



City of Salinas

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

65 W. Alisal Street, 2nd Floor • Salinas, California 93901
(831) 758-7387 • (831) 775-4258 (Fax) • www.ci.salinas.ca.us

1. BACKGROUND

Project Name: General Plan Amendment 2017-001 (GPA 2017-001) and Rezone 2017-002 (RZ 2017-002).

Project Location: 295 Sun Way in the P-F (Park – Flood Plain Overlay) Zoning District

Assessor Parcel Number: 003-212-017-000

☒ See Attached Vicinity Map

Current Land Use: Park (Privately-owned)

Surrounding Land Uses/Zoning Districts:

North: U.S. 101
South: Industrial Complex / IGC-F (Industrial-General Commercial – Flood Plan Overlay)
East: U.S. 101
West: Warehousing and Storage, Limited / IGC-F (Industrial-General Commercial – Flood Plan Overlay)

Lead Agency Contact Person: Bobby Latino, Associate Planner

Telephone: (831) 758-7206

Location and Existing Setting: City of Salinas/ Existing privately-owned Park.

Project Description: General Plan Amendment 2017-001 (GPA 2017-001) to change a 7.67-acre site from Park to General Commercial/Light Industrial and a Rezone 2017-002 (RZ 2017-002) to change a 7.67-acre site from Park to Industrial - General Commercial. Following the effective date of the General Plan Amendment and Rezone, subsequent development would be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| ☐ Aesthetics | ☐ Agricultural Resources | ☐ Air Quality |
| ☐ Biological Resources | ☒ Cultural Resources | ☐ Energy |
| ☐ Geology/Soils | ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality | ☐ Land Use/Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources |
| ☐ Noise | ☐ Population/Housing | ☐ Public Services |
| ☐ Recreation | ☒ Transportation | ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources |
| ☐ Utilities/Service Systems | ☐ Wildfire | ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance |

2. CHECKLIST

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
1. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, <i>would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, N1
(a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that area experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a-b) The site is in an urbanized area and is not adjacent to or near a scenic vista or a scenic highway.
- (c) The project does not include development at this time; therefore, the project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Future development would be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code, including the development and design standards, which will address any visual impacts.
- (d) No development is proposed with this project. However, any future development would be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code which would ensure that impacts due to light and glare are reduced to a level of insignificance.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, N1
(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?					
(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a-e) The site is located on an in-fill property within the P-F (Park – Flood Plain Overlay) Zoning District. Farming activities and forest land are not located on the site.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
3. AIR QUALITY. <i>Would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, A3 A7, B1, F1, F2
(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a) Considering the consistency with the 2012-2015 Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and the project's

- future construction and operational emissions, the project would not exceed MBARD's thresholds of significance and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Air quality impacts would be less than significant as assessed by Air Quality Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated September 19, 2019 (see attached, Exhibit "5") and confirmed by the City's contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit "10").
- (b) The average daily and annual operational emissions from the future construction would not exceed the MBARD operational thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Therefore, the future construction operational-related emission impact would be less than significant. This was assessed by Air Quality Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated September 19, 2019 (see attached, Exhibit "5") and confirmed by the City's contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit "10").
 - (c) Impacts from CO emissions and construction Health Risk Assessment (HRA) on nearby sensitive receptors would be less than significant. This was assessed by Air Quality Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated September 19, 2019 (see attached, Exhibit "5") and confirmed by the City's contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit "10").
 - (d) Future construction and operational-related activities could involve diesel-fueled construction equipment and trucks. Furthermore, VOC emissions would be generated during architectural coating and asphalt paving phases, which could be objectionable odors to some populations. However, such odorous emissions would disperse rapidly from the site and would be intermittent during future construction activities. Thus, it is highly unlikely that these intermittent odor sources would reach an objectionable level adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Future construction related odor impacts would be less than significant. This was assessed by Air Quality Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated September 19, 2019 (see attached, Exhibit "5") and confirmed by the City's contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit "10").

