### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This SEIR has been prepared to examine the potential environmental effects of the proposed Del Webb at San Juan Oaks Specific Plan project (Project). This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed Project, the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts associated with the proposed Project.

#### **PROJECT SYNOPSIS**

#### **Property Owners/Project Applicant**

San Juan Oaks, LLC 3825 Union Road Hollister, California 95023

Pulte Group 6210 Stoneridge Mall Road, Fifth Floor Pleasanton, California 94588

#### **Project Location**

The Project Site encompasses approximately 1,994 acres located in the central northern portion of unincorporated San Benito County. The Project Site is located approximately three miles southwest of the City of Hollister, approximately 3.5 miles southeast of the City of San Juan Bautista and approximately 1.0 miles south of State Route 156 (SR 156). The Project Site's street address is 3825 Union Road, Hollister.

San Benito County is considered part of the Monterey Bay Area; it is located in the Coast Range Mountains, south of the City of San Jose, and west of the Central Valley. The cities of Hollister and San Juan Bautista are the only two incorporated cities in San Benito County. San Benito County is bordered by Santa Clara County to the north, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties to the west, and Merced and Fresno Counties to the east and south.

#### **Project Description**

The proposed Project involves adoption of the Del Webb at San Juan Oaks Specific Plan as well as other related approvals, permits and entitlements to guide future development within the Project Site, located in the northern/central portion of the County. The Project Site would be developed with two primary components, and consists of a combined acreage of approximately 1,994 acres.

The first component consists of an "active-adult community" (i.e., age-restricted to 55 years and older) including 1,017 single-family residences on approximately 176 acres and an approximately 17,500 to 25,000 square foot amenity center on approximately 10 acres. The second component would consist of 67 conventional (i.e., non-age restricted) single-family residential units, an up to 200-room resort hotel on approximately 35 acres, up to 65,000 square foot neighborhood

commercial center on 14 acres, an approximately four-acre assisted living/skilled nursing/memory care facility with up to 100 beds.

The Project also includes the provision of a substantial amount of open space areas, as well as park and recreational facilities and agricultural and habitat preserves. This would include four private neighborhood hood parks (totaling approximately seven acres) in the adult-active community for use by Project residents; two community parks (totaling approximately 17 acres); and approximately 114 acres of common area open space, including landscaped areas and informal trails. The Project would also establish approximately 41 acres of on-site agricultural preserves, and set aside approximately 1,243 acres for permanent wildlife habitat preservation.

#### **Project Phasing**

Development of the Project Site is proposed to include five development phases, with anticipated build-out occurring over a period of approximately ten years. Development of the Project Site would be in response to market demands and other considerations, and according to orderly extension of roadways, infrastructure, public services, and utilities.

#### ALTERNATIVES

Four alternatives to the proposed Project were selected for consideration and analyzed in the EIR as follows:

- Alternative 1: No Project /No Development
- Alternative 2: No Project /Buildout Under Existing Land Use and Zoning Designations
- Alternative 3: Reduced Site Development Footprint
- Alternative 4: Reduced Project Buildout

As described in Section 6.0, *Alternatives*, the No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid all of the proposed Project's impacts, and is therefore considered environmentally superior overall. The No Project/Buildout Under Existing General Plan and Zoning Designations Alternative would also be considered environmentally superior. This alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact of the proposed Project to a less than significant level. However, this alternative would increase impacts on agricultural resources to a significant and unavoidable level because the proposed off-site 153-acre preserve would not be established to offset the loss of agricultural resources. In addition, the remaining significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed Project would remain under this alternative (greenhouse gas emissions, noise, transportation and circulation). It should also be noted that this alternative would not meet a number of the Project objectives, as described in Section 6.0, *Alternatives*.

The Reduced Project Buildout Alternative and Reduced Site Development Footprint Alternative would both be considered environmentally superior for some issue areas, as described in Section 6.0, *Alternatives*.

#### SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

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

| Impact                                   | Mitigation Measures                                 | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| AESTHETICS                               |   |                                  |
| Impact AES-1 Implementation of the       | None required.                                      | Less than significant.           |
| proposed Project would alter the         |   | 3                                |
| scenic vistas from public viewing        |   |                                  |
| locations because the proposed           |   |                                  |
| Project would create new                 |   |                                  |
| development located south of two         |   |                                  |
| viewsheds on SR 156 and one              |   |                                  |
| viewshed southwest of Union Road.        |   |                                  |
| However, it would not alter scenic       |   |                                  |
| resources within a state scenic          |   |                                  |
| highway. The proposed buildings          |   |                                  |
| would be constructed approximately       |   |                                  |
| 1.5 miles from the viewsheds, behind     |   |                                  |
| agricultural land and in the foreground  |   |                                  |
| of sloping hillsides. Due to the         |   |                                  |
| distance from the viewsheds and          |   |                                  |
| relative building size compared to the   |   |                                  |
| hillsides, impacts would be Class III,   |   |                                  |
| less than significant. [Inresholds       |   |                                  |
| number 1 and 2                           | Dropped Dreiget design features would reduce        | Significant and                  |
| Impact AES-2 The proposed Project        | Proposed Project design reatures would reduce       | Significant and                  |
| has the potential to substantially alter | mpacts to the extent leasible. No leasible          | unavoidable.                     |
| the aesthetic character of the site      | Initigation measures are available that would       |                                  |
| character from rural to a more           | character to a loss than significant lovel          |                                  |
| urbanized developed setting. This is a   | character to a less than significant level.         |                                  |
| Class L significant and unavoidable      |   |                                  |
| impact to the aesthetic character of     |   |                                  |
| the area. [Threshold number 3]           |   |                                  |
| Impact AES-3 Given the distance of       | None required.                                      | Less than significant.           |
| the Project Site from SR 156 and         |   |                                  |
| Union Road, light and glare              |   |                                  |
| generated by the proposed Project        |   |                                  |
| would be minimal to public viewers.      |   |                                  |
| Light and glare impacts would be         |   |                                  |
| Class III, less than significant.        |   |                                  |
| [Threshold number 4]                     |   |                                  |
| AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES                   |   |                                  |
| Impact AG-1 The proposed Project         | None required.                                      | Less than significant.           |
| would convert approximately 12 acres     |   |                                  |
| of Important Farmland and                |   |                                  |
| approximately 218 acres of NRCS-         |   |                                  |
| classified prime farmland                |   |                                  |
| (conservatively assuming irrigation) to  |   |                                  |
| non-agricultural use. However, the       |   |                                  |
| Project would preserve approximately     |   |                                  |
| 153 acres of productive off-site         |   |                                  |
| agricultural land, which would offset    |   |                                  |
| the loss of agricultural land on-site.   |   |                                  |
| Impacts from the loss of Important       |   |                                  |
| Farmland would be Class III, less        |   |                                  |
| than significant. [Inreshold number 1]   |   | Less then similar at             |
| nupact AG-2 implementation of the        | AG-2(a) Onvernin Park Signage. Signage shall        | Less than significant.           |
| proposed Project may result in the       | along the trail (as appropriate) informing upper to |                                  |
|  | along the trail (as appropriate) informing users to |                                  |

| Table ES-1   |  |
|--|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |  |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |  |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After     |
|---|---|------------------------|
| to land use conflicts between<br>existing agricultural land uses and<br>the proposed residential,<br>recreational, resort and commercial<br>uses. This is considered a Class II,<br>significant but mitigable impact.<br>[Threshold numbers 2 and 5]  | stay on designated trails and that dogs must<br>remain on leash. Prior to issuance of a building<br>permit for the proposed Olive Hill Park, a site plan<br>shall be submitted to San Benito County for review<br>and approval showing the location of signage. The<br>signage text shall also be submitted to San Benito<br>County for review and approval.  | Miligation             |
| Impact AQ-1 Construction of the   | None required.  | Less than significant. |
| proposed Project would result in the<br>temporary generation of air<br>pollutants, which would affect local<br>air quality. However, short-term<br>emissions of PM <sub>10</sub> during the<br>construction periods would not<br>exceed MBUAPCD thresholds.<br>Impacts would be Class III, <i>less than</i><br><i>significant.</i> [Threshold number 2] |   |                        |
| Impact AQ-2 Operational emissions<br>of ROG would exceed MBUAPCD's<br>daily thresholds. Mitigation would be<br>required to reduce this impact.<br>Therefore, the Project would have a<br>Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> ,<br>impact to regional air quality.<br>[Threshold numbers 2 and 3]   | <ul> <li>AQ-2(a) Natural Gas Fueled Residential<br/>Fireplaces. All residential fireplaces included in<br/>design plans for any unit or structure within the<br/>Project shall be fueled by natural gas, rather than<br/>wood. Planning and Building Inspection Services<br/>Department shall verify that fireplaces are natural<br/>gas fueled before issuance of building permits for<br/>all future development of residential uses within<br/>the Project Site.</li> <li>AQ-2(b) Low-ROG Architectural Coatings. Low-<br/>ROG architectural coatings shall be used on all<br/>interior and exterior surfaces. Coatings shall not<br/>exceed:</li> <li>50 g/L for residential interior<br/>surfaces;</li> <li>100 g/L for residential exterior<br/>surfaces; and</li> <li>150 g/L for non-residential interior<br/>and exterior surfaces.</li> <li>The ROG content of coatings shall be estimated<br/>using the methodology described in the<br/>MBUAPCD's Rule 426 (Architectural Coatings).</li> </ul> | Less than significant. |
| Impact AQ-3 The Project would not<br>expose sensitive receptors to<br>substantial pollutant concentrations<br>associated with construction dust,<br>toxic air contaminants, or naturally-<br>occurring asbestos. Impacts related<br>to localized pollutants would therefore<br>be Class III, less than significant.<br>[Threshold number 4]             | None required.  | Less than significant. |
| Impact AQ-4 The Project would<br>result in the degradation of service<br>levels at four intersections in the<br>vicinity of the Project Site and would<br>have the potential to create carbon   | None required.  | Less than significant. |

| Table ES-1   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |  |  |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |  |  |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| monoxide hotspots (CO hotspots) at<br>these intersections. However, impacts<br>related to CO hotspots are Class III,<br><i>less than significant.</i> [Threshold<br>number 4]  |   |                                  |
| Impact AQ-5 The Project may involve<br>the development of an optional on-<br>site wastewater treatment plant<br>(WWTP), which has the potential to<br>generate odor nuisance effects. Other<br>components of the project would not<br>create objectionable odors that would<br>affect neighboring properties. Impacts<br>related to odors from the optional on-<br>site WWTP would be Class II,<br><i>significant but mitigable</i> . [Threshold<br>number 5]                              | <ul> <li>AQ-5 Odor Abatement Plan. The applicant shall develop an Odor Abatement Plan (OAP) which shall include the following: <ul> <li>a. Name and telephone number of contact person(s) responsible for logging and responding to odor complaints;</li> <li>b. Policy and procedure describing the actions to be taken when an odor complaint is received, including the training provided to the responsible party on how to respond to an odor complaint;</li> <li>c. Description of potential odor sources at the facility;</li> <li>d. Description of wind patterns in the area of the facility;</li> <li>e. Description of methods for reducing odors; and</li> <li>f. Contingency measures to curtail emissions in the event of a continuous public nuisance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>This plan shall be prepared by the applicant and approved by the Planning and Building Inspection Services Department and MBUAPCD prior to approval of the final building permit for the treatment facility. MBUAPCD shall be responsible for overseeing implementation of the OAP if odor complaints are received.</li> </ul> | Less than significant.           |
| Impact AQ-6 The Project Site has a<br>few existing structures such as the<br>Golf Clubhouse (which would be<br>remodeled), the driving range, and<br>supporting structures. The upgrades<br>to these structures would not expose<br>site occupants and/or workers to<br>health hazards associated with<br>hazardous asbestos and/or lead-<br>based paint. This would be a Class<br>III, <i>less than significant</i> , impact.<br>[Threshold number 4]<br>Impact AQ-7 The proposed Project | None required.  | Less than significant.           |
| would contribute to population growth<br>that is consistent with the growth<br>assumptions in the Air Quality<br>Management Plan (AQMP). This<br>impact is Class III, less than<br>significant. [Threshold number 1]<br>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES<br>Impact BIO-1 Implementation of the<br>proposed Project would temporarily   | <b>BIO-1(a) Compensatory Mitigation.</b> Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant   | Less than significant.           |
| and permanently impact 124 acres of available grassland habitat suitable   | shall permanently protect suitable San Joaquin kit fox habitat as follows, to mitigate for permanent  |                                  |

