ATTACHMENT 20

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SALINAS FOR THE WEST AREA SPECIFIC PLAN

I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Salinas (hereinafter "City"), as lead agency, prepared a Program Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") for the West Area Specific Plan (hereinafter "Specific Plan" or "project"). In its entirety, the EIR consists of the February 27, 2019 Draft Program EIR (hereinafter "Draft EIR" or "DEIR") and the October 10, 2019 Final Program EIR (hereinafter "Final EIR" or "FEIR") (State Clearinghouse No. 2006021072).

The Applicant has submitted applications requesting approval of the West Area Specific Plan, Rezoning, and Development Agreement. As approved, the project will facilitate the City's future consideration of applications for individual projects to be proposed within the Specific Plan Area.

The EIR analyzes the impacts of the West Area Specific Plan and the anticipated subsequent filing of maps and other development applications in the future. Therefore, the EIR analyzes the total impacts of the West Area Specific Plan, including these applications yet unfiled, so that future filings will not require separate environmental analysis, as long as development proposed does not substantially deviate from the approved Specific Plan. The specific processes by which the City will review individual applications are set forth on pages ES-1 through pages ES-4 of the Draft EIR and are also described below in section III(D).

These findings, as well as the accompanying statement of overriding considerations in Section XI below, have been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (hereinafter "CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq) and its implementing guidelines (hereinafter "CEQA Guidelines") (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15000 et seq).

II. DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS

Like the EIR itself, these findings use a number of acronyms. Key acronyms are defined the first time they are introduced in the text of this document.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Location

As described in the DEIR, the City of Salinas is located in northern Monterey County, within the Salinas Valley between the Gabilan and Santa Lucia mountain ranges. Salinas is situated approximately 20 miles northeast of the City of Monterey, 60 miles south of San Jose, 100 miles south of San Francisco and 325 miles north of Los Angeles. Figure 2-1 in the Draft EIR displays the project regional location. Several regional transportation routes are located within or near Salinas, including U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101), State Routes 68 (SR 68) and 183 (SR 183), the

Union Pacific Railroad line and the Monterey Regional Airport in Monterey. Salinas Municipal Airport, a general aviation facility, is located in the southeastern portion of the city.

The Specific Plan Area is located within the incorporated boundary of the City of Salinas. It is bounded by San Juan Grade Road on the west, East Boronda Road (also referred to as "Boronda Road") on the south, Natividad Road on the east, and Rogge Road and the future extension of Russell Road on the north. Gabilan Creek is located east of the Specific Plan Area, while U.S. 101 and North Main Street are located to the west. Unincorporated land under the jurisdiction of the County of Monterey abuts the Specific Plan Area on the north and northeast (DEIR, p. 2.0-1).

B. Overview

The West Area Specific Plan establishes the land use planning and regulatory guidance, including the land use and zoning designations and policies, development regulations, and design standards, for the approximately 797-acre Specific Plan Area. The Specific Plan will serve as a bridge between the Salinas General Plan and individual development applications in the Specific Plan Area, applying—and adding greater specificity to—the goals, policies and concepts of the General Plan for that area. The Specific Plan provides a complete blueprint for development of the Specific Plan Area, including:

- A description of proposed land uses,
- Policies, regulations and standards to support the Specific Plan,
- Infrastructure needed to support the Specific Plan, and
- Implementation and administrative processes needed for plan development.

The Specific Plan has been crafted to be consistent with overall community goals as expressed in the City of Salinas General Plan, as well as more specific policies and implementation measures contained in other documents. The City of Salinas Zoning Code requirements will apply to development applications and property within the Specific Plan Area unless specifically superseded by the development regulations or design standards contained in the Specific Plan.

The underlying purpose of the project is the approval and subsequent implementation of the West Area Specific Plan (including the Specific Plan's goals) and related entitlements. Land uses in the approximate 797-acre Specific Plan Area include residential, mixed use commercial, community park, neighborhood parks, small parks, schools and open space (including supplemental storm water detention/retention basins). Implementation will involve development of the site under the New Urbanism Zoning Districts of Neighborhood Edge (NE)/Low Density Residential, Neighborhood General 1 (NG-1)/Medium Density Residential, Neighborhood General 2 (NG-2)/High Density Residential, Village Center (VC) as well as the Public and Semipublic (PS), Parks (P), and Open Space (OS) Zoning Districts.