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the proposal result in impacts to:</i>					A1, A2, A3, A7, B2, M1, N1
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?					
(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a-d) As a result of the recurrent mowing of the project site no special-status species were observed and are not expected to be found on site. No significant impacts to special-status plants species is expected due to high levels of disturbance. Given the location of the site, adjacent to US 101 with high traffic volumes, and between existing warehouse and industrial uses, reduces the ability for most species to use the project site as a migratory corridor. No significant impacts to wildlife movement are expected as a result of existing barriers coupled with the lack of suitable habitat due to high levels of disturbance on the project site. Project does not conflict with any local polices, Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or any other habitat conservation plan. Biological Resources impacts of the project were assessed by a Biological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit “6”) and confirmed by the City’s contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit “10”).

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, B3, Q3
(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐	
(c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐	

Discussion

- (a) The subject site was not included in either of the City of Salinas 1989 or 2016 City Historic and Architectural Surveys.
- (b-c) Cultural Resources impacts were assessed by a Phase 1 Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit “7”) and confirmed by the City’s contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit “10”). However, there is always the potential to encounter subsurface materials during grading and construction. Therefore, pursuant to the Public Resources Code (Section 21083.2), in the event that cultural materials are encountered during grading/construction, all work shall cease until the find has been evaluated and mitigation measures put in place for the disposition and protection of any find. With this requirement, there is little potential for a significant impact on the environment.

On October 12, 2017, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, subd. (d), Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), and California Senate Bill 18 (SB18), City of Salinas staff sent via certified mail, a consultation request on the proposed project within 30-days of the date of the letter to all applicable California Native American Tribes whose geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation lands boundary includes the City of Salinas as specified by the Native American Heritage Foundation.

On December 18, 2017, the Ohlone /Costanoan-Esselen Nation (OCEN) provided a response letter stating concern with the proposed project site and recommending that an OCEN Tribal Monitor be located on-site during construction (see attached. Exhibit “12”). Per Mitigation Measure CU-1 below, pursuant to Public Resources Code (Section 21083.2), in the event that cultural materials are encountered during grading/construction in connection with development, all work shall cease until the find has been evaluated and mitigation measures put in place for the disposition and protection of any find. With mitigation measures, there is little potential for a significant impact on the cultural resources.

Mitigation

CU-1 In the event that cultural materials are encountered during grading/construction, all work shall cease until the find has been evaluated and mitigation measures put in place for the disposition and protection of any find pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
6. ENERGY. <i>Would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, G1
(a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

--	--	--	--	--	--

Discussion

- (a) The proposed project does not include development at this time. Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code. No permanent, long-term, or substantial energy consumption would occur during or as a result of the project. Therefore, impacts related to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources would be less than significant.
- (b) The City of Salinas is part of Monterey Bay Community Power Authority (MBCP), a regional Community Choice Energy project. MBCP was formed to provide locally-controlled, carbon-free electricity to residents and businesses in Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz counties (MBCP 2019). The goals of MBCP are to increase utilization of renewable power, create local and sustainable energy sources, and create green jobs.

The proposed project does not include development at this time. Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code. No permanent, long-term, or substantial energy consumption would occur during or as a result of the project. Due to the limited duration and scope of energy-consuming activity, substantial use of energy would not occur. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the goals of MBCP, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
7. GEOLOGY/SOILS. <i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i> (a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including	☒	☐	☐	☐	A1, A2, A3, A7, B3

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(iv) Landslides?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
risks to life or property?					
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐	

Discussion

- a (i-iv) All structures located in Salinas are required to be designed to at least Seismic Design Category D in accordance with Section 1613 of the 2010 California Building Code. As shown on the Seismic Hazards Map for the Greater Salinas Planning Area (Figure 5.10-1 of the Salinas General Plan Final EIR), the project site is located within the Moderately High Seismic Hazard Zone. Any future development on the site will be subject to the most recent, adopted edition of the California Building Code, and related Codes, as a part of the building permit process to ensure that adequate seismic design is provided.
- (b-d) No construction will occur with this project at this time; therefore, it will not induce substantial changes to the topography or to the soil conditions with a result of excavation or grading. Any future development would be subject to the most recent version of the California Building Code, and related Codes, as a part of the building permit process to ensure adequate seismic safety. The project site is currently developed and is basically flat.
- (e) The subject property is currently served by the City's sewer system. The proposed project would not involve the use of septic systems or alternative waste water disposal systems.
- (f) The proposed project does not include development. Paleontological Resources were assessed by a Phase 1 Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment

by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit “7”) and confirmed by the City’s contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit “10”) and no paleontological resources or unique geological features are evident on the subject property. However, pursuant to Public Resources Code (Section 21083.2), in the event that paleontological materials are encountered during grading/construction, all work shall cease until the find has been evaluated and mitigation measures put in place for the disposition and protection of any find. The proposed project is subject to all local, state, and federal laws relative to discovery of cultural resources during construction. With this requirement, there is little potential for a significant impact on the environment.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source <i>(Refer to Section 3: Source List)</i>
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. <i>Would the project:</i>					A1, A2, A3, A7, B4
(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a-b) The project's amortized construction and annual operational GHG emissions would not exceed the applicable threshold of significance. Thus, the project's future construction and operational GHG emissions would not result in a significant impact on climate change. The project is consistent with the applicable strategies and would not conflict with the recommendations of AB 32 in achieving a statewide

reduction in GHG emissions. The project would not conflict with Monterey County's adopted Municipal Climate Action Plan (MCAP) or the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted to reduce GHG emissions. Greenhouse Gas Emissions impacts were assessed a Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit "8") and confirmed by the City's contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit "10").

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
9. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. <i>Would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, A3, M1, N1
(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) Be located on a site which is					

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

(a-b) The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of materials. Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code. Compliance with local, state, and federal requirements would ensure that the hazards to the public are reduced to a level of insignificance.

(c) The site is composed of a vacant lot [(see also above discussion (a-b))].

Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code; therefore,

the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school is Mt. Toro High School (10 Sherwood Dr.), which is approximately 900 feet away (measured from parcel to parcel).

- (d) The site is not known to be included on a list of hazardous materials sites.
- (e) The site is not located within an airport land use plan area nor located within the Airport Area of Influence per Figure LU-11 of the Salinas General Plan. The site is located approximately 9,756 feet away (over a mile and half away) miles from the end of the runway (8-26) of the Salinas Municipal Airport and would not create a hazard to persons residing or working in the project area.
- (f) Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code. The project will not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- (g) Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code. The project will not expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, because the site is an infill property and no wildlands are located nearby.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, A6, A7, A8, A9
(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?					
(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would:					
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☒	☐	☐	☐	
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite:	☒	☐	☐	☐	
iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☒	☐	☐	☐	
iv. impede or redirect floor flows?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
sustainable groundwater management plans?					
(f) With regards to NPDES compliance:					
(i) Potential impact of project construction on storm water runoff?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(ii) Potential impact of project post-construction activity on storm water runoff?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(iii) Potential for discharge of storm water from material storage areas, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas or loading docks, or other outdoor work areas?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(iv) Potential for discharge of storm water to impair the beneficial uses of the receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefit?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(v) Potential for the discharge of storm water to cause significant harm on the biological integrity of the waterways and water bodies?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
(vi) Potential for significant changes in the flow velocity or volume of storm water runoff that can cause environmental harm?					
(vii) Potential for significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?					
(viii) Could this proposed project result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters? Consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and other typical Stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash).	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(ix) Could the proposed project result in a decrease in treatment and retention capacity for the site's Stormwater run-on?					
(x) Could the proposed project result in	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction?					
(xi) Could the proposed project result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased urban runoff?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xii) Could the proposed project create a significant adverse environmental impact to drainage patterns due to changes in urban runoff flow rates and/or volumes?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xiii) Could the proposed project result in increased erosion downstream?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xiv) Could the proposed project alter the natural ranges of sediment supply and transport to receiving waters?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xv) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the CWA Section 303(d) list? If so, can it result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xvi) Could the proposed project have a	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
potentially significant environmental impact on surface water quality, to either marine, fresh, or wetland waters?					
(xvii) Could the proposed project result in decreased baseflow quantities to receiving surface waterbodies?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xviii) Could the proposed project cause of contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xix) Does the proposed project adversely impact the hydrologic or water quality function of the 100-year floodplain area?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xx) Does the proposed project site layout adhere to the Permittee's waterbody setback requirements?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(xxi) Can the proposed project impact aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a) Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code.
- (b) Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code. Thus, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies and would not interfere substantially with the direction or rate of flow of groundwater.
- (c) The site is basically flat. Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code. There are no rivers or streams on or near the site.
- (d) The site is located within a 100-year flood area. Future development will be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is unlikely because the site is located a considerable distance from the ocean and is relatively flat thereby negating a potential mudflow.
- (e -f)(i – xxi) (see “a” above)