| Table ES-1   |  |
|--|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |  |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |  |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Development in accordance with the<br>proposed Project may also result in<br>direct take of individual SJKF through<br>grading activities and on-site<br>construction. This potential impact to<br>a federally endangered and State<br>threatened species is a Class II,<br>significant but mitigable, impact.<br>[Threshold number 1] | <ul> <li>grassland habitat) and ensure that the conserved lands are managed for wildlife habitat in perpetuity. For every one (1) acre of suitable San Joaquin kit fox grassland habitat on the site that is permanently impacted as a result of Project development, three(3) acres shall be preserved (124 acres of permanent impacts to grassland habitat at a 3:1 mitigation ratio = 372 acres preserved). The required easement area or deed restriction shall therefore be a minimum of 372 acres to compensate for impacts to grassland wildlife habitat, which can be established by utilizing the areas designated for conservation as Permanent Wildlife Habitat within the proposed Project. As proposed, the Project includes a conservation easement for approximately 1,243 acres of land to be preserved as a wildlife conservation area, exceeding the acreage requirements to mitigate for loss of suitable SJKF habitat. The conserved lands shall set aside an unfragmented section of land that could benefit the SJKF, along with other associated plant and animal species. Any proposals to grade, build, landscape, cultivate ground or otherwise use the land within conserved lands shall be prohibited, with the exception of allowable uses specified in the Wildlife/Habitat Management Plan, which shall include, without limitation, ongoing grazing, maintenance and management of utility easements and infrastructure, and abatement of any geological hazards on or through these lands. The Permanent Wildlife Habitat should be managed as a unit by an entity approved by the County. Runoff from roads, building pads, lots and other adjacent developed areas of the site shall be directed away from the conserved lands.</li> <li>Prohibit development of the easement area, including agricultural development (with the exception of allowable uses specified in the wildlife/Habitat management Plan, to be approved by CDFW, which shall include, without limitation, managed grazing, and the ongoing maintenance and management of unugh those lands);</li> <li>Prohibit remov</li></ul> |                                  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | <ul> <li>Wildlife/Habitat Management Plan;</li> <li>Prohibit use of the easement area for agricultural staging activities or storage of any kind unless otherwise specified in the Wildlife/Habitat Management Plan;</li> <li>Allow for scientific investigation within the easement area conducted as part of a project or plan instigated by the land owner, or otherwise approved by the land owner and the USFWS and/or CDFW; and</li> <li>Allow for flood control and stream bank stabilization activities within the easement area conducted State, Federal, and Local permits.</li> </ul>  | <b>9</b>                         |
|        | <ul> <li>The on-site Permanent Wildlife Habitat easement shall not:</li> <li>Allow for or imply public access, unless included as part of a the CDFW- approved Wildlife/ Habitat Management Plan.</li> </ul>  |                                  |
|        | Prior to issuance of any building permits, the<br>applicant shall grant an easement or convey a<br>deed restriction suitable to the County according<br>to the above conditions that shall be approved by<br>the County Planning Department. The County<br>Planning Department staff shall verify that the<br>easement or deed restriction has been granted.  |                                  |
|        | <b>BIO-1(b) Wildlife Fencing.</b> All permanent fencing<br>in the Wildlife Habitat area shall be suitable for<br>SJKF passage (minimum 6-inch gap between<br>bottom of fence and ground) and shall be<br>approved by the CDFW.  |                                  |
|        | <b>BIO-1(c) Pre-Construction Survey and Den</b><br><b>Avoidance</b> . Within 60 days prior to initiation of<br>construction of any phase, the applicant shall hire<br>a qualified biologist acceptable to the USFWS,<br>CDFW, and the County, to conduct a pre-<br>construction survey for active SJKF dens within<br>areas proposed for development. A letter shall be<br>submitted to the County Planning Department<br>prior to issuance of construction permits<br>confirming the completion of this survey. If no<br>dens are observed, no den avoidance<br>requirements mitigation measures are required.<br>However, if dens are observed, implementation of<br>mitigation measures BIO-3(d) and (e) are required.<br>All remaining mitigation measures set forth herein<br>shall be implemented during the Project to assure<br>that the risk of the SJKF impacts is minimized. |                                  |
|        | Prior to final land use clearance, the applicant<br>shall submit the results of the above survey for<br>approval by the County Planning Department. The   |                                  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | County Planning Department, or a qualified third-<br>party retained by the County at the applicant's<br>expense, shall check plans for compliance with<br>mitigation measures recommended by the pre-<br>construction survey.   |                                  |
|        | <b>BIO-1(d)Den Discovery and Avoidance.</b> No active SJKF dens were observed during field surveys. However, if any known or potential SJKF dens are subsequently observed during the required pre-construction survey within the designated grading envelope, the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted to determine the appropriate take avoidance measures. If the den is unavoidable and will be destroyed by the proposed Project, and the result would exceed the take limit authorized by the existing BO (i.e. zero [0] kit foxes killed or harmed and one [1] kit fox harassed) reinitiation of take authorization shall be initiated with the USFWS and take authorization shall be obtained from CDFW, pursuant to the FESA and the CESA, respectively.  |                                  |
|        | <b>Exclusion Zones</b> . If any known or potential SJKF dens are subsequently observed during the required pre-construction survey, the following mitigation measures shall apply: Fenced exclusion zones shall be established by a qualified biologist approved by the County around all SJKF dens that can be avoided but may be inadvertently impacted by Project activities. Exclusion zone fencing shall consist of either large flagged stakes connected by rope or cord, or survey laths or wooden stakes prominently flagged with survey ribbon. Each exclusion zone shall be roughly circular in configuration with a radius of the following distance measured outward from the den or burrow entrances:  |                                  |
|        | <ul> <li>a. Potential kit fox den: 50 feet</li> <li>b. Known kit fox den: 100 feet</li> <li>c. Kit fox pupping den: 250 feet</li> <li>Only essential vehicle operation on existing roads</li> <li>(if the exclusion zone intersects a road) and</li> <li>simple foot traffic shall be permitted within these</li> <li>exclusion zones. Otherwise, all Project activities</li> <li>such as vehicle operation, materials storage, etc.,</li> <li>shall be prohibited within these areas. Exclusion</li> <li>zones shall be maintained until all Project-related</li> <li>disturbances have been terminated, and then shall</li> <li>be removed. If specified exclusion zones cannot</li> <li>be observed for any reason, the USFWS and</li> <li>CDFW shall be contacted for guidance prior to</li> <li>ground disturbing activities on or near the subject</li> <li>den or burrow.</li> </ul> |                                  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|--|----------------------------------|
|        | shall submit the results of the above survey for<br>approval by the County Planning Department. The<br>County Planning Department, or a qualified third-<br>party retained by the County at the applicant's<br>expense, shall check plans for compliance with<br>mitigation measures recommended by the pre-<br>construction survey.   |                                  |
|        | <b>BIO-1(e) Speed Limit Restriction.</b> To reduce the likelihood of road mortality of the SJKF, roads on the Project Site shall be posted with a 25 mph speed limit or lower during construction and in perpetuity.   |                                  |
|        | Prior to final land use clearance the applicant shall<br>submit documentation of compliance with<br>proposed speed limits for approval by the County<br>Planning Department. The County Planning<br>Department shall check plans for compliance and<br>shall site inspect one year after completion of the<br>development for compliance.  |                                  |
|        | <b>BIO-1(f) Worker Education Program.</b> Before any grading or construction activities commence, all personnel who will enter the Project Site shall attend a worker education program regarding the SJKF. Specifics of this program should include SJKF life history and careful review of the mitigation measures required to reduce impacts. A fact sheet conveying this information shall also be prepared for distribution to all contractors, their employees, and other personnel involved with construction of the Project. The County Planning Department shall be notified of the time that the applicant intends to hold this meeting, and be invited to attend. |                                  |
|        | Prior to final land use clearance the applicant shall<br>provide a copy of the WEAP training for approval<br>by the County Planning Department.<br>Documentation (sign-in sheets) of completion of<br>the WEAP training for all personnel shall be<br>submitted to the County Planning Department on a<br>Monthly basis.   |                                  |
|        | <b>BIO-1(g) Entrapment Prevention.</b> To prevent<br>entrapment of the SJKF during the construction<br>phases of the Project, all excavations, steep-<br>walled holes or trenches in excess of two feet in<br>depth shall be covered at the close of each<br>working day by plywood or similar materials, or<br>provided with one or more escape ramps<br>constructed of earth fill or wooden planks.<br>Trenches shall also be inspected for entrapped<br>SJKF each morning prior to onset of field activities<br>and immediately prior to covering with plywood at   |                                  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | the end of each working day. Before such holes or<br>trenches are filled, they shall be thoroughly<br>inspected for entrapped SJKF. Any SJKF so<br>discovered shall be allowed to escape before field<br>activities resume, or removed from the trench or<br>hole by a qualified biologist and allowed to escape<br>unimpeded.  |                                  |
|        | During all of the Project's construction phases, any<br>pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a<br>diameter of four inches or greater that are stored<br>at the Project Site for one or more overnight<br>periods shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped<br>SJKF before the subject pipe is subsequently<br>buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any<br>way. If during any construction phase, a SJKF is<br>discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe shall<br>not be moved, or if necessary shall be moved only<br>once to remove it from the path of activity until the<br>SJKF has escaped.                 |                                  |
|        | Prior to final land use clearance the applicant shall<br>provide written documentation that entrapment<br>prevention measures have been incorporated into<br>Project construction design/plans to the County<br>Planning Department. Adherence to these<br>conditions will be recorded in daily monitoring logs<br>and noted in monitoring reports to be submitted to<br>the County Planning Department for review.   |                                  |
|        | <b>BIO-1(h) Waste Disposal.</b> So as not to attract red fox, coyotes, or domestic dogs to the area (all of which are predators of the SJKF), all waste products shall be disposed of in a manner that would not attract these animals. All food-related trash items such as wrappers cans, bottles, and food scraps generated during all construction phases shall be disposed of in closed containers only and regularly removed from the site. Food items may attract SJKF onto the Project Site, consequently exposing such animals to increased risk of injury or mortality. No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed. |                                  |
|        | Prior to final land use clearance the applicant shall<br>provide written documentation that waste disposal<br>measures have been incorporated into Project<br>construction design/plans to the County Planning<br>Department. Adherence to these conditions will be<br>recorded in daily monitoring logs and noted in<br>monitoring reports to be submitted to the County<br>Planning Department for review.  |                                  |
|        | <b>BIO-1(i) Inadvertent Take Procedure.</b> Any Project contractor or employee that observes or inadvertently kills or injures a SJKF, or who finds   |                                  |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
|  | any such animal either dead, injured, or trapped<br>shall be required to report the incident immediately<br>to a supervisor overseeing the Project<br>development. In the event that such observations<br>are made of injured or dead SJKF, a Project<br>representative shall immediately notify the<br>USFWS and the CDFW by telephone. In addition,<br>formal notification shall be provided in writing<br>within three working days of the finding of any<br>such animal(s). Notification shall include the date,<br>time, location and circumstances of the incident.<br>Any threatened or endangered species found<br>dead or injured shall be turned over immediately to<br>the CDFW for care, analysis, or disposition.<br>Prior to final land use clearance the applicant shall<br>provide written documentation that inadvertent<br>take procedures have been incorporated into<br>Project construction design/plans to the County<br>Planning Department. Adherence to these<br>conditions will be recorded in daily monitoring logs<br>and noted in monitoring reports to be submitted to<br>the County Planning Department for review.  |                                  |
| Impact BIO-2 Implementation of the<br>proposed Project would result in both<br>direct and indirect impacts to CRLF<br>(Federally threatened) and CTS<br>(Federally and State threatened) due<br>to loss of upland habitats. Increased<br>human activity within and adjacent to<br>CRLF and CTS habitat would result in<br>indirect impacts. These impacts are<br>Class II, significant but mitigable,<br>impacts. [Threshold number 1] | <b>BIO-2(a) FESA and CESA Consultation.</b> The<br>Project applicant obtained take authorization from<br>the USFWS for the CRLF in 2006. In doing so, the<br>USFWS also considered impacts to the CRLF<br>critical habitat, CTS and SJKF. Take authorization<br>was obtained by consultation pursuant to Section<br>7 (federal nexus) of the FESA through the USACE<br>and resulted in the issuance of a USFWS<br>Biological Opinion (USFWS 2006). In order to<br>issue take authorization, the USFWS determined<br>that the Corp's proposed authorization of the<br>Project activity was not likely to jeopardize the<br>continued existence of the CTS, CRLF or SJKF.<br>However, since specific details of the Project<br>design and timing have been modified since the<br>issuance of the BO, the applicant initiated informal<br>consultation with the USFWS in 2013 to obtain<br>concurrence that the existing determination of "not<br>likely to jeopardize" is consistent with the current<br>Project design, as required under the applicable<br>permits and this mitigation measure. The USFWS<br>determined in April 2014 that the BO remains<br>valid, as long as none of the reinitiation triggers<br>have been met. In addition, the applicant initiated<br>in 2013. An Incidental Take Permit (ITP)<br>application for CTS has been submitted to CDFW.<br>The USFWS mitigation components of the<br>USFWS take authorization are outlined below and<br>are required to avoid impacts to CTS. The<br>applicant shall also present written confirmation<br>from CDFW that the Project complies with the<br>applicable requirements of CESA, and shall | Less than significant.           |

| Table ES-1   |
|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | demonstrate, to the County's satisfaction, that an ITP has been issued by CDFW.   |                                  |
|        | <ul> <li>BIO-2(b)CRLF, CTS and SJKF avoidance and minimization measures. The USFWS included the following reasonable and prudent measures to minimize adverse effects to the CTS, CRLF, SJKF, and critical habitat for the CRLF in the 2006 BO. Consistent with the previously issued BO, the following measures are necessary to ensure that adequate mitigation is implemented for potential impacts to these species: <ol> <li>The level of incidental take that occurs during Project implementation shall not exceed that allowed through USFWS and CDFW permitting. If take allowance is exceeded, reinitiation with USFWS and CDFW is required.</li> <li>Only qualified biologists, authorized by the USFWS and CDFW, may survey for, capture, and move CRLF from work areas.</li> <li>Authorized biologists must implement well-defined measures to reduce take of CTS and CRLF during Project activities.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>   |                                  |
|        | <ul> <li>The USFWS provided the following non-discretionary specific terms and conditions to implement reasonable and prudent measure 1:</li> <li>a. Based on an estimate of 42 CTS that may be killed, injured or harmed; if more than 7 CTS in any 1 year are found dead or injured, the applicant must contact USFWS immediately so it can review the Project activities to determine if additional protective measures are needed. Project activities may continue pending the outcome of the review, provided that the proposed protective measures and the terms and conditions of the BO have been and continue to be fully implemented. However, if more than 42 CTS are found dead or injured, Project activities must cease and the applicant must contact USFWS immediately so it can review the Project activities to determine if additional protective measures are needed.</li> <li>b. If more than two CRLF are found dead or injured, the applicant must contact USFWS immediately so it can review the Project activities to determine if additional protective measures are needed.</li> <li>b. If more than two CRLF are found dead or injured, the applicant must contact USFWS immediately so it can review the Project activities to determine if additional protective measures are needed.</li> <li>b. If more than two CRLF are found dead or injured, the applicant must contact USFWS immediately so it can review the Project activities to determine if additional protective measures are needed.</li> <li>b. If more than two CRLF are found dead or injured, the applicant must contact USFWS immediately so it can review the Project activities to determine if additional protective measures are needed. Project activities may continue pending the outcome of the review, provided that the proposed protective measures and the terms and conditions of the BO have been and continue to be fully implemented.</li> </ul> |                                  |

| ·      |  | Significance After |
|--------|--|--------------------|
| Impact | Mitigation Measures  | Mitigation         |
|        | c. If one or more SJKF are found dead or<br>injured, the applicant must contact USFWS<br>immediately so it can review the Project<br>activities to determine if additional<br>protective measures are needed. Project<br>activities may continue pending the<br>outcome of the review, provided that the<br>proposed protective measures and the<br>terms and conditions of the BO have been<br>and continue to be fully implemented.  |                    |
|        | Terms and conditions to implement reasonable and prudent measure 2:  |                    |
|        | <ul> <li>a. Bryan Mori (or other duly-authorized USFWS representative) is authorized to: survey for, capture, and move CTS and CRLF from the work area; and survey for SJKF. The applicant must request USFWS approval of any other biologist they wish to employ to survey for SJKF, and/or to survey for, capture, and move CTS and CRLF from the work area. The request must be in writing and be received by the USFWS at least 15 days prior to any such activities being conducted.</li> <li>b. A USFWS-approved biologist must be contacted if any Project personnel find a CTS or CRLF under equipment, materials, or in trenches during construction activities. Project activities that may affect any CTS or CRLF found on the work site must be halted until the animal(s) can be relocated out of harm's way;</li> <li>c. Prior to the onset of grading and construction activities, USFWS-approved biologists must identify appropriate areas to receive translocated CTS and CRLF adults and tadpoles in the Project area. These areas must be in proximity to the capture site, outside of any area likely to be adversely impacted by construction activities, support suitable vegetation, and be free of exotic predatory species (e.g., bullfrogs, crayfish) to the best of the USFWS-approved biologist's knowledge.</li> <li>d. All CTS and CRLF found adjacent to exclusion fencing must be moved to appropriate areas and defined in measure 2, term c above.</li> </ul> |                    |
|        | To avoid transferring disease or pathogens<br>between aquatic habitats during the course of<br>surveys and handling of CTS and CRLF, the<br>USEWS-approved biologist must follow the   |                    |
|        | Declining Amphibian Population Task Force's  |                    |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|--|----------------------------------|
|        | Code of Practice. The approved biologist may<br>substitute a bleach solution (0.5 to 1.0 cup of<br>bleach to 1.0 gallon of water) for the ethanol<br>solution. Care must be taken so that all traces of<br>the disinfectant are removed before entering the<br>next aquatic habitat.   | <b>3</b>                         |
|        | Reporting requirements:  |                                  |
|        | The Applicant must submit a written report to the<br>USFWS by December 31st in each year of<br>construction activities. The annual reports must<br>document: the number of CTS, CRLF, and SJKF<br>observed throughout the action area; the number<br>of CTS and CRLF captured and relocated<br>pursuant to Project activities; the date and time of<br>capture; specific location of capture; life stages<br>(adult or larva) of individuals captured and<br>relocated; and a description of relocation sites<br>including existing habitat types and the presence<br>or absence of non-native vegetation.   |                                  |
|        | The reports must also document: any incidental take that resulted from the implementation of the Project, including the form of take; when and where the take occurred; the disposition of dead or injured animals; problems encountered in implementing avoidance and minimization measures; and any other pertinent information. The reports must also include a map identifying locations of all CTS and CRLF found and relocation areas. The reports shall contain, if applicable, any recommendations on how future projects of this type can be conducted expeditiously while protecting the CTS, .CRLF, and SJKF. These documents will assist the USFWS and USACE in evaluating future measures for the conservation of these species during residential subdivision and associated development projects. |                                  |
|        | Disposition of dead or injured specimens:  |                                  |
|        | Upon locating a dead or injured CTS, CRLF, or<br>SJKF, initial notification must be made in writing to<br>the USFWS's Division of Law Enforcement by<br>facsimile at (31 0) 328C6399 and the Ventura Fish<br>and Wildlife Office at (805) 644-3958 immediately,<br>and in writing within three (3) working days.<br>Notification must include date, time, location of the<br>carcass; cause of death, if known; and any other<br>pertinent information. Care must be taken in<br>handling injured animals to ensure effective<br>treatment and care, and in handling dead<br>specimens to preserve biological material in the<br>best possible state for later analysis. The finder  |                                  |

