density for smaller units through Program 2.6 (re. counting units less than 500 square feet as .5 unit on RM zoned sites) and through density bonus provisions pertaining to senior housing, reducing parking requirements, and allocating RDA funding as matching funds for senior projects that qualify for federal and/or state funding sources.
- Responsible Entity: Board of Supervisors, Planning Department
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- Program 5.8 Encourage the development of larger-sized units (i.e. 3 or more bedrooms), as appropriate, in multi-family developments, specifically, continue to commit Redevelopment Low and Moderate Income Housing Funds to projects applying for state and federal financing in order enhance their competitiveness and feasibility. Many multi-family housing financial tools such as federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits and the state's Multifamily Housing Program are weighted in favor of projects that provide units of 3 or more bedrooms.
- Responsible Entity: Non-profit Housing Developers, RDA
 - Timeframe: Ongoing
- Program 5.9 Support programs that serve the housing needs of individuals with mental health issues, including:
 - Supporting proposals for a variety of housing opportunities for people with mental illnesses, consistent with the Olmstead Act that requires that people with psychiatric disabilities have the opportunity to live in the least restrictive level of care possible;
 - Working with the Health Department to identify and consider development of a facility that includes a locked perimeter enabling people who require this feature to continue to safely live in our community;
 - Supporting and facilitating the programs of the Human Services Department and the Health Services Agency to provide additional crisis treatment facilities, transitional housing, social rehabilitation programs, permanent supportive housing beds, and Skilled Nursing beds for people who are elderly and have a mental illness; and

- Coordinating with the Health Services Agency Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services to develop housing projects and programs targeted for people with mental illness as defined by the Mental Health Services Act.
- Responsible Entity: County Health Services Agency (HSA), Planning Department
- Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 5.10** Promote additional incentives to expand the supply of housing for farmworkers, including:
 - Amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow for the creation of farmworker housing on agriculturally zoned parcels, pursuant to Section 51230.2 of the California Government Code.
- Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
- Timeframe: 2010-2011
- **Program 5.11** Encourage developers of affordable housing projects to pursue funding sources that would allow incorporating units that meet the needs of farmworker households. By continuing to provide local matching funds for such projects that come forward with the California Department of Housing and Community Development funding through the Joe Serna Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, RDA
 - Timeframe: ongoing
- **Program 5.12** Adopt an ordinance to allow homeless shelters as a principally permitted use in the Public Facilities (PF) zone and define appropriate management and development standards, similar to those imposed for other uses in the zone district.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: Before end of 2010

Goal 6: Promote Energy Efficiency in Existing and New Residential Structures

The following programs are intended to implement Goal 6:

- **Program 6.1** Continue to implement existing policies that encourage the design of energy-efficient projects.
 - Responsible Entity: Planning Department, Board of Supervisors
 - Timeframe: Ongoing
- **Program 6.2** Adopt a Green Building Program to govern new home construction and remodels to encourage energy-efficiency, use of recycled or sustainably-produced products, improved indoor air quality, and reduced resource demands.

Promote compliance with this program by making the requirements easy to understand and follow, and by offering Green Building Awards to projects that achieve a very high level of sustainability.

- Responsible Entity: Board of Supervisors, Planning Department
- Timeframe: 2009-2010
- Program 6.3 Explore programs to finance the retrofit of existing affordable housing projects to improve energy efficiency.
 - Responsible Entity: RDA, Non-profit Housing Providers
 - Timeframe: ongoing

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

A. Geology and Soils

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of material loss, injury, or death involving:

- A. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or as identified by other substantial evidence?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ |
|-------|-------|-------------|-------|

- B. Seismic ground shaking?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ |
|-------|-------|-------------|-------|

- C. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ |
|-------|-------|-------------|-------|

- D. Landslides?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ | _____X_____ | _____ |
|-------|-------|-------------|-------|

State

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act's main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The Act only addresses the hazard of surface fault rupture and is not directed toward other earthquake hazards. The law requires the State Geologist to establish regulatory zones (known as Earthquake Fault Zones) around the surface traces of active faults and to issue appropriate maps. The maps are distributed to all affected cities, counties, and state agencies for their use in planning and controlling new or renewed construction. Local agencies must regulate most development projects within the zones. Projects include all land divisions and most structures for human occupancy. Single-family wood-frame and steel-frame dwellings up to two stories that are not part of a development of four units or more are exempt. However, local agencies can be more restrictive than state law requires.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

International Building Code/Uniform Building Code

The Uniform Building Code (UBC) was first enacted by the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO) on October 18-21, 1927. Revised editions of this code are published approximately every 3 years until 1997, which was the final year of the code. The UBC (1997) includes provisions associated with engineering design and building requirements. The UBC was replaced in 2000 by the new International Building Code (IBC) published by the International Code Council (ICC). The ICC was a merger of three predecessor organizations, which published three different building codes.

California Building Standards Code

The California Building Code (CBC) is another name for the body of regulations known as the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24, Part 2, which is a portion of the California Building Standards Code and establishes minimum requirements for a buildings structural strength and stability to safeguard the public health, safety and general welfare. Title 24 is assigned to the California Building Standards Commission, which, by law, is responsible for coordinating all building standards. Under state law, all building standards must be centralized in Title 24 or they are not enforceable.

Published by the International Conference of Building Officials, the UBC is a widely adopted model building code in the United States. The California Building Code incorporates by reference the 2006 International Building Code with necessary California amendments.

Local

County of Santa Cruz General Plan and Local Coastal Program

The County of Santa Cruz General Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in May of 1994 and certified by the California Coastal Commission in December of 1994. The following policies are applicable to geology and soils.

Policy 6.1.4: Site Investigation Regarding Liquefaction Hazard (LCP). Require site-specific investigation by a certified engineering geologist and/or civil engineer of all development proposals of more than four residential units in areas designated as having a high or very high liquefaction potential. Proposals of four units and under and non-residential projects shall be reviewed for liquefaction hazard through environmental review and/or geologic hazards assessment, and when a significant potential hazard exists a site-specific investigation shall be required.

Policy 6.3.4: Erosion Control Plan Approval Required for Development (LCP). Require approval of an erosion control plan for all development, as specified in the Erosion Control Ordinance. Vegetation removal shall be minimized and limited to that amount indicated on the approved development plans, but shall be consistent with fire safety requirements.

Policy 6.3.5: Installation of Erosion Control Measures. Require the installation of erosion control measures consistent with the Erosion Control Ordinance, by October

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

15, or the advent of significant rain, or project completion, whichever occurs first. Prior to October 15, require adequate erosion control to be provided to prevent erosion from early storms. For development activities, require protection of exposed soil from erosion between October 15 and April 15 and require vegetation and stabilization of disturbed areas prior to completion of the project. For agricultural activities, require that adequate measures are taken to prevent excessive sediment from leaving the property.

Policy 6.3.7: Reuse of Topsoil and Native Vegetation Upon Grading Completion. Require topsoil to be stockpiled and reapplied upon completion of grading to promote regrowth of vegetation; native vegetation should be used in replanting disturbed areas to enhance long-term stability.

Policy 6.3.8: On-Site Sediment Containment (LCP). Require containment of all sediment on the site during construction and require drainage improvements for the completed development that will provide runoff control, including onsite retention or detention where downstream drainage facilities have limited capacity. Runoff control systems or Best Management Practices shall be adequate to prevent any significant increase in site runoff over pre-existing volumes and velocities and to maximize on-site collection of non-point source pollutants.

Policy 6.3.9: Site Design to Minimize Grading (LCP). Require site design in all areas to minimize grading activities and reduce vegetation removal based on the following guidelines:

- (a) Structures should be clustered;
- (b) Access roads and driveways shall not cross slopes greater than 30 percent; cuts and fills should not exceed 10 feet, unless they are wholly underneath the footprint and adequately retained;
- (c) Foundation designs should minimize excavation or fill;
- (d) Building and access envelopes should be designated on the basis of site inspection to avoid particularly erodible areas;
- (e) Require all fill and sidecast material to be recompacted to engineered standards, reseeded, and mulched and/or burlap covered.

Amending the County of Santa Cruz Housing Element would not result in any significant geological impacts because actions to implement the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect the safety of the community. Furthermore, all new housing development and rehabilitation that might result from Housing Element implementation would be required to be consistent with existing state and local building codes, which are designed to ensure that new construction does not expose people to significant geological impacts. Therefore, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with seismic hazards.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

2. Subject people or improvements to damage from soil instability as a result of on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, to subsidence, liquefaction, or structural collapse?