The quantifiable objectives of the project include the development of up to 4,340 residential dwelling units (with a minimum of 3,553 required under the General Plan), up to 571,500 square feet of commercial/mixed use building area, and up to 177 acres of public facilities (including three elementary schools, a high school, a middle school, open space areas (including supplemental storm water detention/retention basins) and 11 parks). It is anticipated that the Specific Plan Area will house up to 15,928 residents at project build-out.

C. Project Objectives

The underlying purpose of the project is the approval and subsequent implementation of the West Area Specific Plan and related entitlements. The quantifiable objectives of the project include the development of up to 4,340 residential dwelling units (with a minimum of 3,553 required under the General Plan), up to 571,500 square feet of commercial/mixed use building area, and up to 177 acres of public facilities (including three elementary schools, a high school, a middle school, open space (including supplemental detention/retention basins) and 11 parks. The Specific Plan goals are summarized as follows:

- Create a community with a compact form that promotes sustainable neighborhood design and is pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly.
- Provide a variety of land uses in easy walking distance of housing including a mixed use village, parks, and schools to reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Provide parks and other public green space in accordance with General Plan standards that are designed to be safe and easily accessible to residents.
- Provide a variety of low density, medium density, and high density housing to provide a variety of housing options for residents at various life stages.
- Provide public services and infrastructure improvements that achieve and maintain City service standards.
- Provide an inviting tree-lined street system which incorporates traffic calming and other measures.
- Establish an interconnected sidewalk/path and open space system throughout the development which links to the greater Future Growth Area (FGA) and City as a whole.
- Create a sense of place and unique identity through the use of entry treatments, landscaping, streetscapes, public art, decorative street lighting, pedestrian amenities and other elements.
- Provide for a reasonable jobs/housing balance.
- Provide opportunities for senior housing.
- Provide for a site/parcel-based post-construction Stormwater Control Measures (SCMs)/LID to the maximum extent practicable.

It is noted that there are additional project objectives that are not specifically presented in the Specific Plan, but are more overarching and are a response to, and driven by, the policy direction from the State Legislature and the Salinas City Council.

The State Legislature has declared that "California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions. The consequences of failing to effectively and aggressively confront this crisis are hurting millions of Californians, robbing future generations of the chance to call California home, stifling economic opportunities for workers and businesses, worsening poverty and homelessness, and undermining the state's environmental and climate objectives." (Government Code section 65589.5.) The Legislature notes that "California housing has become the most expensive in the nation. The excessive cost of the state's housing supply is partially caused by activities and policies of many local governments that limit the approval of housing, increase the cost of land for housing, and require that high fees and exactions be paid by

producers of housing." The Legislature further found that "Among the consequences of those actions are discrimination against low-income and minority households, lack of housing to support employment growth, imbalance in jobs and housing, reduced mobility, urban sprawl, excessive commuting, and air quality deterioration." The legislative intent of Government Code section 65589.5 is to "significantly increase the approval and construction of new housing for all economic segments of California's communities by meaningfully and effectively curbing the capability of local governments to deny, reduce the density for, or render infeasible housing development projects and emergency shelters. That intent has not been fulfilled." The State Legislature established its policy direction in the statute as follows: "It is the policy of the state that this section should be interpreted and implemented in a manner to afford the fullest possible weight to the interest of, and the approval and provision of, housing."

The City of Salinas has recognized the need for additional housing supply for its citizens for many decades. Dating back to 1986, the City entered into the Boronda Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the County of Monterey to preserve the best agricultural land and to provide certain areas for future urban growth. Twenty years later, in 2006, the Greater Salinas Area MOU was adopted to preserve agricultural lands within Monterey County, and to provide future growth areas (FGSs) for Salinas. A year later, in 2007, applications for an amendment to the City's Sphere of Influence (to include the FGAs) and Pre-Zoning and Annexation (for the majority of the North of Boronda FGA consisting of approximately 2,400 acres) were submitted to the Monterey County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for consideration. A Supplemental EIR for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR (SCH#2007031055) was also submitted in conjunction with the applications. The applications were approved by LAFCO on May 19, 2008. The North of Boronda FGA (which includes the West Area Specific Plan) was formally annexed to the incorporated City of Salinas on September 8, 2008 and zoned New Urbanism Interim (NI) with a Specific Plan Overlay. The West Area Specific Plan is a reflection of over twenty years of planning for new development, which is reflected by the City Council's approval of the FGA, including annexation of the land into the City limits.