| Table ES-1   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |  |  |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |  |  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | has the responsibility to ensure that evidence<br>intrinsic to the specimen is not unnecessarily<br>disturbed, unless to remove it from the path of<br>further harm or destruction. Should any treated<br>listed species survive, the USFWS should be<br>contacted regarding their final disposition.   |                                  |
|        | The remains of CTS and CRLF must be placed<br>with the California Academy of Sciences<br>Herpetology Department. Arrangements regarding<br>proper disposition of potential museum specimens<br>must be made with the California Academy of<br>Sciences by the USACE or the Applicant prior to<br>implementation of any actions.   |                                  |
|        | Any SJKF found dead shall be provided to CDFW<br>unless authorized agreements have been made<br>with CDFW to the contrary. Additional CTS<br>avoidance and minimization measures may be<br>developed through the ITP process with CDFW.   |                                  |
|        | developed through the ITP process with CDFW.<br><b>BIO-2(c) Compensatory Mitigation for CTS and</b><br><b>CRLF.</b> Prior to the recordation of the first final tract<br>map, the applicant shall permanently protect<br>suitable upland habitat for CTS and CRLF through<br>a conservation easement or a deed restriction<br>suitable to the County to ensure that the<br>conserved lands are managed for wildlife habitat<br>in perpetuity. The total area of conserved land<br>must be equal to or greater than one acre of<br>suitable CRLF and CTS habitat with known<br>populations for every one acre of impacted habitat<br>(as recommended by CDFW for this project).<br>Therefore, the required easement shall include a<br>minimum of 315 acres of upland habitat to be<br>considered in conjunction with grassland habitat<br>impacts for the SJKF in Measure BIO-3[a] above)<br>within the conservation of the Wildlife Habitat<br>Preserve as described in the proposed Specific<br>Plan. Any proposals to grade, build, landscape,<br>cultivate ground or otherwise use the land within<br>this area shall be prohibited, with the exception of<br>uses specified in the Wildlife/Habitat Management<br>Plan, which shall include, without limitation,<br>ongoing grazing, maintenance and management<br>of utility easements and infrastructure, and<br>abatement of geologic hazards on or through |                                  |
|        | those lands. The Permanent Wildlife Habitat<br>should be managed as a unit by an entity<br>approved by the County. Runoff from roads,<br>building pads, lots and other adjacent developed<br>areas of the site shall be directed away from the<br>wildlife habitat.<br>The on-site Permanent Wildlife Habitat easement<br>shall   |                                  |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
|  | <ul> <li>Provide a complete corridor through the subject property;</li> <li>Prohibit development of the area, including agricultural development (with the exception of allowable uses specified in the Wildlife/Habitat Management Plan, which shall include, without limitation, managed grazing, and ongoing maintenance and management of utility easements and infrastructure, and abatement of geologic hazards on or through those lands);</li> <li>Prohibit removal or alteration of native plants or animals unless specified in the Wildlife/Habitat Management Plan;</li> <li>Prohibit use of the area for agricultural staging activities or storage of any kind unless specified in the Wildlife/Habitat Management Plan;</li> <li>Allow for scientific investigation conducted as part of a project or plan instigated by the land owner, or otherwise approved by the land owner and the USFWS and/or CDFW; and</li> <li>Allow for flood control and stream bank stabilization activities conducted with approved State, Federal, and Local permits.</li> <li>The on-site Permanent Wildlife Habitat easement shall not:         <ul> <li>Allow for or imply public access, unless included as part of the CDFW- approved Wildlife/Habitat Management Plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Prior to final map recordation, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the above for approval by the County Planning Department. The County Planning Department shall check plans for compliance and shall site inspect one year after</li> </ul> |                                  |
| Impact BIO-3 Implementation of the<br>proposed Project could directly<br>impact nesting raptors and other<br>avian species protected under<br>existing regulations by causing injury,<br>death, or nest failure. Potential<br>impacts to nesting birds are a Class<br>II, significant but mitigable, impact.<br>[Threshold number 4] | BIO-3(a) Nesting Bird Surveys and Avoidance.<br>For any construction activities occurring during the<br>nesting season (generally February 1 to August<br>31), surveys for nesting birds covered by the<br>CFGC, MBTA and the BGEPA (including, but not<br>limited to, Cooper's hawk, California horned lark,<br>merlin, red-shouldered hawk, and red-tailed hawk)<br>shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more<br>than 14 days prior to initiation of construction<br>activities, including construction staging and areas<br>of vegetation removal. The surveys shall include<br>the entire disturbance area(s) plus a 200-foot buffer<br>around each of the disturbance area(s). If active<br>nests are located, all construction work shall be<br>conducted outside a buffer zone from the nest to be<br>determined by the qualified biologist. The buffer<br>shall be a minimum of 50 feet for non-raptor bird  | Less than significant.           |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
|   | species and at least 150 feet for raptor species.<br>Larger buffers may be required depending upon the<br>status of the nest and the construction activities<br>occurring in the vicinity of the nest. The biologist<br>shall have full discretion for establishing a suitable<br>buffer, although any such buffer shall meet or<br>exceed the above minimum requirements. The<br>buffer area(s) shall be closed to all construction<br>personnel and equipment until the adults and<br>young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A<br>qualified biologist shall confirm that<br>breeding/nesting is completed and young have<br>fledged the nest prior to removal of the buffer.   |                                  |
|   | Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant<br>shall submit a preconstruction survey report (or a<br>preliminary notification that preconstruction surveys<br>have been completed that includes a summary of<br>results) documenting the findings of preconstruction<br>surveys for nesting birds and identifying any active<br>nests and associated buffers within and adjacent to<br>impact areas. A complete preconstruction report<br>should be submitted to the County within 30 days<br>after surveys have been completed. The County<br>Planning Department, or a qualified third party<br>retained by the County at the applicant's expense,<br>shall review preconstruction reports and shall site<br>inspect during construction of the development for<br>compliance. |                                  |
| <b>Impact BIO-4</b> Implementation of the<br>proposed Project could result in<br>impacts to special status animal<br>species including American badger,<br>burrowing owl, Pacific pond turtle,<br>coast horned lizard and San Joaquin<br>coachwhip. Impacts to special status<br>animals are Class II, significant but<br>mitigable. [Threshold number 1] | <b>BIO-4(a) Burrowing Owl Pre-Construction</b><br><b>Surveys and Minimization.</b> A qualified biologist<br>shall conduct pre-construction clearance survey(s)<br>prior to any ground disturbance activities within all<br>suitable habitat to confirm the presence/absence of<br>burrowing owls. The survey(s) shall be consistent<br>with the recommended survey methodology<br>provided by CDFW (2012). Clearance surveys<br>shall be conducted within 14 days prior to<br>construction and ground disturbance activities. If<br>no burrowing owls are observed, no further actions<br>are required.   | Less than significant.           |
|   | If burrowing owls are detected during the pre-<br>construction clearance surveys, avoidance buffers<br>will be implemented in accordance with the CDFW<br>(2012) and Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993)<br>minimization mitigation measures. Coordination<br>with the CDFW by a qualified biologist shall occur<br>to establish the appropriate avoidance buffer<br>distances specific for the Project's activities and<br>level of expected disturbance.<br>If avoidance of burrowing owls is not feasible, a<br>Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan and Mitigation and<br>Monitoring Plan will be developed by a qualified<br>biologist in accordance with the CDEW (2012) and  |                                  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After |
|--------|---|--------------------|
|        | Burrowing Owl Consortium (1993). The Plan shall<br>be provided to the applicable local CDFW office<br>prior to implementation. A qualified biologist shall<br>coordinate with the CDFW to determine the<br>appropriate exclusion methods (passive or active<br>relocation) for the Project to relocate burrowing<br>owls to a suitable offsite location. Relocation of<br>owls can only occur during the non-breeding<br>season.  | Mitigation         |
|        | Prior to issuance of each grading permit, the<br>applicant shall submit a preconstruction survey<br>report (or a preliminary notification that<br>preconstruction surveys have been completed that<br>includes a summary of results) documenting the<br>findings of preconstruction surveys for burrowing<br>owls and identifying any active burrows and<br>associated buffers within and adjacent to impact<br>areas. A complete preconstruction report should<br>be submitted to the County within 30 days after<br>surveys have been completed. The County<br>Planning Department, or a qualified third party<br>retained by the County at the applicant's expense,<br>shall review preconstruction reports and shall site<br>inspect during construction of the development for<br>compliance.  |                    |
|        | BIO-4(b) Pacific Pond Turtle, San Joaquin<br>Coachwhip and Coast Horned Lizard, Capture,<br>and Relocation. Not less than 14 days prior to the<br>start of any construction activities (including<br>staging and mobilization), a San Benito County<br>and CDFW approved biologist shall conduct<br>surveys for Pacific pond turtle, San Joaquin<br>coachwhip and coast horned lizard within suitable<br>habitat. The biologist shall also oversee installation<br>of exclusion fencing where suitable habitat is<br>present to prevent these species from entering<br>active work areas. If any of these species are<br>identified within the work area, they shall be<br>captured and relocated to suitable habitat. CNDDB Field<br>Survey Forms shall be submitted to the CDFW for<br>all special status animal species observed. The<br>relocation site shall include suitable micro habitat<br>and ecological features for each species as |                    |
|        | <ul> <li>Pacific pond turtle habitat shall include a pool surrounded by vegetation for escape cover.</li> <li>San Joaquin coachwhip habitat shall include suitable small mammal burrows to provide immediate escape and cover</li> <li>Coast horned lizard habitat shall include open grassland and sandy habitats, particularly where native ants are present.</li> </ul>  |                    |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|--|----------------------------------|
|        | During the rainy season (approximately November<br>1 to April 15), Pacific pond turtles may actively<br>move through upland habitats outside of<br>drainages. San Joaquin coachwhip and coast<br>horned lizard can occur in upland habitat at any<br>time of the year. If any of these species are<br>observed by construction personnel within or<br>adjacent to the proposed development area, the<br>animal's location shall be communicated to the<br>San Benito County-approved biologist. Only the<br>San Benito County-approved biologist shall<br>capture and relocate wildlife. Construction<br>personnel are not permitted to handle animals.  |                                  |
|        | Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant<br>shall submit a preconstruction survey report (or a<br>preliminary notification that preconstruction<br>surveys have been completed that includes a<br>summary of results) documenting the findings of<br>preconstruction surveys for San Joaquin<br>coachwhip, coast horned lizard and Pacific pond<br>turtle. A complete preconstruction report should be<br>submitted to the County within 30 days after<br>surveys have been completed. The County<br>Planning Department, or a qualified third party<br>retained by the County at the applicant's expense,<br>shall review preconstruction reports and shall site<br>inspect during construction of the development for<br>compliance. |                                  |
|        | BIO-4(c) American Badger Pre-construction<br>Surveys and Impact Avoidance. A qualified<br>biologist shall conduct pre-construction clearance<br>surveys for American badger in suitable habitat<br>within impact areas. These surveys may be<br>conducted concurrently with SJKF surveys.<br>Clearance surveys should be conducted for<br>American badger, within 14 days of the start of any<br>ground-disturbing activity. Surveys need not be<br>conducted for all areas of suitable habitat at one<br>time; they may be phased so that surveys occur<br>within 14 days of that portion of the site being<br>disturbed. If no potential American badger dens<br>are present, no further mitigation is necessary.                                |                                  |
|        | <ul> <li>If potential American badger dens are present, the following measures shall be implemented:</li> <li>If the qualified biologist determines that potential American badger dens are inactive, the biologist shall excavate these dens during the first clearance survey. The dens shall be excavated by hand with a shovel to prevent badgers from re-use during construction.</li> <li>If the qualified biologist determines that</li> </ul>  |                                  |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
|  | <ul> <li>potential dens may be active, an on-site passive relocation program shall be implemented. This program shall consist of excluding badgers from occupied burrows by installation of one way doors at burrow entrances, monitoring of the burrow for one week to confirm usage has been discontinued, and excavation and collapse of the burrow to prevent reoccupation. After the qualified biologist determines that badgers have stopped using active dens within the Project boundary, the dens shall be hand-excavated with a shovel to prevent re-use during construction.</li> <li>Construction activities shall not occur within 30 feet of active badger dens.</li> </ul>  |                                  |
|  | Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant<br>shall submit a preconstruction survey report (or a<br>preliminary notification that preconstruction<br>surveys have been completed that includes a<br>summary of results) documenting the findings of<br>preconstruction surveys for American badger. A<br>complete preconstruction report should be<br>submitted to the County within 30 days after<br>surveys have been completed. The County<br>Planning Department, or a qualified third party<br>retained by the County at the applicant's expense,<br>shall review preconstruction reports and shall site<br>inspect during construction of the development for<br>compliance.   |                                  |
| Impact BIO-5 Implementation of the<br>proposed Project may impact riparian<br>habitat associated with drainages<br>present within the Project Site. This is<br>Class II, significant but mitigable,<br>impact. [Threshold numbers 2 and 3] | <ul> <li>BIO-5(a) Riparian and Wetland Protection.</li> <li>Implementation of the following measures would further protect, and avoid riparian/wetland habitat:</li> <li>The Project shall be designed so that any and all preserved riparian and wetland habitat is buffered from development (including grading, except for stormwater and drainage control features (e.g., basins, bioswales), which may be within the buffer zone) by an average 50-foot setback measured from the edge of riparian vegetation or delineated wetland. Vegetation may be managed in this setback area for fire protection purposes.</li> <li>The riparian and wetland habitat area and average 50-foot buffer zone for preserved riparian/wetland areas shall be shown on all grading plans and shall be demarcated with highly visible construction.</li> <li>Drainage from development adjacent to jurisdictional drainages shall be directed away from those drainages or routed through bioswales prior to entering the drainages.</li> </ul> | Less than significant.           |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | <ul> <li>The applicant shall prepare and submit for approval to the County's Planning Department a grading and drainage plan that specifically seeks to protect waters and riparian/wetland resources downstream of construction activities (refer to Mitigation Measure H-1(c) in Section 4.9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality Impact Analysis</i>).</li> <li>During construction activities, washing of concrete, paint, or equipment, and equipment maintenance, repair or fueling shall occur only in areas where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site. Washing of such materials shall not be allowed within 100 feet of wetland and riparian resources.</li> <li>Where impacts to riparian habitat cannot be avoided, the following shall be implemented to mitigate impacts.</li> <li>The applicant shall obtain authorization from the CDFW pursuant to Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code for any activities that affect the bed, bank, or channel of streams. It is recommended that the applicant contact CDFW prior to final plan submittal in order to incorporate any additional requirements into the Project design.</li> </ul>                               |                                  |
|        | As part of the regulatory permitting process, the<br>applicant would likely be required to prepare,<br>implement, and monitor a compensatory habitat<br>creation/restoration plan to mitigate impacts to<br>CDFW jurisdictional stream and riparian areas.<br>The plan should, at a minimum ensure no net loss<br>of riparian habitat. One component of the plan was<br>implemented in 2012 and provided greater than<br>2:1 replacement for the loss of habitat<br>functions/values and/or acres. The remaining<br>components of the plan would be implemented by<br>a qualified biologist and shall include, at a<br>minimum, the following mitigation measures:<br>Mitigation plantings for the loss of existing riparian<br>habitat shall be located in the on-site drainages<br>that are proposed to be modified or preserved as<br>part of the proposed Project to the fullest extent<br>feasible. The compensatory plan shall provide a<br>minimum 2:1 ratio of habitat values, functions,<br>and/or acres created or enhanced to that<br>impacted.<br>i. Prior to commencement of grading, the<br>applicant shall file a performance security with<br>the County to complete restoration,<br>monitoring, and maintenance of plantings for |                                  |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
|  | <ul> <li>a minimum five (5) year period to ensure mitigation success.</li> <li>ii. Tree and shrub species installed as mitigation shall have 80% survivorship at the end of the five (5) year monitoring period.</li> <li>iii. Control of invasive plant species will be conducted, as necessary, to encourage the development and establishment of mitigated vegetation. Seasonally-timed weeding will be done mechanically or by hand during the five (5) year monitoring period or until it is determined that the installed plantings are not at risk from competition and exclusion by exotic pest plants.</li> <li>iv. Removal of native species in the creeks/drainages that are to be retained shall be prohibited, except as allowed through authorizations from CDFW.</li> <li>v. Construction envelopes shall be restricted to those areas shown on approved site Grading Plans in order to avoid impacts on riparian/wetland habitats. Envelope boundaries shall be staked in the field. Approved construction envelopes shall be shown on all approved grading and building plans.</li> </ul> |                                  |
|  | Prior to tract map recordation of each phased final<br>map, the applicant shall submit the agency-<br>approved habitat restoration/compensation plan<br>and a copy of the CDFW Streambed Alteration<br>Agreement or written confirmation from the CDFW<br>that a permit is not required to the County<br>Planning Department for review and approval. All<br>aspects of the plan shall be implemented as<br>approved. The County Planning Department, or a<br>qualified third party retained by the County, shall<br>conduct site inspections throughout all phases of<br>development to ensure compliance with all habitat<br>restoration measures, and the Streambed<br>Alteration Agreement at the applicant's expense.   |                                  |
| Impact BIO-6 Implementation of the<br>proposed Project would result in<br>direct and indirect impacts to oaks<br>trees and the oak woodland habitat<br>on the Project Site. Impacts would be<br>Class II, significant but mitigable.<br>[Threshold number 5] | <b>BIO-6(a) Pre-construction Survey and Tree</b><br><b>Protection Plan.</b> Pre-construction Survey and<br>Tree Protection Plan. Prior to Final Map<br>recordation, an accurate map identifying and<br>locating all existing oak trees within and adjacent<br>to areas proposed for new development shall be<br>prepared. The map shall include all existing oak<br>trees that are outside of the proposed<br>development area but which could be affected by<br>the Project, and will identify all trees that would be<br>removed as a result of Project development. The<br>map shall be prepared by a certified arborist and<br>submitted to the County for review and approval.<br>Such map shall also identify all existing oak trees<br>that are proposed by the applicant for relocation,   | Less than significant.           |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | and such trees shall be visibly marked for inspection.  |                                  |
|        | Upon determination of the final development plans<br>for each phase of the Project, a qualified arborist<br>shall conduct surveys of oak trees and oak<br>woodland habitat that could be affected by the<br>proposed development, and shall recommend<br>specific measures to mitigate impacts, to the<br>extent feasible, including:   |                                  |
|        | If feasible, the remaining oak trees and oak<br>woodland habitat shall be avoided by adjusting<br>proposed lots to eliminate inclusion of oak trees. If<br>avoidance of oak trees, their canopies, and root<br>zones is not feasible, tree replacement shall be<br>required as described below.   |                                  |
|        | The design of proposed structures shall avoid<br>impacts to limbs that are eight inches in diameter<br>or greater to the greatest extent possible. In some<br>instances, pruning and/or tying back branches<br>may be a viable option for certain trees. These<br>alternatives to avoidance shall be reviewed by a<br>qualified arborist, and approved by the County, on<br>a case-by-case basis.   |                                  |
|        | All trenching, soil scraping, over-excavation and grading (soil cuts, over-excavation, fill, and finish-<br>grading) shall be avoided within the Tree<br>Protection Zone (TPZ), as feasible. For design<br>purposes, the TPZ of a particular tree shall be a<br>minimum distance from its trunk of ten times its<br>diameter. Where an impact encroaches slightly<br>within a TPZ, it can be reviewed by the County<br>and the qualified arborist on a case-by-case basis<br>to determine appropriate mitigation measures.<br>Soil disturbance (e.g. over-excavation, sub-<br>excavation, grading, compaction or trenching)<br>beyond a feature to be built within or near a TPZ<br>shall be reduced to the maximum extent possible<br>in the direction of a tree's trunk. In no instance<br>should disturbance exceed the following distances<br>towards a tree's trunk: 12 inches for a curb, gutter,<br>walkway or pier, or 24 inches for retaining walls,<br>foundations and concrete pads. |                                  |
|        | Any existing, unused lines or pipes within a TPZ<br>shall be abandoned and cut off at existing soil<br>grade. These features shall not be dug up so as to<br>avoid potential impacts to the root system; this<br>provision shall be specified on applicable plans.  |                                  |
|        | To restrict spoils and runoff from traveling into root<br>zones, erosion control design shall establish any<br>silt fence and/or straw rolls uphill away from a tree  |                                  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|--|----------------------------------|
|        | trunk (not against it), and as close to the canopy<br>edge as possibly. Where erosion control devices<br>are located within a TPZ, the material shall not<br>exceed a vertical soil cut of two inches for<br>embedment.  |                                  |
|        | Underground utilities and services shall be routed<br>beyond a TPZ whenever possible. Where this is<br>not feasible, the section of line(s) within the TPZ<br>shall be directionally-bored by a minimum of four<br>feet below existing grade, or installed by other<br>means (e.g. pipe-bursting) to avoid an open<br>trench; the ground above any tunnel shall remain<br>undisturbed, and access pits and any above-<br>ground infrastructure (e.g. splice boxes, meters<br>and vaults) shall be established beyond all TPZs.<br>No machine trenching within the TPZ shall be<br>permitted, unless authorized, in writing, by the<br>County, in consultation with an arborist.  |                                  |
|        | Staging areas and access routes shall be designed to avoid trees and tree canopies.  |                                  |
|        | Any structure or wall proposed within a TPZ shall<br>utilize an alternative foundation that minimizes<br>impacts to tree root systems (i.e., cantilever the<br>encroaching section over and above existing soil<br>grade so that the ground beneath is not be<br>compacted or disturbed, or a pier and above-grade<br>beam foundation that avoids soil disturbance), and<br>shall be reviewed by a qualified arborist prior to<br>final design approval.   |                                  |
|        | All trees designated to remain in place and that<br>are within 50 feet of grading or ground disturbance<br>shall be protected by a five-foot high fence<br>enclosure, prior to the beginning of construction.<br>The fence shall be highly visible wooden, chain<br>link, or plastic barricade fencing. The location of<br>the fence is normally at the dripline of the tree, but<br>it may be adjusted or omitted with the County's<br>written approval. In addition, the applicants shall<br>demonstrate, to the County's satisfaction that<br>construction activities are adhering to the<br>approved tree protection plan. No parking of<br>vehicles or equipment, or storage of materials<br>shall be permitted within the dripline of the trees<br>designated to remain. |                                  |
|        | The diameter at breast height (DBH) of oak trees<br>removed shall be replaced on an inch-for-inch<br>basis with replacement oak trees. For example, if<br>a 30" DBH oak tree is removed it shall be replaced<br>with 30 one-inch diameter container stock oak<br>trees, or 15 two-inch diameter container stock oak<br>trees. Replacement oak trees shall be from  |                                  |