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, A3, M1,

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
(a) Physically divide an established community?	☒	☐	☐	☐	N1
(b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a) The proposed project does not have the potential to disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the community. Existing and planned adjacent uses will not be disrupted or divided as a result of the proposed project.
- (b) The proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment to change a 7.67 acre-site from Park to General Commercial/Light Industrial and a Rezone to change a 7.67 acre-site from Park to Industrial - General Commercial. Subsequent development would be subject to the City of Salinas Zoning Code including, but not limited to the development standards, design standards, and mitigation measure made a part of the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
12. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the proposal:</i>					A1, A2, A3

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

(a-b) The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
13. NOISE. <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>					A1, A2, A3, M1
(a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?					
(b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a) No substantial permanent, or temporary or periodic, increases in the ambient noise level are expected with the project. According to the General Plan Master Environmental Assessment Section 9.2, ambient noise is defined as the “all encompassing noise associated with a given environment, being a composite of sounds from many sources, near and far.”
- (b) The site is located within the 60 CNEL contour as shown on *Figure 5.3-1 Noise Contours (CNEL)* of the Salinas General Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, 2002. The Future Noise Contours as shown on Figure 5.3-4 of the Salinas General Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, 2002, shows the project site as located within the 70 CNEL contour. Traffic generates the main source of noise for the depicted 70 CNEL contour.

Groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels generated by any future development on the project site is not expected to be excessive. The Zoning Code Standards regarding noise are expected to reduce noise impacts to a level of

insignificance.

- (c) The site is located approximately 1.88 miles from the Salinas Municipal Airport and is located within the 55 CNEL contour as shown on *Figure 5.3-2: Salinas Airport Future Noise Contours*) of the Salinas General Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, 2002. Noise impacts from airport operations will not have an adverse impact on the site.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source <i>(Refer to Section 3: Source List)</i>
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the proposal:</i> (a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☒ ☒	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	A1, A2, A3, M1, N1

Discussion

- (a-b) The proposed project does not include a residential component. It will not induce substantial growth, and it will not displace housing units or people. The subject site is composed of an existing 7.67-acre vacant lot.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
15. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>					A1, A2, A7, A8, B5
(a) Fire protection?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Police protection?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Schools?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) Parks?	☐	☒	☐	☐	
(e) Other public facilities?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a-c) The proposed project is located on an existing vacant lot. Police and Fire services are currently available to serve the site. No schoolchildren will be generated by the project.
- (d-e) Although the General Plan identifies the site as a Park, the grounds are owned by a private corporation, which entered into a lease with the City of Salinas for the use as a Park. The lease (see attached City Council Resolution No. 19242) between the City of Salinas and the current property owner, Simas-East Market Street LLC, was terminated on November 4, 2018 (see attached Termination Letter

for Lease). Per Condition No. 6 of the lease, “upon termination of the lease agreement for any reason, Tenant agrees that it will cooperate in accomplishing a change of zoning of the leased premises to correspond with the zoning designation of other properties in the area in order to give the Leased Premises the highest market potential possible.” This General Plan Amendment and Rezone is in direct response to Condition No. 6 of the Lease; therefore, excluding this property further as a Park. No other government services are expected to be impacted by the proposed project.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source <i>(Refer to Section 3: Source List)</i>
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
16. RECREATION. <i>Would the proposal:</i> (a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☒ ☒	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	A1, A2, M1, N1

Discussion

- (a-b) The proposed project will not increase the use in park facilities because it does not include residential development. The proposed project includes the removal of a

recreational facilities, which will not have an adverse effect on the environment.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
17. TRANSPORTATION. <i>Would the project:</i>					A1, A2, A8, B5
(a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐	
(b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	
(c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐	
(d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a-c) Transportation impacts were assessed by a Traffic Impact Analysis by Mott McDonald, dated June 12, 2019 (see attached, Exhibit “9”) and confirmed by the City’s Traffic Engineer on June 25, 2019. Following the effective date of the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone, the site could be developed at a floor area ratio 0.40 maximum. For purposes of the Traffic Impact Analysis, 4 percent of the floor space (4,700 square feet) was assumed to be occupied by

support office space and this space was modeled as general office space. The remaining floor area (113,900 square feet) was modeled as light industrial space. Potentially significant impacts were identified at five different intersections.