X

Liquefaction tends to occur in loose, saturated fine-grained sands, coarse silts or clays with low plasticity. The liquefaction process typically occurs at depths less than 50 feet below the ground surface, although liquefaction can occur at deeper intervals, given the right conditions. The most susceptible zone occurs at depths shallower than 30 feet below the ground surface. In order for liquefaction to occur there must be the proper soil type, soil saturation, and cyclic accelerations of sufficient magnitude to progressively increase the water pressures within the soil mass. Non-cohesive soil shear strength is developed by the point-to-point contact of the soil grains. As the water pressures increase in the void spaces surrounding the soil grains, the soil particles become supported more by the water than the point-to-point contact. When the water pressures increase sufficiently, the soil grains begin to lose contact with each other resulting in the loss of shear strength and continuous deformation of the soil where the soil begins to liquefy.

Liquefaction can lead to several types of ground failure, depending on slope conditions and the geological and hydrological settings, of which the four most common types of ground failure are: 1) lateral spreads, 2) flow failures, 3) ground oscillation and 4) loss of bearing strength. Much of Santa Cruz County is subject to damage from soil instability as a result of on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, or liquefaction.

The County of Santa Cruz General Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in May of 1994 and certified by the California Coastal Commission in December of 1994. The following policies are applicable to slope stability and liquefaction: Policy 6.1.1, Geologic Review for Development in Designated Fault Zones; Policy 6.1.2, Geologic Reports for Development in Alquist-Priolo Zones; Policy 6.1.3, Engineering Geology Report for Public Facilities in Fault Zones; Policy 6.1.4, Site Investigation Regarding Liquefaction Hazard; Policy 6.1.5, Location of Development Away from Potentially Hazardous Areas; Policy 6.1.9, Recordation of Geologic Hazards; Policy 6.1.10, Density Recommendations for Proposed Development; Policy 6.1.11, Setbacks from Faults; Policy 6.1.12, Minimum Parcel Size in Fault Zones; Policy 6.2.1, Geologic Hazards Assessments for Development on and Near Slopes; Policy 6.2.2, Engineering Geology Report; 6.2.3, Conditions for Development and Grading Permits; Policy 6.2.4, Mitigation of Geologic Hazards and Density Considerations; Policy 6.2.5, Slope Considerations for Land Division Calculations; Policy 6.2.6, Location of Structures and Drainage Considerations in Unstable Areas; Policy 6.2.7; Location of Septic Leach Fields; and Policy 6.2.9, Recordation of Geologic Hazards.

The amendment to the County's Housing Element identifies that an additional 1,289 housing units are required in the unincorporated County. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of these additional units, it is not possible to

| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
|---|---|---|-------------------|

determine if new residential development would be subject to liquefaction, landslide, and other related hazards. However, new residential development within the County would be designed and constructed to meet the most current seismic safety standards for liquefaction included in the California Building Code (2007) and/or standards established by the County of Santa Cruz. Therefore, a case-by-case review of future housing projects and programs would be necessary to ensure consistency with state, federal, and all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that potential liquefaction, landslide, and other related impacts are less-than-significant.

3. Develop land with a slope exceeding 30%?

X

There are many slopes that exceed 30% within the County. The County of Santa Cruz General Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in May of 1994 and certified by the California Coastal Commission in December of 1994. The following policies are applicable to slopes exceeding 30 percent: Policy 6.2.1, Geologic Hazards Assessments for Development on and Near Slopes; Policy 6.2.2, Engineering Geology Report; 6.2.3, Conditions for Development and Grading Permits; Policy 6.2.4, Mitigation of Geologic Hazards and Density Considerations; Policy 6.2.5, Slope Considerations for Land Division Calculations; Policy 6.2.6, Location of Structures and Drainage Considerations in Unstable Areas; Policy 6.2.7; Location of Septic Leach Fields; Policy 6.2.9; Recordation of Geologic Hazards; and Policy 6.3.1, Slope Restrictions.

The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area or parcels of land, there is no potential impact from approval of the document. Each discretionary development proposal will necessitate independent review of environmental impacts.

4. Result in soil erosion or the substantial loss of topsoil?

X

Much of Santa Cruz County is subject to soil erosion during construction. However, standard erosion controls are a required condition of projects with erosion potential. The County of Santa Cruz General Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in May of 1994 and certified by the California Coastal Commission in December of 1994. The following policies are applicable to soil erosion and loss of topsoil: Policy 6.3.1, Slope Restrictions; Policy 6.3.2, Grading Projects to Address Mitigation Measures; Policy 6.3.3, Abatement of Grading and Drainage Problems; Policy 6.3.4, Erosion Control Plan Approval Required for Development; Policy 6.3.5, Installation of Erosion Control Measures; Policy 6.3.6, Earthmoving in Least Disturbed or Water Supply Watersheds; Policy 6.3.7, Reuse of Topsoil and Native Vegetation Upon Grading Completion; Policy 6.3.8, On-site Sediment Containment; Policy 6.3.9, Site Design to Minimize Grading; Policy 6.3.10, Land Clearing Permit; and Policy 6.3.11, Sensitive Habitat Considerations for Land

| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
|---|---|---|-------------------|

Clearing Permits.

The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area or parcels of land, there is no potential impact from approval of the document. Each discretionary development proposal will necessitate independent review of environmental impacts.

5. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to property? _____

X

Expansive soils have the potential for shrinking and swelling with changes in moisture content, which can cause damage to overlying structures. The amount and type of clay in the soil influences the changes. The problems resulting from expansive soils can be controlled by proper engineering and construction practices. The presence or absence of expansive soils is therefore not considered a critical factor in overall land planning.

The amendment to the County's Housing Element identifies that an additional 1,289 housing units are required in the County. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of these additional residential units, it is not possible to determine if new residential development would be subject to hazards associated with expansive soil(s). However, new residential development within the County would be designed and constructed to meet the most current standards included in the California Building Code. Implementation of the related County of Santa Cruz General Plan policies and environmental review would ensure that any potential impacts are less-than-significant.

In addition, the Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area or parcels of land, there is no potential impact from approval of the document. Each discretionary development proposal will necessitate independent review of environmental impacts.

6. Place sewage disposal systems in areas dependent upon soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, leach fields, or alternative waste water disposal systems? _____

X

New sewer connections and/or the installation of new septic systems will be evaluated on a project specific basis. The County of Santa Cruz General Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in May of 1994 and certified by the California Coastal Commission in December of 1994. The following policies are applicable to sewage disposal systems: Policy 6.2.7, Location of Septic Leach Fields; Policy 6.2.12, Setbacks from Coastal Bluffs; and Policy 6.4.9, Septic Systems, Leach Fields, and Fill Placement. As no development is proposed as a part of this project, the anticipated future development cannot be predicted. The Housing Element is a

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area, there is no potential impact. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of environmental impacts.

7. Result in coastal cliff erosion?

X

Amending the County of Santa Cruz Housing Element would not result in any significant impacts due to cliff erosion because actions to implement the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan. The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. No development is proposed under this proposal.

Any future development would be required to comply with coastal protection policies including those prohibiting erosion to coastal cliffs and bluffs. The following General Plan policies are applicable to coastal cliff erosion. Policy 6.2.10: Site Development to Minimize Hazards; Policy 6.2.11: Geologic hazards Assessment in Coastal Hazard Areas; Policy 6.2.12: Setbacks from Coastal Bluffs; Policy 6.2.13: Exception for Foundation; Policy 6.2.14: Additions to Existing Structures; Policy 6.2.15: New Development on Existing Lots of Record; Policy 6.2.16: Structural Shoreline Protection Measures; Policy 6.12.17: Prohibit New Building Sites in Coastal Hazard Areas; Policy 6.2.18: Public Services in Coastal Hazard Areas; Policy 6.2.19: Drainage and Landscape Plans; Policy 6.2.20: Reconstruction of Damaged Structures on Coastal Bluffs; and Policy 6.2.21: Reconstruction of Damaged Structures due to Storm Wave Inundation. Therefore, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with coastal cliff erosion.

B. Hydrology, Water Supply and Water Quality

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Place development within a 100-year flood hazard area?