|        |  | 01                               |
|--------|--|----------------------------------|
| Impact | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|        | regionally or locally collected seed stock (within a 25-mile radius). A qualified, County-approved arborist shall design oak tree replacement programs and monitor the implementation of such plans to ensure successfully meeting the requirements of the plan.   |                                  |
|        | <ul> <li>plans to ensure successfully meeting the requirements of the plan.</li> <li>All trees relocated or planted as mitigation shall be moved to a location approved by a qualified arborist within an on-site habitat restoration area or within the off-site conservation easement area, and planted in the ground. All trees relocated as mitigation shall have a 80% survival rate after five years. If the five year survival rate of trees planted or relocated as mitigation is less than 80%, the number of trees required to reach 80% survival shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio. All replacement mitigation trees (trees planted to replace those that did not survive the five-year period), shall in turn have a survival rate of 100% five years from date of planting. Tree monitoring and replacement shall continue until an overall five-year, 80% survival rate is reached for all mitigation trees.</li> <li>Upon occupancy, property owners shall be advised by the lot seller/lessor to avoid watering within 15 feet of all oak trees and to avoid activity that may encroach upon roots by avoiding activity within the dripline of all oak trees.</li> <li>The proposed landscape design around the valley oaks shall conform to the following additional guidelines: <ul> <li>Turf shall be avoided beneath their canopies.</li> <li>Plant material installed beneath the canopies shall be drought-tolerant, limited in amount, and planted a minimum of five feet from their trunks.</li> <li>Irrigation for any new plant material beneath an oak tree canopy shall be temporary, low volume, the minimum required to ensure establishment of new vegetation, and applied irregularly for no more than two to three years.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |                                  |
|        | <ul> <li>the trunk of any oak tree.</li> <li>New fencing shall be placed a minimum of five feet from any tree trunk.</li> <li>Ground cover beneath canopies should be comprised of a three- to four-inch layer of</li> </ul>   |                                  |
|        | coarse wood chips or other high-quality<br>mulch (gorilla hair, bark, rock, stone, gravel,<br>black plastic or any other synthetic ground<br>cover shall be excluded from use as ground<br>cover under tree canopies).   |                                  |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
|   | <ul> <li>Mulch shall not be placed directly against<br/>the trunk of any trees.</li> <li>Tilling for weed control or other purposes<br/>within a TPZ shall be avoided.</li> <li>Bender board or other edging material<br/>proposed beneath the canopies shall be<br/>established on top of existing soil grade and<br/>not installed below grade.</li> </ul>  |                                  |
|   | The applicant shall submit a final tree report and<br>tree protection plan prepared by a County-<br>approved arborist that includes the species,<br>quantity, diameter-at-breast-height, and status<br>(live, dead, diseased, etc.) of native trees to be<br>translocated and indirectly impacted by<br>construction activities prior to initiation of the<br>proposed Project. This report shall also identify the<br>final number of replacement trees utilizing the<br>County's replacement ratio identified above (if<br>applicable). All aspects of the plans shall be<br>implemented as approved. |                                  |
| <b>Impact BIO-7</b> Implementation of the<br>proposed Project would impact<br>populations and available habitat of<br>wildlife in general and special status<br>species through the introduction or<br>maintenance of populations of non-<br>native and invasive species. Adverse<br>effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat<br>through the introduction and<br>maintenance of invasive species is a | <b>BIO-7(a) Pet Brochure.</b> The applicant shall<br>prepare a brochure that informs prospective<br>homebuyers and all Home Owners Association<br>(HOA) members about the impacts associated with<br>non-native animals, especially cats and dogs, and<br>other non-native animals to the Project Site;<br>similarly, inform potential homebuyers and all HOA<br>members of the potential for coyotes to prey on<br>domestic animals.   | Less than significant.           |
| Class II, significant but mitigable,<br>impact. [Threshold number 7]  | Prior to recordation of the first final map, the<br>applicant shall draft a notice indicating the above<br>information, to be recorded with the final map,<br>subject to approval by the County Planning<br>Department. The County Planning Department<br>shall check plans for compliance.   |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>BIO-7(b) Night Lighting Standards. The following standards pertaining to night lighting shall be added to the Project's design guidelines: <ul> <li>Night lighting of public areas shall be kept to the minimum necessary for safety and security purposes.</li> <li>Exterior lighting within 100 feet of open space shall be shielded and aimed as needed to avoid spillover into open space areas and conservation easements. Decorative lighting shall be low intensity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |                                  |
|   | Prior to recordation of the first final map, the<br>applicant shall submit a lighting plan for approval<br>by the County Planning Department. The County<br>Planning Department shall check plans for<br>compliance and shall site inspect one year after<br>completion of tract development for compliance.  |                                  |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
|   | <b>BIO-7(c) Native or Adaptive Landscaping.</b> In<br>order to ensure that Project landscaping does not<br>introduce invasive or inappropriate plant and tree<br>species into the vicinity of the site, the final<br>landscaping plan shall be reviewed and approved<br>by a County approved biologist or landscape<br>architect. No invasive plant and tree species shall<br>be permitted to be installed by the applicant as part<br>of the Project development.   |                                  |
|   | As a condition of each tentative map, the applicant<br>shall submit a landscaping plan for approval by the<br>County Planning Department. The County<br>Planning Department, or a qualified third party<br>retained by the County at the applicant's expense,<br>shall check plans for compliance and shall site<br>inspect six months after completion of the<br>development for compliance.  |                                  |
| CULTURAL RESOURCES  | CIII -1/a) Archaeological Posourco   | Loss than significant            |
| proposed Project would involve<br>surface excavation, which has the<br>potential to unearth or adversely<br>impact known and previously<br>unidentified cultural resources and<br>human remains. Impacts would be<br>Class II, significant but mitigable.<br>[Thresholds numbers 2 and 4] | <b>Construction Monitoring.</b> Prior to the commencement of any grading or construction within the Project Site, an orientation meeting shall be conducted by an archaeologist for construction workers associated with earth disturbing procedures. The orientation meeting shall describe the possibility of exposing unexpected archaeological resources and directions as to what steps are to be taken if such a find is encountered.  |                                  |
|   | A qualified archaeologist shall be present during<br>ground disturbing activities requiring "cut" and/or<br>excavation within previously undisturbed native<br>soil. A qualified archaeologist shall only be present<br>during ground disturbing activities requiring the<br>placement of fill material within areas of previously<br>identified, known archaeological resources. In the<br>event that unearthed prehistoric or archaeological<br>cultural resources or human remains are<br>encountered during Project construction,<br>mitigation measure CUL-1(b) shall take effect.  |                                  |
|   | A qualified archaeologist and Ohlone/Costanoan<br>representative shall monitor ground disturbing<br>activities requiring "cut" and/or excavation within<br>previously undisturbed native soil or within areas<br>of previously identified, known cultural resources<br>to the extent determined necessary by a qualified<br>archaeologist and the County of San Benito. After<br>the initial ground disturbance phase of grading, the<br>project applicant may request that monitoring<br>activities be reduced or curtailed subject to review<br>and approval by the County of San Benito and a<br>qualified archaeologist. In the event that<br>archaeological or historic artifacts are encountered |                                  |

| Table ES-1   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |  |  |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |  |  |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
|   | during Project grading or construction, all work in<br>the vicinity of the find shall be halted until such<br>time as the find is evaluated for its significance by<br>a qualified archaeologist and appropriate<br>mitigation (e.g., curation, preservation in place,<br>etc.), if necessary, is identified and implemented.   |                                  |
|   | <b>CUL-1(b)</b> Avoidance of CA-SBN-199 and CA-<br>SBN-200. Site CA-SBN-199, and CA-SBN-200,<br>shall be fenced off and avoided. Ground<br>disturbance activities involving "cut" and<br>excavation shall be monitored by a qualified<br>archaeologist within 100 feet of the locations of<br>CA-SBN-199 and CA-SBN-200.  |                                  |
| Impact CUL-2 Construction of the<br>Project would involve surface<br>excavation. Although unlikely, these<br>activities have the potential to unearth<br>and/or adversely impact<br>paleontological resources. Impacts<br>would be Class II, significant but<br>mitigable. [Threshold number 3] | CUL-2(a) Paleontological Resource<br>Construction Monitoring. Any excavations within<br>areas of high paleontological sensitivity (i.e.,<br>Pleistocene- or Pliocene-aged deposits) and those<br>areas potentially underlain by Pliocene- or<br>Pleistocene-aged deposits (i.e., Holocene-aged<br>alluvial valley sediments) that exceed three feet in<br>depth shall be monitored as necessary by a<br>qualified paleontological monitor. If no fossils are<br>observed during the first 50 percent of excavations<br>in Holocene-aged sediments exceeding three feet<br>in depth, or if the qualified paleontologists can<br>determine that excavations below three to five feet<br>are not disturbing fossils within Pliocene or<br>Pleistocene (or other potentially fossil-containing)<br>sediments, then paleontological monitoring shall<br>be reduced to weekly spot-checking under the<br>discretion of the qualified paleontologist. Ground<br>disturbing activity in areas of low paleontological<br>monitoring. | Less than significant.           |
|   | CUL-2(b) Paleontological Resource<br>Construction Monitoring in Areas of<br>Undetermined Paleontological Sensitivity. Any<br>excavations within areas of undetermined<br>paleontological sensitivity (i.e., in areas mapped<br>as unnamed terrestrial clastics or Tn) shall be<br>monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor. If<br>no fossils are observed during the first 50 percent<br>of excavations by area within these sediments,<br>then paleontological monitoring may be reduced to<br>weekly spot-checking under the discretion of the<br>qualified paleontologist.<br>CUL-(c) Fossil Salvage. If fossils are discovered<br>during grading or construction, the qualified<br>paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) shall<br>temporarily halt work and establish a work-<br>exclusion buffer of 50 feet. The paleontologist or<br>contractor shall immediately notify the County and   |                                  |

| and Significance After Mitigation  |   |                                  |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Impact   | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|  | monitor) shall immediately examine the discovery.<br>The paleontologist shall document the discovery<br>as necessary in accordance with the Society of<br>Vertebrate Paleontology standards (SVP 2010),<br>evaluate the potential resource or resources, and<br>assess the significance of the find. In this case,<br>the paleontologist shall have the authority to<br>temporarily direct, divert or halt construction<br>activity to ensure that the fossil(s) can be removed<br>in a safe and timely manner. Once salvaged, the<br>fossils shall be identified to the lowest possible<br>taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready<br>condition and curated in a scientific institution with<br>a permanent paleontological collection, along with<br>all pertinent field notes, photos, data, and maps. |                                  |
| GEOLOGY AND SOILS  | New and the state   | Less there all 10 is             |
| fault surface trace occurs along the<br>southern property line, no other active<br>faults are mapped on the Project Site.<br>The Development Areas are not<br>located in a mapped Alquist-Priolo<br>fault zone and would not be subject to<br>rupture of a known fault. Seismically<br>induced ground shaking could destroy<br>or damage structures and<br>infrastructure, resulting in loss of<br>property or risk to human safety.<br>However, given mandatory<br>compliance with applicable County of<br>San Benito, and California Building<br>Code requirements, impacts from<br>seismic ground shaking would be<br>Class III, less than significant.<br>[Threshold number 1] | None required.  | Less than significant.           |
| Impact GEO-2 The Project could be<br>subject to structural damage related<br>to the presence of liquefiable soils,<br>due to the presence of sand and silty<br>sand below the groundwater level in<br>the Development Areas. Potentially<br>liquefiable soils can result in<br>settlement or rupture of the ground<br>surface during earthquakes.<br>Liquefaction also has the potential to<br>cause lateral spreading at the site.<br>This is considered a Class II,<br>significant but mitigable impact.<br>[Threshold numbers 1 and 3]  | <ul> <li>GEO-2(a) Adherence to Geotechnical Report.<br/>Compliance with the recommendations included in<br/>the Geotechnical/Geologic Feasibility Assessment<br/>(March 7, 2013) and Geotechnical Exploration<br/>(August 6, 2013), prepared by ENGEO, for<br/>foundation design plans and new geotechnical<br/>studies undertaken at the site shall be required.<br/>This includes, but is not limited to the following:</li> <li>Foundation design considerations of a 1-<br/>inch thick total settlement due to<br/>liquefaction-induced settlement, as well as a<br/>reevaluation of the design-level study if<br/>finished site grades are lowered by more<br/>than ten feet when site grades are further<br/>refined. The County of San Benito shall</li> </ul>   | Less than significant.           |

review and approve all final plans for foundational design for each phase prior to issuance of a grading permit. Final plans for foundational design shall be designed to

protect structures from anticipated liquefaction-induced settlement.