- 1) Natividad Road / East Laurel Drive: This intersection would operate at a deficient LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours, unchanged from existing conditions. Specific development project at project site would add 16 AM peak hour and 17 PM peak hour trips to this intersection. The impact of a specific development project at project site to the intersection is significant because the specific development project at project site will add peak hour trips to the intersection that operates at a deficient level without the specific development project at project site as discussed below:
- 2) Sherwood Drive – Natividad Road / East Bernal Drive – La Posada Way: This intersection would operate at a deficient LOS E (AM) and F (PM), unchanged from existing conditions. A specific development project at project site would add 16 AM peak hour and 17 PM peak hour trips to this intersection. The impact of the specific development project at project site to the intersection is significant because the specific development project at project site will add peak hour trips to the intersection that operates at a deficient level without the specific development project at project site.
- 3) North Main Street (SR 183) / Rossi Street: This intersection, which is under Caltrans jurisdiction, would operate at a deficient LOS D during the PM peak hour, unchanged from existing conditions. A specific development project at project site would add 6 trips to this intersection during the PM peak hour and increase the PM peak hour delay by 0.1 seconds. The impact a specific development project at project site to the intersection is significant because the specific development project at project site will increase the average vehicle delay during the PM peak hour by at least 0.1 seconds.
- 4) Sun Street / East Market Street: Side-street operations at this intersection (the southbound Sun Street approach) would operate at a deficient LOS F during the PM peak hour, unchanged from existing conditions. A specific development project at project site would add 31 trips to this approach during the PM peak hour. The impact of a specific development project at project site to the intersection is significant because specific development project at project site will add peak hour trips to the intersection whose southbound approach operates at LOS F without the specific development project at project site.
- 5) U.S. 101 Southbound Offramp – Merced Street / East Market Street: This intersection would operate at a deficient LOS F during the PM peak hour, while side-street operations (the southbound US 101 Southbound Offramp approach) would operate at a deficient LOS F during the AM and PM peak

hours, unchanged from existing conditions. A specific development project at project site would add 30 AM peak hour and 27 PM peak hour trips to this intersection. The impact of specific development project at project site to the intersection is significant because the project will increase the average vehicle delay during the AM and PM peak hours by at least 0.1 seconds.

The mitigation measures for each intersection will mitigate the impacts to less than significant.

(d) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access.

Mitigation

TRANS-1 Add a third northbound lane and third southbound lane to Natividad Road through the Natividad Road / East Laurel Drive intersection. Intersection operations would improve during the AM and PM peak hours. To ensure that the intersection at Natividad Road / East Laurel Drive will operate at acceptable level of service, the Applicant shall pay the City of Salinas Traffic Impact Fees, which would represent the project's fair-share contribution of this improvement that is included in the City of Salinas TFO (Project 61).

TRANS-2 Convert the signal phasing on the east and west intersection of Sherwood Drive – Natividad Road / East Bernal Drive-La Posada Way approaches from concurrent phasing to split phasing. Intersection operations would improve during the AM and PM peak hour to LOS D. To ensure that the intersection of Sherwood Drive – Natividad Road / East Bernal Drive-La Posada Way will operate at acceptable levels of service, the applicant shall either:

(1) Prior to the City's issuance of the first grading permit for a specific development project at project site, pay a traffic impact fee provided the City has updated its Traffic Improvement Program and Traffic Fee Ordinance to include the signal modifications at this intersection as one of the improvements that is funded by the TFO, or

(2) if the signal modifications at this intersection have not been included in the TFO, the applicant shall be responsible for either:

(a) Funding the improvements and obtaining the requisite encroachment or other permits for modifying the signal phasing and ensuring that the signal modification is in operation prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for a specific development project at the project site, or

(b) Concurrent with the issuance of the first grading permit for a specific development project at project site, depositing funds with the City in order

for the City to obtain the requisite permits and modifying the signal phasing ensuring that the signal modification is operational prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for a specific development project at the project site.