X

Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific flooding impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case review of future housing projects would be carried out to ensure the safety of the future communities, and that future projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. The following General Plan policies are applicable to development within the 100-year flood hazard area: Policy 6.4.1, Geologic Hazards Assessment Required in Flood Hazard Areas; Policy 6.4.2, Development Proposals Protected from Flood Hazard; Policy 6.4.3, Development on or Adjacent to Coastal Bluffs and Beaches; Policy 6.4.5, New Parcels in 100-year Floodplains; Policy 6.4.6, Density Calculations; Policy 6.4.8, New Construction to be Outside Flood Hazard Areas; Policy 6.4.9, Septic Systems, Leach

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

Fields, and Fill Placement; and Policy 6.4.10, Flood Control Structures. No significant impact is anticipated.

2. Place development within the floodway resulting in impedance or redirection of flood flows?

X

Please see response to B1. No significant impacts are anticipated.

3. Be inundated by a seiche or tsunami?

X

A tsunami is a sea wave generated by a submarine earthquake, landslide or volcanic action. While the possibility of a major tsunami from either of the latter two events is considered to be extremely remote for Santa Cruz County, a tsunami caused by a submarine earthquake is considered possible. Submarine earthquakes are common around the edges of the Pacific Ocean, as well as other areas. Therefore, all of the Pacific coastal areas are subject to this potential hazard to a greater or lesser degree.

Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific impacts resulting from seiches and tsunamis that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case design review of future discretionary housing projects would be carried out to ensure the safety of the future communities, and that future projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. General Plan Policy 6.4.3 is applicable to protection from storm swell, wave action and tsunami impacts. Policy Adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

4. Deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit, or a significant contribution to an existing net deficit in available supply, or a significant lowering of the local groundwater table?

X

The amended Housing Element is a policy level document; and therefore, does not contain specific projects. As no development is proposed as part of this project, the anticipated impacts to groundwater supply or groundwater recharge would not be significant. Each discretionary development proposal would be analyzed to determine whether that particular development would have any impact on groundwater supply or groundwater recharge. The following General Plan policies are applicable to water supply: Policy 5.8.1, Primary Groundwater Recharge Area Designation, Policy 5.8.2, Land Division and Density Requirements in Primary Groundwater Recharge Areas; Policy 5.8.3, Uses in Primary Groundwater Recharge Areas; Policy 5.8.4, Drainage

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

Design in Primary Groundwater Recharge Areas; Policy 7.18.1, Linking Growth to Water Supplies; Policy 7.18.2, Written Commitments Confirming Water Service Required for Permits; 7.18.3, Impacts of New Development on Water Purveyors, Policy 7.18.5, Groundwater Management; Policy 7.18.6, Water Conservation Requirements; and Policy 7.18.7, Water Reuse. Therefore, the impacts associated with the Housing Element would be less-than-significant.

5. Degrade a public or private water supply? (Including the contribution of urban contaminants, nutrient enrichments, or other agricultural chemicals or seawater intrusion).

X

As no development is proposed as part of this project, the anticipated impacts to water supply would not be significant. Any future development would be required to address drainage issues specifically pertaining to that parcel. No commercial or industrial activities are proposed that would contribute a significant amount of contaminants to a public or private water supply. General Plan Policy 7.18.4, Improvement of Water Systems is applicable to the protection of public and private water supplies. Policy

6. Degrade septic system functioning?

X

Existing septic systems would not be affected by the proposed project. The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area or parcels of land, there is no potential impact from approval of the document. Please see discussion for A-6. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of environmental impacts. No significant impacts are anticipated.

7. Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which could result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on or off-site?

X

The proposed project would not affect any watercourses or alter any existing drainage patterns. Any new development would be required to address drainage issues specifically pertaining to that parcel. The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. The following General Plan policies are applicable to alteration of drainage patterns: Policy 6.4.5, New Parcels in 100-year Floodplains; Policy 6.4.7, New Construction to be Outside Flood Hazard Areas; Policy 6.4.8, Elevation of Residential Structures; Policy 6.4.9, Septic Systems, Leach Fields, and Fill Placement; and Policy 6.4.10, Flood Control Structures. Because the project does not make specific reference to any given area or parcels of land, there is no potential impact from approval of the document. Each development proposal would necessitate

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

independent review of environmental impacts. No significant impacts are anticipated.

8. Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, or create additional source(s) of polluted runoff?

X

No change to runoff or drainage patterns would result from the approval of this policy document. Any future development would be required to address drainage issues specifically pertaining to that parcel. The following General Plan policies are applicable to drainage: Policy 7.23.1, New Development; 7.23.2, Minimizing Impervious Surfaces; Policy 7.23.3, On-site Storm Water Detention; Policy 7.23.4, Downstream Impact Assessments; and 7.23.5, Control Surface Runoff. No significant impacts are anticipated.

9. Contribute to flood levels or erosion in natural water courses by discharges of newly collected runoff?

X

See discussion B-8. Approval of the proposed policy document would not result in new impervious surfaces, thus there would be no additional storm water runoff that could contribute to flooding or erosion. Any future development would be required to address drainage issues specifically pertaining to that parcel. No significant impacts are anticipated.

10. Otherwise substantially degrade water supply or quality?

X

See response to B-4.

Under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits to regulate waste discharges to "waters of the U.S." Waters of the U.S. include rivers, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of storm water and construction project discharges. A construction project resulting in the disturbance of one (1) or more acres requires a NPDES ground construction permit. Construction project proponents are required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

The amended Housing Element is a policy level document; and therefore, does not contain specific projects. Future development anticipated in the amended Housing Element that requires a discretionary approval would be subject to the County's environmental review process; therefore, future residential development would be evaluated on an individual basis for conformance with water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) as specified by the NPDES permit and the approval of a SWPPP would ensure that any

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

potential impacts associated with this issue are less than significant.

C. Biological Resources

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Have an adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

X

The Housing Element Update anticipates the need for 1,289 housing units in the County for the seven-year period from 2007-2014. The County of Santa Cruz General Plan has been developed with resource protection policies. Amending the County of Santa Cruz General Plan to include the Housing Element Update would not result in any significant impacts on biological resources because implementation of the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with state and federal laws and the goals, policies, and standards established within the Conservation and Open Space Element of the General Plan, which are intended to protect biological resources. The following General Plan policies are applicable to sensitive species and their habitats: Policy 5.1.1, Sensitive Habitat Designation; Policy 5.1.2, Definition of Sensitive Habitat; Policy 5.1.3, Environmentally Sensitive Habitats; Policy 5.1.4, Sensitive habitat Protection Ordinance; Policy 5.1.5, Land Division and Density Requirements in Sensitive Habitats; Policy 5.1.6, Development within Sensitive habitats; Policy 5.1.7, Site Design and Use Regulations; Policy 5.1.8, Chemicals within Sensitive Habitats; Policy 5.1.9, Biotic Assessments; Policy 5.1.10, Species Protection; Policy 5.1.11, Wildlife Resources Beyond Sensitive Habitats; Policy 5.1.12, Habitat Restoration with Development Approval; Policy 5.1.14, Removal of Invasive Plant Species; and Policy 5.1.15, Priorities for Restoration Funding.

Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific biological impacts that may result from future housing development proposals. Therefore, case-by-case review of future housing projects would be necessary to assess the potential for environmental project specific biological impacts and project consistency with state and federal regulations, and all General Plan goals, objectives and policies. Adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

2. Have an adverse effect on a sensitive biotic community (riparian corridor, wetland, native grassland, special forests, intertidal zone, etc.)?

X

| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
|---|---|---|-------------------|

Please refer to response C-1 above.

3. Interfere 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 or migratory wildlife nursery sites?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

Please refer to response C-1 above.

4. Produce nighttime lighting that will illuminate animal habitats?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

Please refer to response C-1 above.

5. Make a significant contribution to the reduction of the number of species of plants or animals?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

Please refer to response C-1 above.

6. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (such as the Significant Tree Protection Ordinance, Sensitive Habitat Ordinance, provisions of the Design Review ordinance protecting trees with trunk sizes of 6 inch diameters or greater)?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances. The Housing Element would be consistent with Objective 5.1, Biological Diversity; Objective 5.2, Riparian Corridors and Wetlands; Objective 5.3, Aquatic and Marine Habitats; and Objective 5.4, Monterey Bay and Coastal Water Quality and their associated Policies.

7. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Biotic Conservation Easement, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

Please see response to C-1 above.

D. Energy and Natural Resources

Does the project have the potential to:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

1. Affect or be affected by land designated as "Timber Resources" by the General Plan?

X

Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific timber resources impacts that may result from future housing development proposals. Therefore, case-by-case review of future housing projects would be necessary to assess the potential for environmental project specific timber resources impacts and project consistency with all General Plan goals, objectives and policies. The following General Plan policies are applicable to Timber Resources: Policy 5.12.2, Uses within Timber Production Zones; Policy 5.12.4, land Divisions and Density Requirements for Timber Production Zoned Lands; Policy 5.12.5, General Conditions for All Development Proposals on Timber Production Zoned Lands; Policy 5.12.6, Conditions for Clustered Development Proposals on Timber Production Zoned Lands; Policy 5.12.7, Location of Development on Timber Production Lands; and Policy 5.12.8, Timber Resource Land Not Zoned Timber Production. Adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

2. Affect or be affected by lands currently utilized for agriculture, or designated in the General Plan for agricultural use?

X

Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific impacts to agricultural lands that may result from future housing development proposals. Therefore, case-by-case review of future housing projects would be necessary to assess the potential for environmental project specific impacts and project consistency with all General Plan goals, objectives and policies. The following General Plan policies are applicable to agricultural resources: Policy 5.13.20, Conversion of Commercial Agricultural lands; Policy 5.13.21, Determining Agricultural Viability; Policy 5.13.22, Conversion to Non-agricultural Uses Near Urban Areas; Policy 5.13.23, Agricultural Buffers Required; Policy 5.13.24, Agricultural Buffer Findings Required for Reduced Setbacks; Policy 5.13.25, Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission Review; Policy 5.13.26, Windbreaks; Policy 5.13.27, Siting to Minimize Conflicts; Policy 5.13.28, Residential Uses on Commercial Agricultural Land; Policy 5.13.31, Agricultural Notification Recordation for Land Divisions; Policy 5.13.32, Agricultural Statement of Acknowledgement; Policy 5.13.33, Density on Parcels Adjacent to Commercial Agricultural Lands; and Policy 5.14.12, Non-commercial Agricultural Land Division and Density Requirements. Adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

3. Encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use of these in a wasteful manner?

X

The Housing Element is a policy level document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area, there is no potential impact. The following General Plan policies are applicable to fuel, water, and energy use: Policy 5.17.1, Promote Alternative Energy Sources; Policy 5.17.2, Design Structures for Solar Gain; Policy 5.17.3, Solar Access; Policy 5.17.5, Weatherization Improvements; Policy 5.17.6, Tubs and Pools; Policy 5.17.7, Street Lighting; Policy 5.17.8, Unnecessary Waste; Policy 7.18.6, Water Conservation Requirements; and Policy 7.18.7, Water Reuse. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of environmental impacts. No significant impact is anticipated.

4. Have a substantial effect on the potential use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource (i.e., minerals or energy resources)?

X

The Housing Element is a policy level document to guide future housing projects. The following General Plan policies are applicable to mineral extraction land use conflicts: Policy 5.16.2, Uses in Mineral Resource Areas; Policy 5.16.3, Review of Incompatible Uses; Policy 5.16.4, Minimizing Conflicts Between New Development and Mineral Resource Areas; and Policy 5.16.5, Land Division and Density Requirements on Mineral Resource Land. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area, there is no potential impact. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of environmental impacts. No significant impact is anticipated.

E. Visual Resources and Aesthetics

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Have an adverse effect on a scenic resource, including visual obstruction of that resource?

X

The Housing Element Update anticipates the need for 1,289 housing units in the County for the seven year period from 2007 to 2014. Without identifying the location of residential development, the potential impact of development on a scenic resource, including a visual obstruction of that resource, is impossible to determine. Furthermore, because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific visual impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. A case-by-case design review of future housing projects would be carried

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

out to ensure that existing views and aesthetic conditions are preserved, and that the projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. The following General Plan policies are applicable to scenic resources: Policy 5.10.2, Development within Visual Resource Areas; Policy 5.10.3, Protection of Public Vistas; Policy 5.10.3, Protection of Public Vistas; Policy 5.10.4, Preserving Natural Buffers; Policy 5.10.5, Preserving Agricultural Vistas; Policy 5.10.6, Preserving Ocean Vistas; Policy 5.10.7, Open Beaches and bluffs; Policy 5.10.8, Significant Tree Removal Ordinance; Policy 5.10.9, Restoration of Scenic Areas; Policy 5.10.11, Development Visible from Rural Scenic Roads; Policy 5.10.12, Development Visible from Urban Scenic Roads; Policy 5.10.13, Landscaping Requirements; Policy 5.10.14, Protecting Views in the North Coast and Bonny Doon; Policy 5.10.16, Designation of Coastal Special Scenic Areas; and Policy 5.10.17, Swanton Road Coastal Special Scenic Area. Therefore, adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

2. Substantially damage scenic resources, within a designated scenic corridor or public view shed area including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

Please refer to response E-1 above.

3. Degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridge line?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

Please refer to response E-1 above.

4. Create a new source of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

Please refer to response E-1 above.

5. Destroy, cover, or modify any unique geologic or physical feature?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | _____ | X | _____ |
|-------|-------|---|-------|

Please refer to response E-1 above. The following General Plan policies are applicable to unique geologic or physical features: Policy 5.9.1, Protection and Designation of Significant Resources; and Policy 5.9.2, Protecting Significant Resources Through Easements and Land Dedications. No significant impact is

F. Cultural Resources

1. Cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5?

X

The amended Housing Element requires the development of an additional 1,289 housing units in the County. However, the amended Housing Element contains policies and programs rather than ordinance amendments or specific projects. Without specific data on the location and type of new residential development, it is not possible to determine potential impacts to archaeological and historic resources. Environmental review of discretionary residential development(s) would permit an analysis of how such development may potentially conflict with known archaeological and/or historic resources. The possibility also exists that future discretionary development would discover or uncover previously unknown archaeological resources. Therefore, a case-by-case environmental review of future discretionary housing projects and programs would be necessary to ensure consistency with state, federal, and all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. The following General Plan policies are applicable to historic resources: Policy 5.20.3, Development Activities; Policy 5.20.4, Historic Resources Commission Review; Policy 5.20.5, Encourage Protection of Historic Structures; Policy 5.20.6, Maintain Designation as a Certified Local Government; Policy 5.19.1, Evaluation of Native American Cultural Sites; Policy 5.19.2, Site Surveys; Policy 5.19.3, Development Around Archaeological Resources; Policy 5.19.4, Archaeological Evaluations; and Policy 5.19.5, Native American Cultural Sites. Adherence to applicable County, state, and federal standards and guidelines related to the protection/preservation of cultural resources, as well as the requirements mandated during the environmental review of individual projects would ensure that potential impacts related to cultural resources are less-than-significant.

2. Cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5?

X

43 / 63

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

X

See response to F-1 above. No impact to disturbance to human remains is anticipated. The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area, there is no potential impact. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of environmental impacts.

4. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

X

No impact to any unique paleontological resources would occur. The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area, there is no potential impact. The following General Plan policies are applicable to paleontological resources: Policy 5.9.1, Protection and Designation of Significant Resources, and Policy 5.9.2, Protecting Significant Resources Through Easements and Land Dedication. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of environmental impacts.

G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as a result of the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, not including gasoline or other motor fuels?

X

The potential release of hazardous materials along roadways is an on-going condition that is regulated by federal, state, and local regulations. This condition would exist with or without the proposed project.

The update to the County's Housing Element identifies that an additional 1,289 housing units are required in the unincorporated County of Santa Cruz. Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific hazardous impacts that may result from future housing development proposals. However, operation of residential developments generally does not involve hazardous materials, aside from common household products.

Amending the Housing Element would not result in any significant hazards, such as exposure to potential health hazards, or creation of a health hazard, because actions to implement the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect the safety of the community. General Plan policy 6.7.10, Distance from Residences, is applicable to hazardous materials: Policy Furthermore, to ensure that development of housing on specific sites does not result in potentially significant hazards or expose people to potential health hazards, future projects would be reviewed for consistency with state, federal, and local requirements and guidelines. Adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

2. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

X

The amended Housing Element contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. In the absence of specific information regarding the location and type of additional residential units, a residential development site cannot be identified as being located in or near an area identified as a hazardous materials site. Review of potential impacts related to this issue would be conducted during the environmental review of specific residential developments requiring discretionary review. General Plan Policy 6.6.1, Hazardous Materials Ordinance, is applicable to hazardous materials sites. Adherence to applicable County, state, and/or federal regulations would ensure that potential hazards to the public are less-than-significant.