|   | <u> </u>   |                                  |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Impact  | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|   | <ul> <li>Once grading plans with a scale of 1 inch to<br/>40 feet are available, a site-specific<br/>geotechnical report shall be produced by a<br/>County-approved geotechnical engineer to<br/>confirm the scope of any lateral spreading<br/>and slope deformation and to specify the<br/>most appropriate remedial measures.<br/>Mitigation measures may include, without<br/>limitation, specifications for cut and fill<br/>slopes, specification of minimum setbacks<br/>from unstable natural slope areas,<br/>construction of a toe shear keyway that<br/>extends below the flow line elevation of the<br/>adjacent drainage channels, and other<br/>common remedial grading practices used to<br/>minimize potential impacts from settlement,<br/>surface rupture, and lateral spreading. The<br/>developer shall implement all recommended<br/>mitigation measures, as required by the<br/>County approved geotechnical engineer</li> </ul>   |                                  |
|   | and the County Public Works Department.<br><b>GEO-2(b) Site-Specific Geotechnical Studies</b><br><b>and Hazard Minimization.</b> Prior to issuance of<br>grading permits for each phase of development in<br>the Project Site, a site-specific geotechnical study<br>shall be prepared by a County-approved<br>geotechnical engineer to more specifically identify<br>any areas that could be subject to geologic or soil-<br>related hazards, including liquefaction, slope<br>instability, ground shaking, faults, and expansive<br>soils. If such hazards are identified, then the<br>appropriate phase of development shall be<br>designed in compliance with the recommendations<br>of the geotechnical survey and in conformance<br>with the County's Subdivision Ordinance and shall<br>comply with recommendations in the<br>Geotechnical/Geologic Feasibility Assessment<br>(March 7, 2013) and Geotechnical Exploration<br>(August 6, 2013), prepared by ENGEO, for<br>foundation design plans. Site-specific geotechnical<br>studies and grading and design recommendations<br>shall be reviewed and approved by the County of<br>San Benito Public Works Department. |                                  |
| Impact GEO-3 The geotechnical<br>analysis prepared for the Project Site<br>concluded that the on-site unstable<br>existing and proposed slopes could<br>be subject to seismically induced<br>landslides. This is considered a Class<br>II, significant but mitigable impact.<br>[Threshold numbers 1 and 3] | <b>GEO-3(a) Slope Stability Analysis.</b> As<br>applicable, prior to issuance of a grading permit,<br>further slope analysis shall be conducted once 40-<br>scale grading plans are available. The analysis<br>shall confirm landslide stability in proximity to<br>grading limits, cut slopes, slope rebuilds and<br>planned taller fill slopes. If it is determined that<br>shallow landslides and slope instability may occur<br>related to the specific development proposed, then<br>measures as identified in the slope analysis shall<br>be incorporated into the Project design. These<br>mitigation measures for shallow landslides and   | Less than significant.           |

| Table ES-1   |  |
|--|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |  |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | slope instability may include, without limitation,<br>avoiding placement of structures in or downslope<br>of slide areas, removing the landslide debris to<br>bedrock and replacing it with engineered fill,<br>buttressing the toes of landslides with engineered<br>fill, and constructing keyways, debris benches,<br>and/or landslide buffer/catchment areas with<br>surface and subsurface drainage. Depending upon<br>the type and heights of graded slopes, toe<br>keyways may be recommended.   |                                  |
|        | <b>GEO-3(b) Soil Creep.</b> Improvements that will be<br>located in the hillside portions of the Project Site<br>shall be designed to mitigate the potential for<br>adverse impacts from soil creep. Unless analysis<br>by the Geotechnical Engineer on final grading<br>plans determines otherwise, the proposed water<br>tank shall be relocated to the west along the<br>ridgeline to minimize design and corrective grading<br>impacts, which the applicant has confirmed would<br>be acceptable and consistent with the overall site<br>plan and Specific Plan. The water tank shall be<br>constructed entirely on bedrock cut, or otherwise<br>designed and constructed to avoid a cut-fill<br>transition condition during tank construction. Also,<br>a supplemental subsurface exploration for the tank<br>site, the resort hotel site, and the neighborhood<br>commercial areas shall be performed and a report<br>prepared to provide design-level recommendations<br>and confirm slope stability and bedrock rippability.<br>Remedial and/or structural measures shall be<br>shown on the final 40-scale plans and after<br>detailed slope stability analyses have been<br>performed and reviewed and approved by the<br>County of San Benito Public Works Department. |                                  |
|        | <b>GEO-3(c) Setbacks</b> . Wall and building slope<br>setbacks are variable depending on slope height<br>and soil conditions and shall follow CBC and CRC<br>requirements at a minimum. Additional slope<br>setbacks shall be implemented where natural<br>drainage channels could create slope instabilities<br>unless repaired/mitigated. Specific setback<br>recommendations from the ENGEO March 2013<br>and August 2013 geotechnical reports shall be<br>implemented by the Project, as well as any<br>additional setback recommendations made as part<br>of the site-specific studies required by other<br>mitigation measures in Section 4.6, Geology and<br>Soils, of this SEIR. The County of San Benito shall<br>review and approve all wall and building slope<br>setbacks prior to issuance of a grading permit.  |                                  |
|        | <b>GEO-3(d) Debris Benches.</b> Debris benches shall<br>be created at the interface between the open<br>space hillside and the residential lots. Unless site-   |                                  |

| Table ES-1   |
|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
|  | specific supplemental studies approved by the<br>County of San Benito for final 40-scale plans<br>conclude otherwise, this shall include a minimum<br>debris bench of 50 feet below hillside areas<br>containing unmitigated landslides and a minimum<br>debris bench of 25 feet below hillside areas with no<br>mapped landslides or for mitigated landslide areas.<br>A road may be considered part of the debris<br>bench, but a backyard shall not.   |                                  |
| Impact GEO-4 The construction and<br>operation of the proposed Project<br>could result in soil erosion or loss of<br>topsoil. Impacts would be Class II,<br>significant but mitigable. [Threshold<br>number 2] | <b>GEO-4(a) Debris and Stripping.</b> Debris or soft<br>compressible soils shall be removed from any<br>location to be graded, from areas to receive fill or<br>structures, or those areas to serve as borrow. The<br>depth of removal of such materials shall be<br>determined by the Geotechnical Engineer or<br>qualified representative in the field at the time of<br>grading. Existing vegetation should be removed<br>from areas to receive fill, or structures, or those<br>areas to serve for borrow. Tree roots should be<br>removed down to a depth of at least 3 feet below<br>existing grade. The actual depths of tree root<br>removal shall be determined by the Project<br>Geotechnical Engineer's representative in the field<br>to ensure that all debris or soft compressible soils<br>at each specific construction site are removed.<br>Strippings may be reserved for placement on<br>graded slopes prior to installation of erosion control<br>measures. After placement on graded slopes, any<br>remaining strippings and organically contaminated<br>soils which are not suitable for use as engineered<br>fill may be used in approved open space areas or<br>landscape areas subject to approval by the<br>Landscape Architect. Otherwise, such soils should<br>be removed from the Project Site or may<br>selectively be blended with soil and placed in<br>engineered fills outside street and pad areas. Any<br>topsoil that would be retained for future use in<br>landscape areas should be stockpiled in areas<br>where it would not interfere with grading<br>operations. | Less than significant.           |
|  | <b>GEO-4(b) Erosion Control Mat/Blanket.</b> An<br>erosion control mat or blanket shall be used for<br>select slope face protection and lining of runoff<br>channels during grading and construction. The use<br>of erosion control mats or blankets shall be<br>consistent with the Project's SWPPP prepared in<br>compliance with National Pollutant Discharge<br>Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General<br>Permit 99-08-DWQ. The Contractor shall submit a<br>manufacturer's certification that the erosion<br>mat/blanket supplied meets the criteria specified.   |                                  |
| <b>Impact GEO-5</b> Portions of the Project<br>Site contain expansive soils, which<br>could expose people or structures to<br>potentially substantial adverse  | <b>GEO-5 Structural Reinforcement.</b> During<br>grading, exposed expansive soils where structures<br>will be built shall be kept moist by occasional<br>sprinkling. Structures shall be adequately   | Less than significant.           |

| Table ES-1   |
|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |

|   | • •  |                                  |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Impact                                  | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
| effects. Impacts would be Class II,     | supported on structural reinforced mat foundations                   |                                  |
| significant but mitigable. [Threshold   | that are designed to accommodate shrinking and                       |                                  |
| number 41                               | swelling subgrade soils. If required by the geologic                 |                                  |
|   | and geotechnical analysis, expansive soils either                    |                                  |
|   | shall be removed and replaced with low-                              |                                  |
|   | expansivity soils (the preferred approach) or an                     |                                  |
|   | additional approach is that foundations shall be                     |                                  |
|   | designed to accommodate movements caused by                          |                                  |
|   | avpansive soil or expansive soils shall be                           |                                  |
|   | expansive soil, of expansive soils shall be                          |                                  |
| GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS/CL             | IMATE CHANGE   |                                  |
| Impact GHG-1 Development of the         | GHG-1 GHG Reduction Plan Prior to initial                            | Significant and                  |
| Development of the                      | GIG-I GIG Reduction Flan. Flor to Initial                            | Significant and                  |
| Project would generate additional       | grading permit issuance, the Project applicant shall                 | unavoidable.                     |
| GHG emissions beyond existing           | develop and implement a Project GHG Reduction                        |                                  |
| conditions due to construction activity | Plan, approved by the County, that documents a                       |                                  |
| and the Project's long-term operation.  | reduction in annual GHG emissions from the                           |                                  |
| Total estimated GHG emissions           | Project by a minimum of 2,522 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/year over         |                                  |
| would exceed the efficiency             | the operational life of the Project. The GHG                         |                                  |
| threshold. Therefore, this impact       | Reduction Plan shall include:  |                                  |
| would be Class I, significant and       | A. On-site GHG reduction measures designed                           |                                  |
| unavoidable. [Threshold number 1]       | to reduce GHG emissions on the Project                               |                                  |
|   | Site. On-site GHG reduction measures shall                           |                                  |
|   | be implemented by the Project applicants                             |                                  |
|   | and shall be reflected on and incorporated                           |                                  |
|   | into all applications for development within                         |                                  |
|   | the Project Site On-site GHG reduction                               |                                  |
|   | measures may include, but are not be limited                         |                                  |
|   | to the following components:   |                                  |
|   |  |                                  |
|   | Energy Use   |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>On-site energy conservation policies in</li> </ul>          |                                  |
|   | addition to those described in the Specific                          |                                  |
|   | Plan Development Standards   |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Exceed adopted 2013 Title 24 energy</li> </ul>              |                                  |
|   | requirements by a minimum of 10 percent                              |                                  |
|   | through implementation of energy                                     |                                  |
|   | reduction measures, including:                                       |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Use locally made building materials for</li> </ul>          |                                  |
|   | construction of the Project and                                      |                                  |
|   | associated infrastructure when such                                  |                                  |
|   | materials are locally available:                                     |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Use of materials which are resource</li> </ul>              |                                  |
|   | efficient recyclable with long life                                  |                                  |
|   | cycles:  |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Install energy-reducing shading</li> </ul>                  |                                  |
|   | mechanisms for windows, porches                                      |                                  |
|   | nation walkwaye ato:   |                                  |
|   | Patios, waikways, etc.,<br>■ Install operative reducing dow lighting |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Install energy reducing day lighting</li> </ul>             |                                  |
|   | systems (e.g. skylights, light shelves,                              |                                  |
|   | liansom windows);  |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Use of water efficient landscapes;</li> </ul>               |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Use tankless water heaters or solar</li> </ul>              |                                  |
|   | water heaters;   |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Use of low-energy interior lighting;</li> </ul>             |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Use low-energy street lights and</li> </ul>                 |                                  |
|   | parking lot lights (i.e. sodium); and                                |                                  |
|   | <ul> <li>Use of light colored water-based paint</li> </ul>           |                                  |

| Impact | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
|        | <ul> <li>and roofing materials.</li> <li>On-site renewable energy production,<br/>including wind-generated energy or<br/>installation of solar photovoltaic (PV)<br/>panels or other on-site renewable energy<br/>that generates a minimum of 30 percent of<br/>the Project's total energy demand</li> <li>Vehicle Trips (based on MBUAPCD<br/>Transportation Demand Management [TDM]<br/>measures)</li> <li>Provide preferential carpool/vanpool<br/>parking spaces</li> <li>Add a location for tour and shuttle buses to<br/>pick up passengers near the amenity<br/>center and assisted living facility (i.e. bus<br/>duck out for residents living on the Project<br/>Site), or other shuttle/mini bus service</li> <li>Provide bicycle storage/parking facilities<br/>for on-site employees</li> <li>Provide child care centers for on-site<br/>employees</li> <li>Provide an on-site park-and-ride lot</li> <li>Employ a transportation/rideshare<br/>coordinator</li> <li>Implement a rideshare program for on-site<br/>residents and employees to<br/>rideshare or take public transportation</li> <li>Implement compressed work schedules</li> </ul> |                                  |
|        | B. GHG/Carbon Offset Mechanism. The GHG emissions reduction achieved through implementation of on-site GHG reduction measures would depend on the specific mix of measures available for each development application within the Project. Because it is not yet possible to know with certainty which onsite GHG reduction measures would be feasibly incorporated into the Project, or to quantify the reduction in GHG emissions that these measures would achieve, on-site GHG reduction measures may not be sufficient to reduce Project GHG emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year. If GHG emissions cannot be reduced below threshold levels through compliance with the Project GHG Reduction Plan described in Part A, Project applicants shall purchase a fair share of carbon offsets that meet approved offset protocols through the California Cap-and-Trade Program to reduce GHG emissions below threshold levels. Carbon offsets reduce GHG emissions globally through funding offsite projects that eliminate new GHG   |                                  |