TRANS-3 Add a third northbound lane and third southbound lane on North Main Street through the North Main Street / Rossi Street intersection. Intersection operations would improve during the PM peak hour to LOS C. To ensure that the intersection at North Main Street / Rossi Street will operate at acceptable level of service, the Applicant shall pay the City of Salinas Traffic Impact Fees, which would represent the project's fair-share contribution of this improvement that is included in the City of Salinas TFO (Project 31).

TRANS-4 Signalize the intersection of Sun Street and East Market Street. The intersection would operate at LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours with signalization. To ensure that the intersection of Sun Street and East Market Street will operate at acceptable levels of service, the applicant shall be responsible for either:

(a) Funding the improvements and obtaining the requisite encroachment or other permits for installation of a traffic signal and ensure that the signal is in operation prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for a specific development project at the project site, or

(b) Concurrent with the issuance of the first grading permit for a specific development project at project site, depositing funds with the City in order for the City to obtaining the requisite permits for, and installation of, a traffic signal that will be operational prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for a specific development project at the project site.

TRANS-5 Signalize the intersection. Intersection operations would improve during the AM and PM peak hours to LOS B. To ensure that the intersection of U.S. 101 Southbound Offramp – Merced Street/East Market Street will operate at acceptable levels of service, the applicant shall either:

(1) Prior to the City's issuance of the first grading permit for a specific development project at project site, pay a traffic impact fee provided the City has updated its Traffic Improvement Program and Traffic Fee Ordinance to include a traffic signal at this intersection as one of the improvements that is funded by the TFO, or

(2) if the traffic signal at this intersection has not been included in the TFO, the applicant shall be responsible for either:

(a) Funding the improvements and obtaining the requisite encroachment or other permits for installation of a traffic signal and ensure that the signal is in operation prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for a specific development project at the project site, or

(b) Concurrent with the issuance of the first grading permit for a specific development project at project site, depositing funds with the City in order for the City to obtain the requisite permits and install the traffic signal ensuring that the signal is operational prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for a specific development project at the project site.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i> (a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a Californian Native American tribe, and that is: i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public	☒	☐	☐	☐	A5, A6, A7, B3, Q3

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or ii. A resource determined by the Lead Agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 In applying the criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code 5024.1, the Lead Agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☒	☐	

- (a)(i) The subject site was not included in either of the City of Salinas 1989 or 2016 City Historic and Architectural Surveys.
- (a)(ii) Cultural Resources impacts were assessed by a Phase 1 Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit “7”) and confirmed by the City’s contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants, Inc., dated October 23, 2018 (see attached, Exhibit “10”). However, there is always the potential to encounter subsurface materials during grading and construction. Therefore, pursuant to the Public Resources Code (Section 21083.2), in the event that cultural materials are encountered during grading/construction, all work shall cease until the find has been evaluated and mitigation measures put in place for the disposition and protection of any find. With mitigation measures, there is little potential for a significant impact on the environment.

On October 12, 2017, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, subd. (d), Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), and California Senate Bill 18 (SB18), City of Salinas staff sent via certified mail, a consultation request on the proposed project within 30-days of the date of the letter to all applicable California Native American Tribes whose geographic area of traditional and cultural affiliation lands boundary includes the City of Salinas as specified by the Native American Heritage Foundation.

On December 18, 2017, the Ohlone /Costanoan-Esselen Nation (OCEN) provided a response letter stating concern with the proposed project site and recommending that an OCEN Tribal Monitor be located on-site during construction (see attached, Exhibit “12”). Per Mitigation Measure TCR-1 below, pursuant to Public Resources Code (Section 21083.2), in the event that cultural materials are encountered during grading/construction in connection with development, all work shall cease until the find has been evaluated and mitigation measures put in place for the disposition and protection of any find. With mitigation measures, there is little potential for a significant impact on cultural resources.

Mitigation

TCR-1 In the event that cultural materials are encountered during grading/construction in, all work shall cease until the find has been evaluated and mitigation measures put in place for the disposition and protection of any find pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2.