3. Create a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area as a result of dangers from aircraft using a public or private airport located within two miles of the project site?

X

One municipal airport is located in Santa Cruz county within the City of Watsonville at the south end of the county. The amended Housing Element contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. Future discretionary development proposals would undergo analysis to determine whether a residential development site would create a safety hazard for persons residing in new residential development. Review of potential impacts related to this issue would be conducted during the environmental review of specific residential developments. The following General Plan policies are applicable to airport safety: Policy 3.18.1, Prevention of Airspace Obstructions; Policy 3.18.2, Creation of New Parcels in the Runway Protection Zone Area; Policy 3.18.3, Land Use Limitation in Runway Protection (Clear or A) Zones; Policy 3.18.4, Land Use Limitation in Airport Approach (B) Zones; and Policy 3.18.5, Deed Recordation Acknowledging Airport Hazard. Adherence to applicable County, state, and/or federal regulations would ensure that potential hazards associated with this issue are less-

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

than-significant.

4. Expose people to electro-magnetic fields associated with electrical transmission lines?

X

Amending the Housing Element would not result in exposure of people to electro-magnetic fields associated with electrical transmission lines, because actions to implement the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect the safety of the community (e.g., Public Safety and Noise). Furthermore, to ensure that development of housing on specific sites does not result in potentially significant hazards or expose people to potential health hazards, future discretionary projects would be reviewed for consistency with state, federal, and local requirements and guidelines. The following General Plan policies are applicable to electro-magnetic fields: Policy 6.8.1, Prudent Avoidance; Policy 6.8.2, Measuring Ambient Magnetic Fields; and Policy 6.8.3, Development Mitigation Measures. Adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

5. Create a potential fire hazard?

X

Amending the Housing Element would not create a potential fire hazard, because actions to implement the goals, policies, and actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect the safety of the community (e.g., Public Safety and Noise). The following General Plan policies are applicable to fire hazards: Policy 6.5.1, Access Standards; Policy 6.5.2, Exceptions to Access Standards; Policy 6.5.3, Conditions for Project Approval; Policy 6.5.4, Fire Protection Standards for Land Divisions Outside the Urban Services Line; Policy 6.5.5, Standards for New Dead End Roads; Policy 6.5.6, Maintenance for Private Roads; Policy 6.5.7, Certification of Adequate Fire Protection Prior to Permit Approval; Policy 6.5.9, Consistency with Adopted Codes Required for New Development; Policy 6.5.10, Land Divisions Access Requirements; and Policy 6.5.11, Fire Protection Standards for Land Divisions Inside the Urban Services Line. In addition, any potential future project design would incorporate all applicable fire safety code requirements. No significant impact is anticipated.

6. Release bio-engineered organisms or chemicals into the air outside of project buildings?

X

Amending the Housing Element would not release bio-engineered organisms or chemicals into the air. No commercial or industrial policies have been incorporated into the Housing Element. General Plan Policy 6.6.1, Hazardous Materials Ordinance, is applicable to the release of hazardous substances. No significant impact is

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

anticipated.

H. Transportation/Traffic

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

X

The amended Housing Element identifies an assigned growth need of 1,289 additional housing units through 2014. Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Element does not include site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific transportation impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. All future discretionary residential development shall be reviewed to ensure consistency with all regional and local transportation plans and policies, the County of Santa Cruz General Plan, and all applicable County ordinances. The following General Plan policies are applicable to traffic generation: Policy 3.12.1, Level of Service Policy; Policy 3.12.2, Level of Service Calculation Methods; Policy 3.12.3, Transportation Impact Fees as Mitigation Measures; and Policy 3.12.4, Reduced Traffic Generation. In addition, all discretionary proposals, both private and public, to develop new residential units shall be subject to a project-specific environmental analysis. Adherence to such requirements would ensure potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

2. Cause an increase in parking demand which cannot be accommodated by existing parking facilities?

X

Development anticipated by the amended Housing Element involves the construction of residential dwelling units. Each development would be required to adhere to all applicable County of Santa Cruz standards pertaining to the provision of parking facilities. Any future discretionary development project would be evaluated to determine adequacy of parking on an individual basis. The following General Plan policies are applicable to parking demand: Policy 3.3.1, Reduced Parking Requirements; Policy 3.3.2, Shared Parking; Policy 3.3.3, Park & Ride Lots; Policy 3.3.4, Joint Use; Policy 3.3.5, Neighborhood Parking Spillover; and Policy 3.3.6, Americans with Disabilities Act. Adherence to these standards would ensure that potential parking impacts are less-than-significant.

3. Increase hazards to motorists, bicyclists, or pedestrians?

X

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

The amended Housing Element identifies an assigned growth need of 1,289 additional housing units through 2014. Any needed traffic improvements associated with the anticipated development would be constructed to the County's roadway standards. The increased amount of traffic associated with the anticipated development would not substantially increase hazards to motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists. The following General Plan policies are applicable to hazards to motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians: Policy 3.9.1, Design; Policy 3.9.2, Construction; Policy 3.9.3, Parking; Policy 3.9.4, Maintenance; and Policy 3.11.1, Functional Street Classification and Street Standards in Urban Areas. Adherence to these standards would ensure that potential hazards to motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians would be less-than-significant.

4. Exceed, either individually (the project alone) or cumulatively (the project combined with other development), a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated intersections, roads or highways?

X

The amended Housing Element identifies an assigned growth need of 1,289 additional housing units. Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Element does not include site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific transportation impacts that may result with future discretionary housing development proposals. All discretionary residential development would be reviewed to ensure consistency with all regional and local transportation plans and policies, the County of Santa Cruz General Plan, and all applicable County ordinances (see H-1). In addition, all discretionary proposals, both private and public, to develop new residential units shall be subject to a project-specific environmental analysis. Adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

I. Noise

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Generate a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

X

The update to the Housing Element identifies that an additional 1,289 housing units are required in the unincorporated County. The development of new residential uses typically increases the traffic volumes in the vicinity of new development. Because traffic noise is a primary contributor to the local noise environment, any increase in traffic resulting from the development of new residential uses would be expected to

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

proportionally increase local noise levels. The following General Plan policies are applicable to noise generation: Policy 6.9.1, Land Use Compatibility Guidelines; Policy 6.9.2, Acoustical Studies; Policy 6.9.3, Noise Sensitive Land Uses; Policy 6.9.5, Residential Development; and Policy 6.9.7, Construction Noise.

An analysis of potential impacts associated with permanent increases in ambient noise levels brought about through implementation of the amended Housing Element would be conducted as part of the environmental review required for discretionary residential developments. In addition, adherence to applicable County and/or state noise standards would ensure that potential impacts related to this issue are less-than-significant.

2. Expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan, or applicable standards of other agencies?

X

Sound refers to anything that is or may be perceived by the ear. Noise is usually defined as unwanted sound. Noise consists of any sound that may produce physiological or psychological damage and/or interfere with communication, work, rest, recreation, and sleep. Noise impacts can be described in three categories. The first is audible impacts that refer to increases in noise levels noticeable to humans. Audible increases in noise levels generally refer to a change of 3.0 decibels (dB) or greater because this level has been found to be barely perceptible in exterior environments. The second category, potentially audible, refers to a change in the noise level between 1.0 and 3.0 dB. This range of noise levels has been found to be noticeable only in laboratory environments. The last category is changes in noise level of less than 1.0 dB that are inaudible to the human ear. Only audible changes in existing ambient or background noise levels are considered potentially significant.

The proposed project identifies a housing need of 1,289 housing units in the unincorporated County of Santa Cruz. Typically, residential housing does not generate unacceptable noise levels, which would exceed County standards. All new residential and noise sensitive land developments should conform to a noise exposure standard of 60 dB L_{dn} (day/night average noise level) for outdoor noise and 45 dB L_{dn} for indoor noise according to the General Plan. Actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect the safety of the community. Any future development of housing units are required to be consistent with General Plan Objectives and the following Policies: Policy 6.9.1, Land Use Compatibility Guidelines; Policy 6.9.2, Acoustical Studies; Policy 6.9.3, Noise Sensitive Land Uses; Policy 6.9.5, Residential Development; Policy 6.9.6, Vibrations from Rail; and Policy 6.9.7, Construction Noise. No significant impacts are anticipated.