| Implicit         Mitigation           emissions and/or sequester existing GHGs in<br>the atmosphere.         Plan Requirements and Timing. The GHG<br>Reduction Plan shall be approved by San Benito<br>County Planning and Building Departments prior to<br>initial grading permit issuance. Applicable<br>elements of the GHG Reduction Plan shall be<br>reflected on development plans prior to permit<br>approval. If GHG emissions cannot be reduced<br>through compliance with such a plan. purchased<br>carbon offsets shall be approved by Planning and<br>Building staff prior to permit approval.           Emissions reductions from individual GHG<br>reduction measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcaa.org/wpr<br>contert/upload\$2001/11/CAFCOA-Quantification-<br>Reports-14-Final.pdf           Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2.522 MT CO24/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2.522 MT CO24/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that met approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.         Less than significant.           Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required.         Less than significant.           Iterast hat met approved of the<br>Project AID oper head hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to pobenital soil conamination of<br>the proprosis a sublication of pastis   | Impact                                   | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After     |
|--|--|---|------------------------|
| Impact GHC-2 The proposed Project<br>Norther purposed Number Structures and Structure Project Structures of the Project, Structures of the CHG and Structure Project Structures of the CHG and Structures of the CHG Reduction Project Structures of the CHG Reducture Project Structures of the CHG Reducture Proved.         Impact GHC-2 The proposed Project<br>Norther Structures A required.       Nor required.         Impact GHC-2 The proposed Project<br>Norther Structures of Structures as a required.       Nor required.         Impact GHC-2 The proposed Project<br>Norther Structures of reduction Structures as a required.       Nor required.         Impact GHC-2 The proposed Project<br>Norther Structures Norther Structures and the structures of structures as a required.       Less than significant.         Impact GHC-2 The proposed Project<br>Norther Structures Norther Structures and the completed for the proposed of the required Structure phases of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions and the completed for the order Structures and the completed for the proposed Project<br>Norther structures and the structure of the project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions Project<br>applicants would be required to protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.       Less than significant.         Impact HA2-1 Development of the<br>Project could phase of the project. Therefore,<br>to profess structures associated with<br>the Project, sufficient the project.       Less than significant.         Impact HA2-1 Development of the<br>Project could phase health active the project the proposed project<br>is associated with the project.       HA2-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Pr   | inipact                                  | Miligation Measures   | Mitigation             |
| Plan Requirements and Timing. The GHG<br>Reduction Plan shall be approved by San Benito<br>County Planning and Building Departments prior to<br>initial grading permit issuance. Applicable<br>elements of the GHG Reduction Plan shall be<br>reflected on development plans prior to permit<br>approval. If GHG emissions cannot be reduced<br>through compliance with such a plan, purchased<br>carbon offsets shall be approved by Planning and<br>Building staff prior to permit approval.         Emissions reductions from individual GHG<br>reduction measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measure GHG-1 using CAPCOA's<br>Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures:<br>A Resource for Local Government to Assess<br>Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas<br>Mitigation Measure (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.caacoa.org/wp-<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.pdf         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions,<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2.522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required discut protocols through<br>the purpose of reducting<br>Strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>construction workers or future<br>general greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>construction workers or future<br>strategies and the 2008 MATERIALS       None required.         HZ21 Sbil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>insident and occupants of the<br>project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the<br>project outlo pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>stance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>from previous and nogoing usees<br>involving the ap  |  | emissions and/or sequester existing GHGs in the atmosphere. |                        |
| Reduction Plan shall be approved by San Benito<br>County Planning and Building Departments prior to<br>initial grading permit issuance. Applicable<br>elements of the CHG Reduction Plans prior to permit<br>approval. It GHG emissions cannot be reduced<br>through compliance with such a plan, purchased<br>carbon offsets shall be approved by Planning and<br>Building staff prior to permit approval.         Emissions reductions from individual GHG<br>reduction measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measure GHG-1 using CAPCOA's<br>Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures:<br>A Resource for Local Government to Assess<br>Emission Reductions from individual GHG<br>reductions measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.org/wpc<br>content/upload/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report.9-14-Final.pdf         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2,252 MT CO2/eyear<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts Would be Class<br>Reduction Team GHG reduction<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occopants of the ster,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>provelying the application of the ster,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>in dual use graded under the<br>spervision of a professional geologist or<br>prostion of a perimesional geologist or<br>prostion of a perimesional geologist or<br>prostion of a perimesion of in the perion of<br>in absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>a barence of contaminated soil in the por  |  | Plan Requirements and Timing. The GHG                       |                        |
| County Planning and Building Departments prior to<br>initial grading permit issuance. Applicable<br>elements of the CHG Reduction Plan shall be<br>reflected on development plans prior to permit<br>approval. If CHG Reduction Plan shall be<br>reflected on development plans prior to permit<br>approval. If CHG Reduction Plan shall be<br>purpose of offents hall be approved by Planning and<br>Building staff prior to permit approval.         Emissions reductions from individual CHG<br>reduction measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.pdf         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet Project ZMT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions (Project<br>applicants would be required 2,522 IMT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to California Cap-and-Trade Program.       Less than significant.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plin, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. It project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plin, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the project culo goes health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occopants of the site,<br>due to potential soli contamination<br>from previous and orgoing uses<br>involving the application of the site,<br>due to potential soli contamination<br>involving the applicantit would<br>applicants would be requined adoid   |  | Reduction Plan shall be approved by San Benito              |                        |
| Initial grading permit issuance. Applicable         Initial grading permit susuance. Applicable <t< td=""><td></td><td>County Planning and Building Departments prior to</td><td></td></t<>  |  | County Planning and Building Departments prior to           |                        |
| elements of the CHG Reduction Plan shall be<br>reflected on development plans prior to permit<br>approval. If GHG emissions cannot be reduced<br>through compliance with such a plan, purchased<br>carbon offsets shall be approved by Planning and<br>Building staff prior to permit approval.         Emissions reductions from individual GHG<br>reduction measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.org/wp<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.off         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions Project Site protocols through<br>the Califonia Cap-and-Trade Program.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved dister protocols through<br>the Califonia Cap-and-Trade Program.       Less than significant.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>measures. As a result, the Project<br>applicants would be required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved dister protocols through<br>the Califonia Cap-and-Trade Program.       Less than significant.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>Would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>would pose health hazards to<br>construction work  |  | initial grading permit issuance. Applicable                 |                        |
| Impact CHG-2 The proposed Project<br>Regord PLAC The project of the site<br>offsets shall be approved by Planning and<br>Building staff prior to permit approval.Impact CHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Compensions by the required 1.522 Million to compliance with<br>Milligation Measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.org/wpc-<br>content/upload/s2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.pdfImpact CHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team CHG reduction<br>actions that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.Less than significant.Impact CHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be constraint go constraint go constraint go constraint go constraint with the<br>Climate Action Team CHG reduction<br>attractions trade program.Less than significant.Impact CHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be constraint go constraint with the<br>Climate Action Team CHG reduction<br>attracting and the 2008 Attorney<br>registers and the 2008 Attorney<br>registers and the 2008 Matorney<br>registers and docupant of the<br>the opation project config the project. Thereshold<br>mumber 2]Less than significant.HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS<br>the opation of the specific on fight the 2 project as oil assessment shall be completed for<br>the project, a soli assessment shall be completed for<br>the project as oil assessment shall be completed for<br>the project on fight the project as oil aspra  |  | elements of the GHG Reduction Plan shall be                 |                        |
| approval. If GHG emissions cannot be reduced<br>through compliance with such a plan, purchased<br>carbon offsets shall be approved by Planning and<br>Building staff prior to permit approval.Emissions reductions from individual GHG<br>reduction measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measure GHG-1 using CAPCOA's<br>Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures:<br>A Resource for Local Government to Assess<br>Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas<br>Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report.9-14-Final.pdf<br>Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions Project and the required 2.522 MT CO24/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions<br>reductions framed HGG reduction<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be required.None required.Less than significant.None required.Less than significant.None required.Less than significant.Less than significant.Mumber 2]HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, soil engade under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>rofessional geologist or<br>rofessiona   |  | reflected on development plans prior to permit              |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.gov/pup:<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.pdf         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reduction sfrom of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHC reduction<br>applicants would be required.       Less than significant.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHC reduction<br>attractiges and the 2008 Attorney<br>general frequencing applicable<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>phan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reduction general projects with an asplificant.       Less than significant.         HAZT Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>general for exolution general for a for the site<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>for the potion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>or professional general when the fore<br>the potential soil contamination<br>for the potential soil contamination<br>for the potential soil contamination<br>professional general when the fore<br>the potential soil contamination<br>supervision of a professional general when the project<br>applicants would be required above and environd in<br>supervision of a professional general there and thead the<br>professional there are not environd in<br>the bovertice mean   |  | approval. If GHG emissions cannot be reduced                |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be classed.       None required.         None required.       None required.         None required.       Less than significant.         Project, sufficient on-site be grade under the<br>suppricants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Project.       Less than significant.         Matter Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Creenhouse Gas Reduction<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant.       HA2-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional gelogits or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the bore   |  | through compliance with such a plan, purchased              |                        |
| Building star prior to permit approval.         Emissions reductions from individual GHG<br>reduction measures are quantifiable for the<br>purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measures GAG Mitigation Measures:<br>A Resource for Local Government to Assess<br>Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas<br>Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.pdf         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions from on-site GHG emissions.<br>Project sufficient on-site GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required 0 fiset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.       Less than significant.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]       None required 1         HAZ-15 Oil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional gelogist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development for the project would not civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the boroin of and to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional gelogist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development for the unon  |  | carbon offsets shall be approved by Planning and            |                        |
| Emissions reductions from individual GHG         reduction measures are quantifiable for the         purpose of demonstrating compliance with         Mitigation Measure GHG-1 using CAPCOA's         Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures:         A Resource for Local Government to Assess         Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas         Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at         http://www.capcoa.org/wp-         content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-         Report-9-14-Final.pdf         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction         reductions may not be available to reduce GHG         emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year         over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,         to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project         applicants would be required 0 fore protocols through         the California Cap-and-Trade Program.         None required.         Vould be generally consistent with the         Consistent with the         Resources of reducing GHG         emissions. Impacts would be Class         II, less than significant. Threshold         HAZ-1 Development of the         Project could pose health hazards to         construction workers or future         residents and occoupants of the site,   |  | Building staff prior to permit approval.                    |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project       None required.         Limate CHG-2 The proposed Project       None required.         Limate CHG-3 The proposed Project       None required.         Limate CHG reduction strategies and the 2008 Attorney       Less than significant.         Climate Action Team CHG reduction required.       Less than significant.         HAZ2ATOS/  |  | Emissions reductions from individual GHG                    |                        |
| purpose of demonstrating compliance with<br>Mitigation Measure GHC-1 using CAPCOA's<br>Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures:<br>A Resource for Local Government to Assess<br>Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas<br>Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.pdf         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.       Less than significant.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]       Less than significant.         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the application of pesticides.       Less than significant.   |  | reduction measures are quantifiable for the                 |                        |
| Image: Section 1       Mitigation Measure GHG-1 using CAPCOA's Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures: A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at <a href="http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pd">http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pd</a> Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction components available to a particular phase of the Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions reductions may not be available to reduce GHG emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year over the operational life of the Project. Therefore, to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project applicants would be required to purchase carbon offsets that meet approved offset protocols through the California Cap-and-Trade Program.       Less than significant.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable for the Project. The proposed Project would be generally consistent with the Climate Action Team GHG reduction adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant. [Threshold number 2]       None required.       Less than significant.         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to the project, a soil assessment shall be completed for the project and coupants of the site, due to potential soil contamination from previous and ongoing uses involving the application of pesticides, area and seed under the supervision of a professional geologist or professional geologist or professional civil engineer to confirm the presence or absence of contaminated soli in the portion of the beneficient on the prote would in the portion of the project shouse and ongoing uses i  |  | purpose of demonstrating compliance with                    |                        |
| Undantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures:         A Resource for Local Government to Assess         Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas         Mitigation Measures (August 2010), available at         http://www.capca.org/wp-<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.pd         Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 1,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.       Less than significant.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional give or burd wing the application of pesticides,<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence   |  | Mitigation Measure GHG-1 using CAPCOA's                     |                        |
| Impact CHG-2 The proposed Project       None required 2,522 MT CO2e/year         would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project Mathematication<br>Measures. Mould be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]       Less than significant.         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence or absence of contaminated soli in the profix of the<br>profesion of a professional geologist or<br>professi  |  | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures:             |                        |
| Imitsion Reductors from Greening August 2010), available at<br>http://www.capcoa.org/wp-<br>content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-<br>Report-9-14-Final.pdf<br>Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.Less than significant.Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would hat conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]Less than significant.Impact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the application of pasticides,<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the application of pasticides,<br>involving the application of pasticides,<br>inv  |  | A Resource for Local Government to Assess                   |                        |
| Image to the street of the   |  | Mitigation Measures (August 2010) available at              |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project       Nor required 2,522 MT CO2e/year         word be generally consistent with the Climate Action Team GHG reduction designed for the purplex and the 2008 Attorney General Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures. As a result, the Project would be class III, less than significant. Threshold number 2]       None required to be grading and Remediation. Prior to issuance of any grading permits associated with the Project could pose health hazards to construction workers or future review of and or going uses involving the application of persicides, but the project could pose health hazards to construction workers or future review and or going uses involving the application of persicides.       Less than significant.         Less than significant.       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to project and angoing uses involving the application of persicides.       Less than significant.         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the Project could pose health magnetic provision of a professional geologist or professional civil engineer to confirm the presence or any grading permits associated with the Project, as oil assessment shall be completed for the project and plication of persicides.       Less than significant.   |  | http://www.capcoa.org/wp-                                   |                        |
| Report-9-14-Final.pdf           Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.           Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshol<br>number 2]         Less than significant.           HAZ-ARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>bubbicide contrale of application of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or   |  | content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-              |                        |
| Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction<br>components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.Less than significant.Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]IMAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the potential soil contamination<br>fore previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>burbinden entroleum benedificides,<br>to the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional geologist or<br>professional geologist or<br>professional divil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>hore provided in<br>professional geologist or<br>professional geologist or<br>professional divil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional geologist or<br>professional geologist or<br>professional geologist or<br>professional divil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional geologist or<br>professional geologist   |  | Report-9-14-Final.pdf                                       |                        |
| components available to a particular phase of the<br>Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]None required.Less than significant.HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS<br>Impact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional geologist or<br>professional professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional geologist or<br>professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to   |  | Depending on the specific mix of GHG reduction              |                        |
| Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions<br>reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.Less than significant.Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>Offsets and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]None required.Less than significant.HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALSHAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>rot portential soil contamination<br>for the potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>out both be due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>out both be due to be proved of protect that use per user with an endimeted in<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional period the proving the user path completed in<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the prevaluated in<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the prevaluated in<br>profess  |  | components available to a particular phase of the           |                        |
| reductions may not be available to reduce GHG<br>emissions by the required 2,522 MT CO2e/year<br>over the operational life of the Project. Therefore,<br>to further reduce Project GHG emissions, Project<br>applicants would be required to purchase carbon<br>offsets that meet approved offset protocols through<br>the California Cap-and-Trade Program.         Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]       None required.       Less than significant.         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Davalement Area that under the day<br>of a bordensional geologist or       Less than significant.  |  | Project, sufficient on-site GHG emissions                   |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]None required.Less than significant.Impact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soli contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>borbinities, patraleum bared funde.HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>hot proves the twoen ent or whore do in<br>the portion of the portion of<br>the portion of prescicides,<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>the Demement Areas that were that were at an end end whole.Less than significant.   |  | reductions may not be available to reduce GHG               |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project<br>would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]None required.Less than significant.HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALSHAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, as oil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development of two<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development to the port on of<br>the Development to the port on of<br>the Development to the port on of the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development to the port on of<br>the Development to the port on of<br>the Development to the port on of<br>the Development to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development to the port on of<br>the Development to the port on of<br>the  |  | over the operational life of the Project. Therefore         |                        |
| Impact CHG-2 The proposed Project       None required to purchase carbon offsets that meet approved offset protocols through the California Cap-and-Trade Program.         Impact CHG-2 The proposed Project       None required.         Would be generally consistent with the Climate Action Team GHG reduction strategies and the 2008 Attorney       None required.         General Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures. As a result, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Impacts would be Class III, less than significant. [Threshold number 2]       HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the Project could pose health hazards to construction workers or future residents and occupants of the site, due to potential soil contamination from previous and ongoing uses involving the application of pesticides, notroloum baced fuels.       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to issuance of any grading permits associated with the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed for the portion of alad to be graded under the supervision of a professional geologist or professional civil engineer to confirm the presence or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of the portion of the portion of the portion of the protion of thene protion of the protion of the protion of t   |  | to further reduce Project GHG emissions Project             |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project       None required.       Less than significant.         Would be generally consistent with the       None required.       Less than significant.         Climate Action Team GHG reduction       Stategies and the 2008 Attorney       Less than significant.         General Greenhouse Gas Reduction       Measures. As a result, the Project       None required.         would not conflict with an applicable       plan, policy, or regulation adopted for       Hazaros freduction         Ill, less than significant. [Threshold       Impact HAZ-1 Development of the       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to       Less than significant.         Project could pose health hazards to       issuance of any grading permits associated with       Less than significant.       Less than significant.         ue to potential soil contamination       for the project, a soil assessment shall be completed       for the protion of land to be graded under the       supervision of a professional geologist or         professional civil engineer to confirm the presence       or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of       the Development of the   |  | applicants would be required to purchase carbon             |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project       None required.       Less than significant.         Would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney       None required.       Less than significant.         General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>IIII, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the application of pesticides,       Haz-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development Areas the regulation of pesticides,   |  | offsets that meet approved offset protocols through         |                        |
| Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project       None required.       Less than significant.         would be generally consistent with the       Climate Action Team GHG reduction       Less than significant.         strategies and the 2008 Attorney       General Greenhouse Gas Reduction       Measures. As a result, the Project       Would not conflict with an applicable         plan, policy, or regulation adopted for       the purpose of reducing GHG       Home required.       Less than significant.         Ill, less than significant. [Threshold       HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to       Less than significant.         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the       Froject, a soil assessment shall be completed       for the portion of land to be graded under the       supervision of a professional geologist or       professional civil engineer to confirm the presence       or absence of contaminated os in the portion of   |  | the California Cap-and-Trade Program.                       |                        |
| would be generally consistent with the<br>Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]       Impact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>parkieves.       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>pervisione. Porteored fuels       Less than significant.  | Impact GHG-2 The proposed Project        | None required.  | Less than significant. |
| Climate Action Team GHG reduction<br>strategies and the 2008 Attorney<br>General Greenhouse Gas Reduction<br>Measures. As a result, the Project<br>would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]<br>HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS<br>Impact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>involving the | would be generally consistent with the   |   |                        |
| Strategies and the 2006 Attorney         General Greenhouse Gas Reduction         Measures. As a result, the Project         would not conflict with an applicable         plan, policy, or regulation adopted for         the purpose of reducing GHG         emissions. Impacts would be Class         III, less than significant. [Threshold         number 2]         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the         Project could pose health hazards to         construction workers or future         residents and occupants of the site,         due to potential soil contamination         from previous and ongoing uses         involving the application of pesticides,         the Drovent of the   | Climate Action Team GHG reduction        |   |                        |
| Measures. As a result, the Project         would not conflict with an applicable         plan, policy, or regulation adopted for         the purpose of reducing GHG         emissions. Impacts would be Class         III, less than significant. [Threshold         number 2]         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the         Project could pose health hazards to         construction workers or future         residents and occupants of the site,         due to potential soil contamination         from previous and ongoing uses         involving the application of pesticides,         or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of         barbinides patreleum based fuels  | General Greenhouse Gas Reduction         |   |                        |
| would not conflict with an applicable<br>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]       HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>herthicide, netroloum hazard funda.       Less than significant.   | Measures. As a result, the Project       |   |                        |
| plan, policy, or regulation adopted for<br>the purpose of reducing GHG<br>emissions. Impacts would be Class<br>III, less than significant. [Threshold<br>number 2]HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALSImpact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>particides netroleum baced fuelsHAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>hazing the application of pesticides,<br>involving the apoly application of pesticides,<br>invo  | would not conflict with an applicable    |   |                        |
| the purpose of reducing GHG         emissions. Impacts would be Class         III, less than significant. [Threshold         number 2]         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the         Project could pose health hazards to         construction workers or future         residents and occupants of the site,         due to potential soil contamination         from previous and ongoing uses         involving the application of pesticides,    Project could pose health hazards to Construction workers or future residents and occupants of the site, due to potential soil contamination from previous and ongoing uses involving the application of pesticides, Development Arace that was not evaluated in Development Arace that was not evaluated in The Development Arace that was not evaluated in  | plan, policy, or regulation adopted for  |   |                        |
| emissions. Impacts would be Class       III, less than significant. [Threshold number 2]         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the Project could pose health hazards to construction workers or future residents and occupants of the site, due to potential soil contamination from previous and ongoing uses involving the application of pesticides, barbicides patroloum based fuels.       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to issuance of any grading permits associated with the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed for the portion of land to be graded under the supervision of a professional geologist or professional civil engineer to confirm the presence or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of headed fuels.  | the purpose of reducing GHG              |   |                        |
| III, less than significant. [Inreshold number 2]         HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the Project could pose health hazards to construction workers or future residents and occupants of the site, due to potential soil contamination from previous and ongoing uses involving the application of pesticides, bartheider patroleum based fuels.       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to issuance of any grading permits associated with the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed for the portion of land to be graded under the supervision of a professional geologist or professional geologist or or professional civil engineer to confirm the presence or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of the Dovelopment Arease that was not suplusted in the portion of the power of the   | emissions. Impacts would be Class        |   |                        |
| HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS         Impact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>barbicides patroleum hazard fuels       HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>hazbicides patroleum hazard fuels       Less than significant.  | III, less than significant. [Inreshold   |   |                        |
| Impact HAZ-1 Development of the<br>Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing usesHAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to<br>issuance of any grading permits associated with<br>the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed<br>for the portion of land to be graded under the<br>supervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>herbidide patroleum hazard fuelsLess than significant.  | HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIAL               | S   |                        |
| Project could pose health hazards to<br>construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,  | Impact HAZ-1 Development of the          | HAZ-1 Soil Sampling and Remediation. Prior to               | Less than significant. |
| construction workers or future<br>residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>barbicides, patroloum based fuels   | Project could pose health hazards to     | issuance of any grading permits associated with             |                        |
| residents and occupants of the site,<br>due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing uses<br>involving the application of pesticides,<br>bachicides potroloum based fuels  | construction workers or future           | the Project, a soil assessment shall be completed           |                        |
| due to potential soil contamination<br>from previous and ongoing usessupervision of a professional geologist or<br>professional civil engineer to confirm the presence<br>or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of<br>the Development Areas that was not evaluated in   | residents and occupants of the site,     | for the portion of land to be graded under the              |                        |
| from previous and ongoing uses       professional civil engineer to confirm the presence         involving the application of pesticides,       or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of         the Development Areas that was not evaluated in  | due to potential soil contamination      | supervision of a professional geologist or                  |                        |
| Involving the application of pesticides, or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of   | from previous and ongoing uses           | professional civil engineer to confirm the presence         |                        |
|  | Involving the application of pesticides, | or absence of contaminated soil in the portion of           |                        |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After     |
|---|--|------------------------|
| chlorinated solvents, or other  | the Phase LESA report and presented to the San   | Mitigation             |
| chlorinated solvents, or other<br>chemicals. Impacts would be Class II,<br>significant but mitigable. [Threshold<br>numbers 1 and 4]  | the Phase I ESA report, and presented to the San<br>Benito County Environmental Health Services for<br>confirmation. Laboratory analysis of soil samples<br>shall be analyzed for the presence of<br>organochlorine pesticides in accordance with EPA<br>Test Method 8081. Soil samples also shall be<br>analyzed for the presence of total arsenic in<br>accordance with EPA Test Method 6010. Arsenic<br>concentrations in the soil shall be evaluated by<br>comparison with background levels in the southern<br>hillsides on the Project Site, as identified in the<br>Phase I ESA report, and with typical background<br>levels in California, whereby an exceedance of<br>typical background levels would represent a<br>potential health hazard. If soil sampling indicates<br>the presence of any contaminant at concentrations<br>exceeding applicable environmental screening<br>levels, the Project proponent shall coordinate with<br>San Benito County Environmental Health Services<br>to develop and implement a program to remediate<br>or manage the contaminated soil during<br>construction. Disposal shall occur at an<br>appropriate facility licensed to handle such<br>contaminants and remedial excavation shall<br>proceed under the supervision of an environmental<br>consultant licensed to oversee such remediation.<br>The remediation/disposal program shall be | Mitigation             |
| Impact HAZ-2 The Project would involve the development of certain   | The remediation/disposal program shall be<br>approved by San Benito County Environmental<br>Health Services.<br>The Project proponent shall submit all<br>correspondence to San Benito County<br>Environmental Health Services prior to issuance of<br>grading permits. All proper waste handling and<br>disposal procedures shall be followed. Upon<br>completion of any required remediation/disposal, a<br>qualified environmental consultant shall prepare<br>and submit to the County for review and approval a<br>report summarizing the remediation efforts, the<br>remediation/disposal approach implemented, and<br>the analytical results after completion of the<br>remediation, including all waste disposal or<br>treatment manifests.<br>None required.  | Less than significant. |
| land uses that could result in the use,<br>transport or creation of hazardous<br>materials, which could place such<br>materials in proximity to residences<br>and other occupied uses.<br>Development would also occur near<br>roadways on which accidents that<br>involve hazardous materials could<br>potentially create a public safety<br>hazard by exposing people to<br>contaminants. However, required |  |                        |