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
19. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i> (a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause	☒	☐	☐	☐	A1, A2, M1, N1

Issue	Impact				Source (Refer to Section 3: Source List)
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
significant environmental effect?					
(b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has the adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or Local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impact the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Discussion

- (a) Salinas is an urbanized area and utilities are available to serve the site.
- (b-c) The proposed project is not expected to involve a heavy usage of water and therefore does not discharge significant quantities of water into the wastewater treatment plant (also see Hydrology and Water Quality above).

- (d-e) The proposed project is not expected to generate significant solid waste. Disposal of waste generated by the project is not expected to be significant. Subsequent development will be required to comply with federal, state, and local reduction statutes related to solid waste.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Issue	Impact				Source <i>(Refer to Section 3: Source List)</i>
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
20. WILDFIRE. <i>If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>					A1, A2, M1, N1
(a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☒	☐	☐	☐	
(d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream	☒	☐	☐	☐	

Issue	Impact				Source <i>(Refer to Section 3: Source List)</i>
	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	
flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?					

Discussion

- (a-d) The City of Salinas is not located in or near State responsible areas or lands classified at very high fire hazard severity zones.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Mandatory Findings of Significance	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Potentially Significant Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☒	☐	☐	☐
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☒	☐	☐	☐

3. SOURCE LIST

Source	Source Number
City of Salinas:	
<i>Salinas General Plan, 2002.</i>	A1
<i>Salinas General Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report, 2002.</i>	A2
<i>Salinas Zoning Code: ☒ Entire Code Section: _____</i>	A3
<i>City of Salinas Stormwater Ordinance, dated March 2013</i>	A4
<i>1989 City Historical and Architectural Survey</i>	A5
<i>2016 City Historical and Architectural Survey</i>	A6
<i>Contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants Inc. of the Air Quality Impact Analysis, Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, Biological Resources Assessment, and Phase 1 Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated October 23, 2018</i>	A7
<i>City of Salinas Traffic Improvement Program, dated March 2010</i>	A8
Applicant:	
<i>Air Quality Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018</i>	B1
<i>Biological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018</i>	B2
<i>Phase 1 Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018</i>	B3
<i>Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018</i>	B4
<i>Traffic Impact Analysis by Mott McDonald, dated June 12, 2019</i>	B5
Monterey Bay Air Resources District:	

Source	Source Number
<i>CEQA Air Quality Guidelines prepared by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District, dated February 2008</i>	F1
<i>Monterey Bay Air Resources District. 2012-2015 Air Quality Management Plan, dated March 2017</i>	F2
Monterey Bay Community Power Authority:	
<i>Monterey Bay Community Power Authority Implementation Plan, August 2017</i>	G1
Field Inspections:	
<i>By City staff, various dates</i>	M1
Maps/Aerial Photography:	
<i>City's aerial photographs, 2007.</i>	N1
Other:	
<i>Native American Heritage Commission</i>	Q3

4. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this Initial Study:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect:
 - (a) Has been adequately analyzed in (*Reference document*) pursuant to applicable legal standards; and

- (b) Has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described in *Section 2: Checklist*, if the effect is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a Negative Declaration: "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated".

An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects:

- (a) Have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and;
- (b) Have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

NOTHING FURTHER IS REQUIRED.

Prepared by: Bobby Latino

Dated: September 25, 2019

Courtney Grossman
Planning Manager

Attachments:

1. Vicinity Map
2. General Plan Amendment and Rezone – Site Plan
3. City Council Resolution No. 19242 (Expo Site Lease Agreement)
4. Termination Letter for Expo Site Lease Agreement, dated January 14, 2019
5. Air Quality Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated September 19, 2019
6. Biological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018
7. Phase 1 Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018
8. Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis by First Carbon Solutions, dated August 17, 2018
9. Traffic Impact Analysis by Mott McDonald, dated June 12, 2019
10. Contracted Peer Review by Rincon Consultants Inc. of the Air Quality Impact Analysis, Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis, Biological Resources Assessment, and Phase 1 Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment by First Carbon Solutions, dated October 23, 2018
11. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
12. Letter from Ohlone/Costanoan-Esselen Nation (OCEN), dated December 17, 2018