The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area, there is no potential impact. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

environmental impacts.

3. Generate a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

X

See I-1. The update to the Housing Element identifies that an additional 1,289 housing units are required in the unincorporated County. Development of new residential uses would require the modification of individual project sites, installation of utilities, and construction of structures. Noise generated from grading and construction equipment, as well as noise generated from workers' vehicles would contribute to a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site.

An analysis of potential impacts associated with temporary increases in ambient noise levels brought about through implementation of the amended Housing Element would be conducted as part of the environmental review of discretionary residential developments. Adherence to applicable County and/or state noise standards would ensure that potential impacts related to short-term construction noise are less-than-significant.

J. Air Quality

Does the project have the potential to:
(Where available, the significance criteria established by the MBUAPCD may be relied upon to make the following determinations).

1. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

X

The North Central Coast Air Basin (hereinafter "Basin"), which is just south of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin, covers an area of 5,159 square miles and consists of the counties of Santa Cruz, San Benito, and Monterey. Marine breezes from Monterey Bay dominate the climate of this portion of the Basin. Westerly winds predominate in all seasons, but are strongest and most persistent during the spring and summer months.

The extent and severity of the air pollution problems in the Basin are a function of the area's natural physical characteristics (weather and topography), as well as human created influences (development patterns and lifestyle). Factors such as wind, sunlight, temperature, humidity, rainfall and topography all affect the accumulation and/or dispersion of pollutants throughout the Basin area.

In general, the air pollution potential of the coastal areas is relatively low due to persistent winds. The Basin is, however, subject to temperature inversions that restrict vertical mixing of pollutants and the warmer inland valleys of the Basin have a high pollution potential.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

Since 1970, air quality has been regulated at the federal level under the Clean Air Act (CAA). The CAA authorized the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for air pollutants of nationwide concern. The EPA has established standards for six criteria air pollutants. These pollutants include ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), suspended particulate matter (PM₁₀), and lead (Pb). PM_{2.5} particulate matter has recently been added to this listing. Primary standards for air pollutants were established to protect public health, while secondary standards were established to protect the public welfare by preventing impairment of visibility and damage to vegetation and property.

Local ambient air quality is monitored by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB); refer to Table 4: Local Ambient Air Quality Levels. CARB monitors ambient air quality at approximately 250 air-monitoring stations across the state. Air quality monitoring stations usually measure pollutant concentrations ten feet above ground level; therefore, air quality is often referred to in terms of ground-level concentrations. Monitoring stations within the Santa Cruz County include the Santa Cruz-Soquel monitoring station located at 2544 Soquel Avenue in the City of Santa Cruz, Watsonville Airport monitoring station located at 444 Airport Boulevard in the City of Watsonville, and the Davenport monitoring station located at Marine View and Center Avenue in the community of Davenport. The Watsonville Airport monitoring station monitors coarse PM₁₀ and O₃. The Davenport monitoring station is the only station in the North Central Coast Air Basin that monitors SO₂ and is included in Table 4: Local Ambient Air Quality Levels.

Designations are made by pollutant according to the following categories:

Attainment – Air quality in the area meets the standard.

Nonattainment Transitional – Air quality is approaching the standard (state only).

Nonattainment – Air quality in the area fails to meet the applicable standard.

Unclassified – Insufficient data to designate area, or designations have yet to be made.

Nonattainment designations are of most concern because they indicate that unhealthy levels of the pollutant exist in the area, which typically triggers a need to develop a plan to achieve the applicable standard (MBUAPCD 2009).

The Basin is considered in attainment or unclassified for most of the criteria pollutants for state and federal considerations except for O₃ and PM₁₀. Under federal regulations the Basin is designated an unclassified/attainment area for PM_{2.5} standards.

Designations in relation to the state standards are made by CARB, while designations in relation to the national standards are made by EPA. State designations are reviewed annually while the national designations are reviewed when either the standards change, or when an area requests that they be re-designated due to changes in the area's air quality. Designations are made by individual air basin and in some cases, designations are made at the county level.

Significant
Or
Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less than
Significant
with
Mitigation
Incorporation

Less than
Significant
Or
No Impact

Not
Applicable

| Table 4: Attainment Status for the North Central Coast Air Basin – January 2009 | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| Pollutant | State Standards | National Standards |
| Ozone (O ₃) | Nonattainment ¹ | Attainment ² |
| Inhalable Particulates (PM ₁₀) | Nonattainment | Attainment |
| Fine Particulates (PM _{2.5}) | Attainment | Unclassified/Attainment ³ |
| Carbon Monoxide (CO) | Monterey Co. – Attainment San Benito Co. – Unclassified Santa Cruz Co. – Unclassified | Attainment |
| Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) | Attainment | Attainment |
| Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂) | Attainment | Attainment |
| Lead | Attainment | Unclassified/Attainment ⁴ |
| Notes: | | |
| 1) Effective July 26, 2007, the ARB designated the NCCAB a nonattainment area for the state ozone standard, which was revised in 2006 to include an 8-hour standard of 0.070 ppm. | | |
| 2) On March 12, 2008, EPA adopted a new 8-hour ozone standard of 0.075 ppm, while temporarily retaining the existing 8-hour standard of 0.08 ppm. EPA is expected to issue new designations by March 2010. | | |
| 3) In 2006, the Federal 24-hour standard for PM _{2.5} was revised from 65 to 35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Although final designations have yet to be made, it is expected that the NCCAB will remain designated unclassified/attainment. | | |
| 4) On October 15, 2008 EPA substantially strengthened the national ambient air quality standard for lead by lowering the level of the primary standard from 1.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to 0.15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Initial recommendations for designations are to be made by October 2009 with final designations by January 2012. | | |

Source: MBUAPCD 2009.

The proposed project identifies a housing need of 1,289 housing units in the unincorporated County of Santa Cruz. Actions included in the Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan that are intended to protect the safety of the community. Any future development of housing units are required to be consistent with General Plan Objectives and the following Policies: Policy 5.18.1, New Development; Policy 5.18.6, Plan for Transit Use; Policy 5.18.7, Alternatives to the Automobile; Policy 5.18.8, Encouraging Landscaping; and Policy 5.18.9, Greenhouse Gas Reduction. No significant impacts are anticipated.

The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area, there is no potential impact. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of environmental impacts.

2. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of an adopted air quality plan?

X

The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plan. See J-1 above.

3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

X

The amended Housing Element contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. New development within the County must comply with the density and intensity standards outlined in the Land Use Element and the County's Zoning

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

Ordinance. A case-by-case review of future discretionary housing projects would be necessary to ensure that air quality is protected and that the projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies (See J-1 above). Furthermore, the construction of residences, in addition to the activities associated with the residences would not result in the creation of objectionable odors. Adherence to all applicable standards and guidelines would ensure that potential impacts related to sensitive receptors would be less-than-significant.

4. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
See response to J-3 above.

| | | | |
|-------|-------|--------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
|-------|-------|--------------|-------|

K. Public Services and Utilities

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Result in the need for new or physically altered public 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:

- a. Fire protection?

| | | | |
|-------|-------|--------------|-------|
| _____ | _____ | <u> X </u> | _____ |
|-------|-------|--------------|-------|

Residential development proposed by the amended Housing Element would be served by the various fire districts and departments located throughout the county. The additional development of 1,289 housing units set forth by the Housing Element would increase the need for fire protection services in the County. However, the amended Housing Element contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development may require improvements to existing facilities or increases in staffing and equipment. Through the County's environmental review process, future discretionary development would be evaluated on an individual basis for potential impacts related to the provision of fire protection services. Without specific details regarding each development, the adequacy of fire protection is impossible to determine with any precision. These needs would be evaluated in the environmental review for each individual project. The following General Plan policies are applicable to fire protection: Policy 7.16.1, Reviewing New Development for Fire Protection; Policy 7.16.2, Development to be Consistent with Fire Hazards Policies; Policy 7.16.3, Future Fire Station Sites; and Policy 7.16.4, Annexation to Scotts Valley Fire Protection District. Appropriate mitigation measures would be required to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the amended Housing Element would result in less than significant impacts to fire protection.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

b. Police protection?