| Table ES-1   |
|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After     |
|--|--|------------------------|
| adherence to existing regulations<br>would reduce impacts to a Class III,<br>less than significant impact.<br>[Threshold numbers 2 and 4]  |  | mitgation              |
| Impact HAZ-3 The Project Site does<br>not contain a listed hazardous<br>materials site, and future residents<br>and occupants would not be exposed<br>to significant hazards from<br>surrounding listed sites. Impacts<br>would be Class III, less than<br>significant. [Threshold number 4]   | None required.   | Less than significant. |
| Impact HAZ-4 Development of the<br>Project would be located in a wildland<br>fire hazard area, which could create a<br>potential safety hazard. However,<br>new development located on the<br>Project Site would be required to<br>comply with existing regulations<br>intended to minimize the potential<br>effects associated with wildfires.<br>Required compliance with these<br>regulations would ensure that impacts<br>would be Class III, less than<br>significant. [Threshold number 8] | None required.   | Less than significant. |
| HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALIT   | Ŷ  |                        |
| Impact HWQ-1 During Project<br>construction, the soil surface would<br>be subject to erosion and the<br>downstream watershed would be<br>subject to pollution. This is a Class II,<br>significant but mitigable impact.<br>[Threshold numbers 1 and 5]   | <ul> <li>HWQ-1(a) Berms and Basins. As a condition of approval of the amended vesting tentative tract map for the Project, the applicant shall be required to construct temporary berms and sediment basins in order to avoid unnecessary siltation into local streams during construction activities where grading and construction shall occur in the vicinity of such streams.</li> <li>Photos showing berm and basin installation shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to issuance of building permits. Berms and basins shall be constructed when grading commences. The Project applicant shall sufficiently document, to the County's satisfaction, the proper installation of such berms and basins during grading.</li> <li>HWQ-1(b) Grading and Drainage Plans. As a condition of approval of the amended vesting tentative tract map for the Project, the applicant shall be required to submit grading and drainage plans to the Planning and Public Works Departments, for approval. The grading and drainage plans shall be consistent with the Project's SWPPP and Chapter 19.17 (Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Ordinance) of the San Benito County Code. The plans shall include the following:</li> </ul> | Less than significant. |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
|   | <ul> <li>a. Graded areas shall be revegetated with deep-rooted, native, non-invasive drought tolerant species to minimize slope failure and erosion potential. Geotextile binding fabrics shall be used if necessary to hold slope soils until vegetation is established;</li> <li>b. Temporary storage of construction equipment shall be limited to a minimum of 100 feet away from drainages on the Project Site; and</li> <li>c. Erosion control structures shall be installed.</li> <li>As a condition of approval of the amended vesting</li> </ul>   |                                  |
|   | tentative tract map, the grading and drainage plans<br>shall be submitted for review and approval by the<br>Planning and Public Works Departments. The<br>applicant shall notify the Planning Department prior<br>to commencement of grading. The notification shall<br>be provided in writing, and indicate the date of<br>planned grading commencement. Components of<br>the grading plan shall be implemented prior to<br>issuance of certificates of occupancy. The<br>applicant shall photo document revegetation and<br>provide sufficient documentation to the Planning<br>Department to ensure compliance with the plan.<br>The applicant shall provide sufficient<br>documentation, to the County's satisfaction, that |                                  |
|   | the technical aspects of the grading activities are<br>being properly monitored. The applicant shall<br>ensure installation of erosion control structures<br>prior to beginning of construction of any structures,<br>subject to review and approval by the County.   |                                  |
|   | approval of the amended vesting tentative tract<br>map for the Project, the applicant shall be required<br>to limit excavation and grading to the dry season of<br>the year (i.e., May to September) unless a County-<br>approved erosion control plan is in place and all<br>measures therein are in effect.   |                                  |
|   | This requirement shall be noted on all grading and<br>building plans. The Planning and/or Public Works<br>Departments shall site inspect during grading, at<br>the applicant's cost.  |                                  |
| <b>Impact HWQ-2</b> The proposed Project<br>would increase stormwater runoff due<br>to the increase in impervious surfaces<br>in the Project Site. However, impacts<br>would be Class III, less than<br>significant. [Threshold numbers 3, 4,<br>5, and 11] | None required.  | Less than significant.           |
| <b>Impact HWQ-3</b> Due to the<br>intensification of uses proposed on<br>the Project Site, there is the potential   | <b>HWQ-3(a) Final Drainage Plan.</b> As a condition of approval of the amended vesting tentative tract map for the Project, the applicant shall be required   | Less than significant.           |

|  |   | r                                |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Impact   | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
| for storm water transport of pollutants,<br>bacteria, salts, and sediment into<br>downstream facilities. However,<br>impacts would be Class II, significant<br>but mitigable. [Threshold number 6] | to submit a drainage plan that graphically<br>illustrates the location and design of pollutant-<br>removal systems for the County's approval. These<br>pollutant-removal systems shall include the<br>following, as described in the Preliminary<br>Stormwater Control Plan prepared for the<br>proposed Project (Balance Hydrologics, Inc. 2013):  |                                  |
|  | <ul> <li>Bioretention basins</li> <li>In-ground planters</li> <li>Vegetated swales</li> <li>Wet ponds</li> <li>Sediment and debris control</li> <li>Covered trash collection areas</li> <li>Education and outreach</li> </ul>   |                                  |
|  | Regular street sweeping   |                                  |
|  | The drainage plans shall be submitted to the San<br>Benito County Public Works Department for review<br>and approval prior to recordation of the first final<br>map for the Project. The applicant shall provide<br>sufficient documentation, to the County's<br>satisfaction, that the approved drainage plans have<br>been properly installed. The County Public Works<br>Department may conduct a site inspection to<br>confirm installation prior to occupancy clearance.   |                                  |
|  | <b>HWQ-3(b) Water Softeners.</b> Self-regenerating<br>water softener appliances (SRWS) shall not be<br>installed in any structure on-site. A SRWS is<br>defined as a water softening device that removes<br>calcium and magnesium salts from water by using<br>an ion-exchange resin utilizing sodium chloride<br>during the ion-exchange process. The ion-<br>exchange resin used in SRWS's is recharged by<br>using a sodium chloride brine solution which is<br>subsequently discharged into the sewer system.<br>Water softeners recharged by portable cartridges<br>supplied by service providers where the brine<br>solution resulting is not discharged into the sewer<br>system shall be allowed. |                                  |
|  | As a condition of approval of the amended vesting<br>tentative tract map, water softeners shall be shown<br>on plans submitted to the San Benito County<br>Planning Department for review and approval. The<br>prohibition of SRWSs shall be included in<br>Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs),<br>and monitored by the two Home Owners<br>Associations (AHOA and MHOA) with oversight by<br>the County Planning Department. The Planning<br>Department shall review site plans for compliance<br>prior to issuance of building permits. County<br>inspectors may inspect site for installation of<br>permitted water softeners prior to occupancy of the<br>structures.                      |                                  |

| Table ES-1   |
|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Impact HWQ-4 As an alternative to<br>the use of groundwater to serve the<br>proposed Project's non-potable<br>demands, the Project may include an<br>increase in the use of CVP water on<br>the Project Site. Impacts related to<br>water quality from use of this water<br>are considered Class III, less than<br>significant. [Threshold number 6] | None required.   | Less than significant.           |
| Project Site is located in an area<br>subject to inundation should a failure<br>of the San Justo Reservoir dam<br>occur. Impacts are considered Class<br>II, significant but mitigable. [Threshold<br>number 9]  | <ul> <li>shall be imposed on the amended vesting tentative tract map for the Project that requires the applicant to prepare a hazard response plan for the Project Site in consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation, OES, and SBCWD. The hazard response plan shall include the following elements, consistent with Government Code Section 8589.5(b)(2): <ul> <li>Delineation of the area of the Project Site subject to potential inundation;</li> <li>Identification of evacuation routes and traffic control measures to be used;</li> <li>Identification of shelters to be activated for the care of evacuees;</li> <li>Methods for the movement of people without their own transportation, including those in the proposed assisted living/skilled nursing/memory care facility;</li> <li>Identification of particular areas of facilities in the flood zones that would not require evacuation because of their location on high ground or similar circumstances;</li> <li>Procedures for the perimeter and interior security of the area, including such things as passes, identification requirements, and anti-looting patrols;</li> <li>Procedures for the lifting of the evacuation and reentry of the area; and</li> <li>Details as to which organizations are responsible for the functions described in the plan and the material and personnel resources required, including financial responsibilities for implementing the plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The San Benito County Planning and Public Works Departments, the Bureau of Reclamation, OES, and SBCWD shall review and approve the hazard response plan prior to the recordation of the first final map for the Project to ensure compliance with applicable laws.</li> </ul> |                                  |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After           |
|--|--|------------------------------|
|  | maps and requires, upon any transfer of real<br>property or rental agreements on the Project Site,<br>that the transferor shall deliver to the prospective<br>purchaser or tenant or a building within the dam<br>inundation area a written disclosure statement that<br>shall make all prospective purchasers or tenants<br>aware that the building is located within a dam<br>failure inundation hazard area. The disclosure shall<br>include a copy of the approved hazard response<br>plan required in mitigation measure MM HWQ-4(a)<br>above.<br>The disclosure shall be provided by the property<br>transfer of real property at issue and/or<br>execution of lease(s) on the Project Site. Updated<br>disclosure notifications shall be provided to<br>existing owner(s) and tenant(s) of the Project as<br>necessary if substantial new information regarding<br>dam inundation at the site becomes available.<br>Planning Department staff shall review and<br>approve the form of disclosure statement prior to<br>issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for a<br>proposed residential unit. | Mitigation                   |
| LAND USE   |  |                              |
| <b>Impact LU-1</b> The proposed Project<br>would not conflict with any applicable<br>land use plan, policy or regulation of<br>an agency with jurisdiction over the<br>Project adopted for the purpose of<br>avoiding or mitigating an<br>environmental impact. Therefore,<br>development of the Project would<br>result in a Class III, less than<br>significant, impact. [Threshold<br>number 2] | None required.   | Less than significant.       |
| NOISE  |  |                              |
| Impact NOI-1 Construction of the<br>proposed Project would not<br>significantly affect nearby off-site<br>sensitive receptors (the nearest of<br>which is approximately 1,600 feet<br>from the Project Site). However,<br>construction noise has the potential to<br>adversely impact newly developed<br>receptors (the nearest of which could   | NOI-1(a) Construction Activity Timing. Restrict<br>noise-generating activities at the construction site<br>or in areas adjacent to the construction site to the<br>hours of 7:00 am and 7:00 pm. Construction-<br>related noise-generating activities shall be<br>prohibited on Sundays and federally-recognized<br>holidays.  | Significant and unavoidable. |
| be adjacent to construction activities)<br>within the Project Site. For the off-site<br>sensitive receptors, construction<br>impacts would be less than<br>significant. However, for those future<br>on-site receptors, construction<br>impacts are considered a Class I,<br>significant and unavoidable impact.<br>[Threshold numbers 1 and 4]  | maintain construction equipment and ensure that<br>all internal combustion engine driven machinery<br>with intake and exhaust mufflers and engine<br>shrouds (if the equipment had such devices<br>installed as part of its standard equipment<br>package) that are in good condition and<br>appropriate for the equipment. Equipment engine<br>shrouds shall be closed during equipment<br>operation. The developer shall require all<br>contractors, as a condition of contract, to maintain   |                              |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
|   | and tune-up all construction equipment to minimize noise emissions.   |                                  |
|   | <b>NOI-1(c) Vehicle and Equipment Idling.</b><br>Construction vehicles and equipment shall not be<br>left idling for longer than five minutes when not in<br>use.   |                                  |
|   | <b>NOI-1(d)Stationary Equipment.</b> All noise-<br>generating stationary equipment such as air<br>compressors or portable power generators shall be<br>located as far as possible from sensitive receptors.<br>Temporary noise barriers shall be constructed to<br>screen stationary noise generating equipment<br>when located near adjoining sensitive land uses.<br>Temporary noise barriers could reduce<br>construction noise levels by 10 dBA.  |                                  |
|   | <b>NOI-1(e) Construction Route.</b> All construction traffic to and from the Project Site shall be routed via designated truck routes where feasible. All construction-related heavy truck traffic in residential areas shall be prohibited where feasible.   |                                  |
|   | <b>NOI-1(f) Workers' Radios.</b> All noise from workers' radios shall be controlled to a point that they are not audible at sensitive receptors near the construction activity.   |                                  |
|   | <b>NOI-1(g)Construction Plan.</b> Prior to issuance of<br>any grading and/or building permits, the contractor<br>shall prepare and submit to the County for<br>approval a detailed construction plan identifying<br>the schedule for major noise-generating<br>construction activity.   |                                  |
|   | NOI-1(h)Disturbance Coordinator. A "noise<br>disturbance coordinator" shall be designated by<br>the contractor. The noise disturbance coordinator<br>would be responsible for responding to any local<br>complaints about construction noise. The noise<br>disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause<br>of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad<br>muffler, etc.) and shall require that reasonable<br>measures warranted to correct the problem be<br>implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone<br>number for the disturbance coordinator at the<br>construction site and include it in the notice sent to<br>neighbors regarding the construction schedule. |                                  |
| <b>Impact NOI-2</b> Construction-related<br>activities associated with the<br>proposed Project would intermittently<br>generate groundborne vibration on<br>and adjacent to the Project Site. Due<br>to the phasing associated with | NOI-2 Vibration Mitigation. Equipment used for<br>vibration-generating construction activities shall be<br>limited to 20 tons, and heavily-loaded trucks shall<br>be routed away from sensitive receptors. Earth-<br>moving equipment shall be operated as far from<br>these uses as possible   | Significant and unavoidable.     |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation                          |
|---|--|---|
| development of the Project, this may<br>affect existing receptors near the<br>Project Site as well as proposed<br>receptors on-site. While impacts to<br>off-site receptors would be less than<br>significant, construction activities<br>could occur adjacent to on-site<br>receptors and produce vibration<br>levels that exceed thresholds of<br>significance. Therefore, impacts<br>would be Class I, significant and<br>unavoidable. [Threshold number 2]  |  | <b>g</b>  |
| Impact NOI-3 Occupants of off-site<br>residences would be exposed to<br>noise levels that could exceed<br>applicable criteria as a result of<br>Project-generated traffic on SR 156,<br>Union Road, and San Juan Oaks<br>Drive. Project-generated traffic on<br>Union Road would have a significant<br>and unavoidable (Class I) impact on<br>exterior noise levels at these sensitive<br>receptors, since available mitigation<br>may not be feasible. [Threshold<br>number 3]   | NOI-3 Off-site Residence Exterior Noise<br>Attenuation. Attenuation of exterior noise levels<br>experienced at the existing residential units located<br>adjacent to Union Road between SR 156 and<br>Riverside Road (specifically those residences<br>located within 100 feet of the roadway centerline)<br>shall be provided to the extent feasible. This can<br>be accomplished by constructing a solid berm<br>between affected residences and the roadway, or<br>via other methods recommended in a noise study<br>to be prepared by an acoustical engineer and<br>approved by the County. The implementation of<br>these structural measures would reduce noise<br>impacts below the applicable standards; however,<br>the measures would require the cooperation of the<br>existing residents and/or private property owners.<br>It should also be noted that the affected residences<br>have driveways on Union Road, and implementing<br>structural measures may limit access. In the event<br>that these entities choose not to grant permission<br>to implement these measures or the possible<br>recommendations of an acoustical engineer, this<br>mitigation would be considered infeasible. | Significant and<br>unavoidable.                           |
| Impact NOI-4 The proposed<br>residential, commercial, recreational,<br>and resort uses would be subject to<br>operational noise generated from<br>existing uses (adjacent industrial,<br>agricultural, and golf course uses)<br>and from other proposed on-site<br>uses. Noise generated by the existing<br>adjacent agricultural and golf course<br>uses, and by proposed uses on the<br>site, would not exceed applicable<br>County standards. Impacts would be<br>considered Class III, less than<br>significant. [Threshold number 1]<br>Impact NOI-5 Occupants of the<br>proposed on-site residences would | None required.<br>Mitigation Measure NOI-3 under Impact NOI-3<br>would be required.  | Less than significant.<br>Significant and<br>unavoidable. |
| not be significantly affected as a<br>result of the cumulative traffic<br>associated with the proposed Project.<br>Existing off-site residences along SR<br>156 and Union Road would be   |  |   |