X

Residential development proposed in the amended Housing Element would be served primarily by the Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Department. The additional development of 1,289 housing units set forth by the Housing Element would increase the need for police protection services in the unincorporated County. However, the amended Housing Element contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development anticipated in the amended Housing Element may require improvements to existing facilities or increases in staffing and equipment. Through the County's environmental review process, future discretionary development would be evaluated on an individual basis for potential impacts related to the provision of police protection services. Without specific details regarding each development, the adequacy of police protection is impossible to determine with any precision. These needs would be addressed and met as each development is constructed. The following General Plan policies are applicable to police protection: Policy 7.17.1, Financing of New Facilities; Policy 7.17.2, Maintaining Adequate Levels of Service; and Policy 7.17.3, Cost Effectiveness. Appropriate mitigation measures would be required to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the Housing Element Update would result in less than significant impacts to police protection.

c. Schools?

X

Public school education in Santa Cruz county is provided by 10 school districts to include: Bonny Doon Union Elementary; Live Oak; Happy Valley Union Elementary; Mountain Elementary; Pacific Elementary; Pajaro Valley Unified; San Lorenzo Valley Unified; Santa Cruz City; Scotts Valley Unified; and Soquel Union Elementary. The amended Housing Element identifies an assigned growth need of 1,289 additional housing units for development through 2014. Development of additional housing intended to meet anticipated population growth, would increase the demand on schools. Additional facilities and staffing may be necessary to accommodate the growth. Payment of the School Facilities Mitigation Fee has been deemed by the state legislature to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of a development project on the provision of adequate school facilities. The environmental assessment of each individual project would require, at minimum, the standard School Facilities Mitigation Fee, which ensures that the amended Housing Element would not result in a significant impact under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), in accordance with Senate Bill 50, which became effective in 1998. The following General Plan policies are applicable to school facilities: Policy 7.12.1, Mitigating Impacts from New Development; Policy 7.12.2, Locations of New Schools; and Policy 7.12.3, School Financing. Therefore, the impact from the amended Housing Element would be less than significant.

d. Parks or other recreational activities?

X

The County of Santa Cruz operates and maintains approximately 730 acres of

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

parkland consisting of 24 sites. The amended Housing Element identifies an assigned growth need of 1,289 additional housing units for development through 2014. The amended Housing Element contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development anticipated in the amended Housing Element would increase the demand for additional parkland within the County. All future residential development would be reviewed to ensure consistency with the County of Santa Cruz General Plan and all applicable County ordinances. The following General Plan policies are applicable to park facilities: Policy 7.1.7, Park Financing; Policy 7.1.8, Sharing Parks and Recreation Facilities; Policy 7.1.9, Priorities for Park Development; Policy 7.1.11, Private Local Parks; Policy 7.2.1, Neighborhood Park Standards; Policy 7.2.2, Mini-park Sites; Policy 7.2.3, Neighborhood Park Siting Criteria; Policy 7.2.5, Beaches in Neighborhoods; Policy 7.3.1, Community Park Standards; Policy 7.3.2, Priority for Mid-County Community Park; Policy 7.3.3, Community Park Siting Criteria; Policy 7.3.4, Establishing Community Centers; Policy 7.4.1, Rural Park Standards; Policy 7.4.2, Rural Park Siting Criteria; Policy 7.4.3, Beaches as Rural Parks; Policy 7.5.1, Regional Park Siting and Standards; Policy 7.5.2, Capital Improvement Program; and Policy 7.5.7, Beaches as Regional Parks. In addition, park dedication fees would be required for all residential development. These fees are based on the number of new bedrooms. The fund is used to purchase and develop land for parks in the area where the fee is charged. Adherence to these measures would ensure that impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

- e. Other public facilities; including
the maintenance of roads?

X

The amended Housing Element identifies an assigned growth need of 1,289 additional housing units for development through 2014. The amended Housing Element contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development anticipated in the amended Housing Element would increase the demand for public facilities and road maintenance within the County. All future residential development would be reviewed to ensure consistency with the County of Santa Cruz General Plan and all applicable County ordinances. In addition, roadside improvement fees, transportation improvement fees, roadway improvement fees, drainage-control zone fees, and sewer connection fees would be charged for maintenance of public facilities in most areas of the County. The following General Plan policies are applicable to public facilities: Policy 7.27.1, Focus Public Services and Facilities within the Urban Services Line; Policy 7.27.2, Capital Improvement Program; and Policy 7.27.3, Countywide Capital Improvements Program. Adherence to these measures would ensure that impacts associated with this issue are less-than-significant.

2. Result in the need for construction of
new storm water drainage facilities or
expansion of existing facilities, the
construction of which could cause
significant environmental effects?

X

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

Because the Housing Element is a policy level document, the Housing Element does not include any site specific designs or proposals that would enable an assessment of potential site specific storm water runoff impacts that may result with future housing development proposals. Therefore, a case-by-case environmental review of future discretionary housing projects would be carried out to ensure the safety of future communities, and that future projects are consistent with all General Plan goals, objectives, and policies. The following General Plan policies are applicable to drainage facilities: Policy 7.23.1, New Development; Policy 7.23.2, Minimizing Impervious surfaces; Policy 7.23.3, On-site Storm Water Detention; Policy 7.23.4, Downstream Impacts Assessment; and Policy 7.23.5, Control Surface Runoff. Adherence to such requirements would ensure that potential impacts associated with this issue are less than significant.

3. Result in the need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

X

With the exception of 200-300 parcels in the Summit area that are served by the San Jose Water Company, Santa Cruz County is served exclusively by local water sources. This situation is unusual in California – most communities rely to some extent on imported water to support their populations.

Water supplies in Santa Cruz County are provided by a variety of water purveyors: municipal water systems, County water districts, investor-owned water companies, mutual water companies, and individual well-water systems. Within the Urban Services Line (USL), water is primarily supplied by three agencies: The Live Oak and Carbonera planning areas are supplied by the City of Santa Cruz Water District, the Soquel and Aptos planning areas are supplied by the Soquel Creek Water District and the Central Water District, and the Pajaro Valley planning area is supplied by the City of Watsonville Water Department. Agricultural water use is a significant portion of water demand, especially in the southern portion of the County, and is usually provided by groundwater pumping. The Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency (PVWMA) was created by state legislation and approved by voters in 1984 to manage water resources within the Pajaro Valley Basin. The PVWMA does not supply water, but is the responsible local government agency with the power to regulate water use.

The County requires, as specified in its General Plan policies, a firm commitment of water availability in order to approve new development, and to date all major water suppliers continue to provide such commitments for new development under the County General Plan. The major water purveyors in the County (City of Santa Cruz Water Department, Soquel Creek Water District, Scotts Valley Water District, San Lorenzo Water District, City of Watsonville Water Department) have developed no new water supplies in over 20 years, and have instead relied on offset programs and

Significant
Or
Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less than
Significant
with
Mitigation
Incorporation

Less than
Significant
Or
No Impact

Not
Applicable

conservation of existing resources to continue to meet the demands of a growing population.

Numerous agencies are responsible for providing sanitary sewer services in the County. These agencies are responsible for operating local wastewater collection systems. Sanitary sewer service providers in the County are provided in Table 5.

The Davenport County Sanitation District (DCSD) sanitary sewer system facilities include approximately 3 miles of gravity sewers, 1.3 miles of force main, and 3 pump stations. The DCSD does not own nor is it responsible for maintenance or repair of any portion of the sewer service laterals (the portion between the building and the public sewer main).

The Freedom County Sanitation District (FCSD) sanitary sewer system facilities include approximately 15.3 miles of gravity sewers, 1.2 miles of force main, and 8 pump stations. The FCSD does not own nor is it responsible for maintenance or repair of any portion of the sewer service laterals.