| Table ES-1   |
|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |

| Impact                                   | Mitigation Measures | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| exposed to noise levels that could       |                     | - Jana                           |
| exceed applicable criteria a result of   |                     |                                  |
| cumulative and Project-generated         |                     |                                  |
| traffic from SR 156, Union Road, and     |                     |                                  |
| San Juan Oaks Drive. Therefore.          |                     |                                  |
| under cumulative conditions. Project-    |                     |                                  |
| generated traffic on SR 156. Union       |                     |                                  |
| Road, and San Juan Oaks Drive            |                     |                                  |
| would have a significant and             |                     |                                  |
| unavoidable (Class I) impact on noise    |                     |                                  |
| levels at sensitive receptors along SR   |                     |                                  |
| 156 and Union Road, since mitigation     |                     |                                  |
| may not be feasible. [Threshold          |                     |                                  |
| numbers 1 and 3]                         |                     |                                  |
| PUBLIC SERVICES                          |                     |                                  |
| Impact PS-1 Implementation of the        | None required.      | Less than significant.           |
| proposed Project would result in a       |                     | 3                                |
| new service population that would        |                     |                                  |
| require police protection services       |                     |                                  |
| from the San Benito County Sheriff's     |                     |                                  |
| Department. This increase in service     |                     |                                  |
| population would require additional      |                     |                                  |
| police staff and vehicles in order to    |                     |                                  |
| maintain acceptable service levels.      |                     |                                  |
| However, the additional police           |                     |                                  |
| enforcement staff and equipment          |                     |                                  |
| required to serve the proposed           |                     |                                  |
| Project would not trigger the need to    |                     |                                  |
| construct new police facilities or       |                     |                                  |
| altered facilities. In addition, the     |                     |                                  |
| Project proposes to include a funding    |                     |                                  |
| mechanism which may be used to           |                     |                                  |
| pay for additional personnel, which      |                     |                                  |
| would be housed at existing facilities   |                     |                                  |
| (thus not triggering the need to         |                     |                                  |
| construct new or expand existing         |                     |                                  |
| facilities). Therefore, this is a Class  |                     |                                  |
| III, less than significant impact.       |                     |                                  |
| [Threshold number 1]                     |                     |                                  |
| Impact PS-2 Implementation of the        | None required.      | Less than significant.           |
| proposed Project would increase the      |                     |                                  |
| service population for the City of       |                     |                                  |
| Hollister Fire Department and the        |                     |                                  |
| American Medical Response (AMR),         |                     |                                  |
| creating a commensurate increase in      |                     |                                  |
| the demand for Fire Department           |                     |                                  |
| personnel and equipment. However,        |                     |                                  |
| the Project proposes to include a        |                     |                                  |
| funding mechanism which may be           |                     |                                  |
| used to pay for additional personnel,    |                     |                                  |
| which would be housed at existing        |                     |                                  |
| facilities (thus not triggering the need |                     |                                  |
| to construct new or expand existing      |                     |                                  |
| tacilities). In addition, the Project    |                     |                                  |
| applicants have incorporated into        |                     |                                  |
| their proposal an offer of dedication to |                     |                                  |

| Table ES-1  |    |
|---|----|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures | 5, |
| and Significance After Mitigation                     |    |

| lunnant                                 | Midimetian Measures | Significance After     |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|
| Impact                                  | Mitigation measures | Mitigation             |
| the County for an approximately two-    |                     |                        |
| acre site (consistent with the 2003     |                     |                        |
| project conditions of approval), as a   |                     |                        |
| potential future site for an additional |                     |                        |
| fire station or other public safety     |                     |                        |
| facility. Therefore, impacts related to |                     |                        |
| the protection are a Class III, less    |                     |                        |
| than significant impact. [Inreshold     |                     |                        |
| Impact PS-2 Implementation of the       | None required       | Loss than significant  |
| proposed Project would apporte ap       |                     | Less than significant. |
| estimated total of approximately 35     |                     |                        |
| elementary middle and high school       |                     |                        |
| students Students generated by the      |                     |                        |
| Project would attend either San Juan    |                     |                        |
| School or Anzar High School, neither    |                     |                        |
| of which would be required to operate   |                     |                        |
| above capacity as a result of the       |                     |                        |
| Project. Therefore, implementation of   |                     |                        |
| the proposed Project would not          |                     |                        |
| require construction of new or          |                     |                        |
| expanded educational facilities.        |                     |                        |
| Impacts to schools would be Class III,  |                     |                        |
| less than significant. [Threshold       |                     |                        |
| number 1]                               |                     |                        |
| Impact PS-4 Implementation of the       | None required.      | Less than significant. |
| Project would generate additional       |                     |                        |
| demand for parkland, and the Project    |                     |                        |
| would be required to adhere to the      |                     |                        |
| County's parkiand requirements          |                     |                        |
| including the development of the        |                     |                        |
| nequired park acreage and/or            |                     |                        |
| The Project would develop               |                     |                        |
| approximately 17 acres of public        |                     |                        |
| parkland in addition to trails and      |                     |                        |
| Class 2 bicycle lanes as well as        |                     |                        |
| private recreational facilities.        |                     |                        |
| Construction of new parkland may        |                     |                        |
| result in footprint impacts; however,   |                     |                        |
| those impacts have been evaluated       |                     |                        |
| as part of the proposed Project and     |                     |                        |
| are addressed throughout the            |                     |                        |
| applicable sections of this SEIR.       |                     |                        |
| Therefore, the Project would result in  |                     |                        |
| Class III, less than significant,       |                     |                        |
| impacts related to park demand and      |                     |                        |
| associated footprint impacts.           |                     |                        |
| [Ihreshold numbers 2 and 3]             |                     |                        |
| Impact PS-5 Implementation of the       | None required.      | Less than significant. |
| proposed Project would result in a      |                     |                        |
| new service population that may         |                     |                        |
| utilize the County library. However,    |                     |                        |
| would not trigger the need to           |                     |                        |
| construct new library facilities or     |                     |                        |
| construct new instary facilities of     |                     |                        |

| Table ES-1                                     |           |
|--|-----------|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation M | leasures, |
| and Significance After Mitigation              |           |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures  | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| altered library facilities. Therefore,<br>this is a Class III less than significant   |  |                                  |
| impact. [Threshold number 1]  |  |                                  |
| TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULAT   | ION  |                                  |
| Impact TRF-1 The proposed Project<br>would increase traffic levels at study<br>intersections under Existing plus<br>Project conditions and exceed<br>established measures of<br>effectiveness at four of the eleven<br>study area intersections. Mitigation is<br>required for three of the four<br>intersections, and would reduce<br>impacts to two intersections to a less<br>than significant level. However,<br>impacts at Union Road-Mitchell Road<br>and SR 156 (Intersection #5) would<br>remain Class I, <i>significant and</i><br><i>unavoidable</i> . [Threshold numbers 1 | <ul> <li>TRF-1(a) Union Road-Mitchell Road and SR 156<br/>(Intersection #5). Prior to issuance of each<br/>building permit, the applicant shall pay the<br/>applicable Regional Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee<br/>(TIMF) to the County of San Benito as a fair share<br/>contribution toward the SR 156 widening project.<br/>The TIMF for the SR-156 widening project has<br/>been calculated as part of the Transportation<br/>Impact Fee Nexus Study completed by the Council<br/>of San Benito County Governments (2011). Based<br/>upon this study, the applicable fee will be \$5,233<br/>per residential unit and \$3,395/1000 s.f. of<br/>commercial development within the Project Site.</li> <li>Monitoring: Compliance shall be monitored by</li> </ul>   | Significant and<br>unavoidable.  |
| and 2]  | <ul> <li>the County Planning Department.</li> <li>TRF-1(b) Union Road and San Juan Oaks Drive (Intersection #8). At such time when construction related traffic is anticipated to reach 158 vehicles trips (the MUTCD peak hour volume signal warrant for this intersection), the applicant shall install a signal at the intersection, which would accommodate efficient ingress and egress for construction-labor traffic, construction heavy vehicles, and operation-related traffic, both in the peak and off peak hours.</li> <li>Monitoring: Compliance shall be monitored by the County Planning Department.</li> <li>TRF-1(c) SR 25-Airline Highway and Union Road (Intersection #11). Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for the Project, the applicant shall add an eastbound right-turn lane from Union Road onto southbound Airline Highway (SR 25). However, this intersection falls under Caltrans</li> </ul> |                                  |
|   | jurisdiction and the County cannot control<br>issuance of the required permit. The applicant<br>shall commence design of the improvement<br>immediately following project approval and work<br>diligently in collaboration with Caltrans and the<br>County to obtain the permit required to authorize<br>construction of this improvement. This<br>improvement is included in the TIMF.<br><b>Monitoring:</b> Compliance shall be monitored by<br>the County Planning Department.<br><b>TRF-1(d)</b> Construction Traffic. At the start of<br>grading, the applicant shall have developed, in<br>close collaboration with the County Public Works  |                                  |

| Impact  | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
|   | Director, a Construction Management Plan that<br>would include industry, Caltrans (Caltrans<br>Standard Plans and 2014 MUTCD), and County<br>standards for managing construction traffic to and<br>from the site. Measures to manage construction<br>traffic could include warning signs per 2014                             |                                  |
|   | deliveries outside the AM and PM peak hours.<br>This Traffic Management Plan shall also include<br>the construction of a temporary signal or the<br>permanent signal in Mitigation Measure TRF-1(b)<br>at Intersection #8   |                                  |
| Impact TRF-2 Implementation of the<br>Project would add traffic to nearby<br>freeway segments under Existing plus<br>Project conditions. However, the<br>Project-added traffic would not<br>exceed established measures of<br>effectiveness by causing<br>unacceptable freeway segment levels<br>of service. Impacts would be Class III,<br><i>less than significant.</i> [Threshold<br>numbers 1 and 2]  | None required.  | Less than significant.           |
| Impact TRF-3 The proposed Project<br>would increase traffic levels at study<br>intersections under Background plus<br>Project conditions and would exceed<br>established measures of<br>effectiveness at four of the eleven<br>study area intersections. Mitigation is<br>required for three of the four<br>intersections, and would reduce<br>impacts to two intersections to a less<br>than significant level. However,<br>impacts at Union Road-Mitchell Road<br>and SR 156 (Intersection #5) would<br>remain Class I, <i>significant and<br/>unavoidable</i> . [Threshold numbers 1<br>and 2] | Mitigation Measures TRF-1(a) through TRF-1(c)<br>under Impact TRF-1 would be required.  | Significant and<br>unavoidable.  |
| Impact TRF-4 Implementation of the<br>Project would add traffic to nearby<br>freeway segments under Background<br>plus Project conditions. However, the<br>Project-added traffic would not<br>exceed established measures of<br>effectiveness by causing<br>unacceptable freeway segment levels<br>of service. Impacts would be Class III,<br><i>less than significant.</i> [Threshold<br>numbers 1 and 2]  | None required.  | Less than significant.           |
| Impact TRF-5 Implementation of the<br>Project would increase traffic levels at<br>study intersections under Cumulative<br>plus Project conditions and would<br>exceed established measures of<br>effectiveness at three of the eleven   | <b>TRF-5 Bixby Road and SR 156-San Juan Road</b><br>(Intersection #4). The applicant shall pay a fair<br>share contribution toward the cost of installing a<br>signal at this intersection. Because the Project<br>would contribute approximately 7 percent of the<br>traffic growth at this intersection, the Project's fair | Significant and unavoidable.     |

| Table ES-1   |
|--|
| Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, |
| and Significance After Mitigation                      |

| Impact   | Mitigation Measures   | Significance After<br>Mitigation |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| study area intersections. Impacts to<br>one of the intersections would be<br>mitigated to a less than significant<br>level. However, impacts at two<br>intersections would remain Class I,<br><i>significant and unavoidable.</i><br>[Threshold numbers 1 and 2]   | <ul> <li>share contribution is 7 percent of the total cost of the improvement.</li> <li>Plan Requirements and Timing: Prior to final map recordation, the applicant shall submit an agreement for provision of traffic mitigation fees, which will be a fair share payment of the cost of installing the signal. The fair share contribution shall be paid prior to Project occupancy.</li> <li>Monitoring: Compliance shall be monitored by</li> </ul> |                                  |
|  | the County Planning Department.   |                                  |
| UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS  |   | •                                |
| Impact U-1 Existing entitlements to<br>produce groundwater from the San<br>Juan Subbasin and the projected<br>ground water supply available from<br>the San Juan Subbasin would be<br>adequate to service both the Project's<br>individual demands as well as the<br>cumulative demand from the Project<br>and other past, present, and<br>reasonably foreseeable future uses in<br>the San Juan Subbasin. Impacts<br>related to groundwater supplies and<br>net aquifer volume would therefore be<br>Class III, less than significant.<br>[Thresholds number 2 and 3] | None required.  | Less than significant.           |
| Impact U-2 The proposed Project<br>would generate an estimated 0.16<br>million gallons of wastewater per day,<br>which could be accommodated within<br>the existing capacity of the City of<br>Hollister's Water Reclamation Facility.<br>Impacts would be Class III, less than<br>significant. [Thresholds number 4<br>through 6]   | None required.  | Less than significant.           |
| <b>Impact U-3</b> The amount of solid<br>waste that would be generated during<br>construction and operation of the<br>proposed Project would not exceed<br>the available capacity of the landfill<br>serving the site. Impacts would be<br>Class III, less than significant.<br>[Thresholds number 7 and 8]  | None required.  | Less than significant.           |

This page intentionally left blank.