The Santa Cruz County Sanitation District (SCCSD) sanitary sewer system facilities include approximately 188 miles of gravity sewers, 14 miles of force main, and 35

| Table 5: Sanitary Sewer Service Providers within Santa Cruz County | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Agency | County Area Served | Service Area |
| Freedom County Sanitation District | Freedom Area | Urban Services Line |
| Salsipuedes County Sanitation District | Pajaro Valley (portions) | Urban/Rural Boundary |
| Santa Cruz County Sanitation District | Aptos, Capitola, Live Oak, Soquel | Urban Services Line |
| City of Santa Cruz (treatment plant) | City of Santa Cruz | Urban Services Line |
| City of Scotts Valley (treatment plant) | City of Scotts Valley | Urban Services Line |
| City of Watsonville (treatment plant) | City of Watsonville | Urban Services Line |
| Rolling Woods CSA#10 (package sewer) | Rolling Woods Subdivision | Urban Services Line |
| Trestle Beach CSA#20 (package sewer) | Trestle Beach Subdivision | Urban/Rural Boundary |
| Septic Tank Maintenance (CSA #12) | Unincorporated County outside Dist. | Rural |
| Davenport County Sanitation District | Davenport | Urban/Rural Boundary |
| Boulder Creek Country Club CSA#7 | Unincorporated County outside Dist. | Urban/Rural Boundary |
| Place de Mer CSA#2 | Unincorporated County outside Dist. | Urban/Rural Boundary |
| Sand Dollar Beach CSA#5 | Unincorporated County outside Dist. | Urban/Rural Boundary |
| Canon del Sol CSA#5 | Unincorporated County outside Dist. | Urban/Rural Boundary |

Source: County of Santa Cruz, 1993.

pump stations. The SCCSD does not own nor is it responsible for maintenance or repair of any portion of the sewer service laterals (County of Santa Cruz 2009).

Construction anticipated by the amended Housing Element includes an assigned growth need of 1,289 housing units for development through 2014. Amending the Housing Element would not result in any impacts to water and wastewater service because actions to implement the goals, policies, and programs included in the

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

Housing Element must be consistent with the goals, policies, and standards established within the other elements of the General Plan. The following General Plan policies are applicable to water and wastewater treatment: Policy 7.18.1, Linking Growth to Water Supplies; Policy 7.18.2, Written Commitments Confirming Water Service Required for Permits; Policy 7.18.3, Impacts of New Development on Water Purveyors; Policy 7.18.4, Improvement of Water Systems; Policy 7.18.7, Water Reuse; Policy 7.19.1, Sewer Service to New Development; Policy 7.19.2, Development Linkage to Downstream Sewer System Improvements; Policy 7.19.3, Sizing Sewer Facilities; Policy 7.20.1, Community Sewage Disposal Systems, within the Rural Services Line; Policy 7.20.2, Rural Services Line areas without Community Sewage Disposal Systems; Policy 7.21.1, Rural Development on Individual Sewage Disposal Systems; Policy 7.21.2, Minimum Parcel Sizes and Maximum Densities with Individual Sewage Disposal Systems; Policy 7.21.3, Maximum Slopes for Individual Sewage Disposal Systems; Policy 7.21.4, Alternative Sewage Disposal Systems; Policy 7.21.5, Community Sewage Disposal Systems Outside the Urban Services Line and Rural Services Line; and Policy 7.21.6, Sanitary Service Connections Outside Urban Services Line and Rural Services Line. The County would continue to carefully review individual projects and work with utility providers to ensure that future projects do not result in localized or project specific utility impacts and ensure that each project is contributing a fair share financial contribution to the ongoing improvement of the public systems. Water and wastewater improvements are required as part of a building permit for most types of "new development." Therefore, the amended Housing Element would result in less-than-significant impacts to water and wastewater treatment facilities.

4. Cause a violation of wastewater treatment standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board?

X

See K-3 above for a complete discussion. No violation of wastewater treatment standards would occur with the implementation of the amended Housing Element.

5. Create a situation in which water supplies are inadequate to serve the project or provide fire protection?

X

See K-3 above for a complete discussion. Approval of the amended Housing Element would not result in inadequate water supplies necessary to provide fire protection.

6. Result in inadequate access for fire protection?

X

See K-1a above. The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. Because it does not make specific reference to any given area, there is no potential impact. Each discretionary development proposal would necessitate independent review of environmental impacts.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

7. Make a significant contribution to a cumulative reduction of landfill capacity or ability to properly dispose of refuse?

X

The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects. The amended Housing Element identifies an assigned growth need of 1,289 additional housing units for development through 2014. The amended Housing Element contains goals, policies, and programs rather than specific projects. Future development anticipated in the amended Housing Element would generate additional solid waste within the County. However, implementation of the existing General Plan policies would ensure that a cumulative reduction of landfill capacity would not occur. The following General Plan policies are applicable to landfill capacity: Policy 7.24.1, Materials Recovery; Policy 7.24.5, Recycling Opportunities for County Residents; Policy 7.24.7, Providing a Variety of Recycling Collection Services; Policy 7.24.8, Meeting State and Local Landfill Diversion Goals; Policy 7.24.9, Storage Requirement for Recyclable Materials; Policy 7.24.11, On-site Yard Waste Composting; Policy 7.24.12, Yard Waste Collection; and Policy 7.24.13, Compost Mulches for Landscaping. No significant impact is anticipated.

8. Result in a breach of federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste management?

X

See K-7 above. The Housing Element is a policy document to guide future housing projects and would be consistent with applicable General Plan policies. A breach of federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste management would not occur. No significant impact is anticipated.

L. Land Use, Population, and Housing

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Conflict with any policy of the County adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

X

The County of Santa Cruz's current Housing Element was adopted in 2006. At the time of adoption, all elements of the County's General Plan were consistent. In accordance with state Law, the County of Santa Cruz has prepared a new 2007-2014 Housing Element, which is the document evaluated in this Initial Study. With the adoption of this amended Housing Element, all elements of the County's General Plan would be consistent with one another. Therefore, upon adoption, the proposed project would have a less than significant impacts to land use plans and policies.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

2. Conflict with any County Code regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

X

Adoption of the amended Housing Element would not conflict with any regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No significant impact is anticipated.

3. Physically divide an established community?

X

State law regarding housing elements states that local and state governments have a responsibility to facilitate housing development and to make "adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community", while considering "economic, environmental, and fiscal factors and community goals set forth in the general plan." It further requires the Housing Element to be consistent and compatible with other General Plan Elements. Additionally, Housing Elements must provide clear policy for making decisions pertaining to zoning, subdivision approval, housing allocations, and capital improvements. State law mandates the contents of the housing element, including:

- An assessment of housing needs and an inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting those needs;
- A statement of the community's goals, quantified objectives, and policies relevant to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing; and
- A program that sets forth a multi-year schedule of actions that the local government is undertaking or intends to undertake to implement the policies and achieve the goals and objectives of the Housing Element.

Therefore, the intention of the proposed amended Housing Element is to make adequate provision for the housing needs of all economic segments of the community, while considering economic, environmental, and fiscal factors, and adoption would not physically divide an established community. No significant impact is anticipated.

4. Have a potentially significant growth inducing effect, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

X

The proposed amended Housing Element remains consistent with the density and intensity of development allowed under the General Plan and zone for the County. Additionally, because the amended Housing Element is a policy document, the proposal would not involve extensions of utilities (e.g., water, sewer, or new road

5. Displace substantial numbers of people, or amount of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

M. Non-Local Approvals

Yes X No

N. Mandatory Findings of Significance

- Yes No X

- Yes ☐ No ☒ X

Significant
Or
Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less than
Significant
with
Mitigation
Incorporation

Less than
Significant
Or
No Impact

Not
Applicable

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, and the effects of reasonably foreseeable future projects which have entered the Environmental Review stage)?

Yes _____ No X

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Yes _____ No X

| | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less than Significant Or No Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

| | <u>REQUIRED</u> | <u>COMPLETED*</u> | <u>N/A</u> |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission (APAC) Review | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> X |
| Archaeological Review | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> X |
| Biotic Report/Assessment | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> X |
| Geologic Hazards Assessment (GHA) | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> X |
| Geologic Report | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> X |
| Geotechnical (Soils) Report | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> X |
| Riparian Pre-Site | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> X |
| Septic Lot Check | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> X |
| Other: | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |

Other technical reports or information sources used in preparation of this Initial Study

County of Santa Cruz, 2009.

StormWater Management Program, County of Santa Cruz and City of Capitola. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program. May 2009.

MBUAPCD. 2009.

North Central Coast Air Basin Area Designations and Attainment Status – January 2009.

Prepared by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

http://www.mbuapcd.org/mbuapcd/pdf/Attainment_Status_January_2009.doc.