The following two overarching project objectives are presented here as a response to: 1) the State Legislature's declaration of a housing crisis in California, 2) the State Legislature's policy direction for the provision of more housing, 3) the Salinas City Council's more than 30 years of planning for urban development within the FGAs, which includes the West Area Specific Plan, and 4) the Salinas City Council's policy direction as provided in the approved FGAs and General Plan:

- Objective 1: Respond to the State Legislature's declaration of a housing crisis in California, and their policy direction that local governmental agencies provide more housing, by including provisions for the construction of new housing supply within the West Area Specific Plan.
- Objective 2: Respond to the Salinas City Council's long-term vision and policy direction for new urban development to be focused in the Future Growth Areas, by including provisions the construction of new urban development consistent with the City of Salinas General Plan.

Based on its own review of the EIR and other information and testimony received in connection with the project, as well as the statutory and planning policies described above, the City Council finds all of these objectives to be acceptable and persuasive from a public policy standpoint. In

choosing to approve the project, the City thus embraces these objectives and accords them weight in considering the feasibility of alternatives set forth in the EIR, and in invoking overriding considerations in approving the project. (See *Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1507-1508.)

D. Discretionary Approvals

Project approval requires the City, as lead agency, to take discrete planning and regulatory actions to approve the overall project. In addition, certain "responsible agencies" may ultimately rely in part on the programmatic analysis in the Specific Plan Area in making decisions associated with future site-specific projects consistent with the Specific Plan. Described below are the discretionary actions necessary to carry out the project.

City of Salinas

In addition to certifying the Final EIR and adopting these Findings and the associated Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (CEQA requirements), the City itself must approve the following actions:

- Certification of the EIR and adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- Approval of the Draft West Area Specific Plan;
- Approval of the rezoning of the Specific Plan area from NI with a Specific Plan Overlay to NE/Low Density Residential, NG-1/Medium Density Residential, NG-2/High Density Residential, VC, PS, P and OS. A Specific Plan Overlay is also applicable to each Zoning District; and
- Approval of the Development Agreement;
- Subsequent Approvals: Parcel Maps, tentative maps, Final Maps, Subdivision Improvement Plans, Site Improvement Plans, Grading Permits, Building Permits, Conditional Use Permits, Business Permits, Encroachment Permits, etc.

Other Responsible/Trustee Agencies

The agencies below will also use the EIR, either as responsible agencies or as trustee agencies:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife – Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600 permit);
- Cal Water – Approval of SB 610 Water Supply Assessment, Approval to serve the Specific Plan Area;
- Central Coast Region - Regional Water Quality Control Board – Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general construction permit;
- Comcast/AT&T/SBC/Other – Approval to serve the Specific Plan Area, approval of telecommunications utility plans, Encroachment Permits;
- Johnson Canyon Landfill – Approval to serve the Specific Plan Area;
- Monterey Bay Air Resources District – Authority to Construct; Demolition permit;

- Monterey Bay Community Power – Approval to Serve the Specific Plan Area;
- Monterey One Water – Approval to serve the Specific Plan Area for wastewater services, and Encroachment Permit;
- Monterey County Health Department - Well demolition permit, Well construction permit;
- Monterey County Water Resources Agency – Approval to serve the Specific Plan Area, Encroachment Permit;
- Monterey-Salinas Transit – Approval to serve the Specific Plan Area, approval of bus stop locations and design;
- Pacific Gas and Electric Company – Approval to serve Specific Plan Area, approval of relocation plans, approval of electric and gas utility plans, Encroachment Permit;
- Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority – Approval to serve the Specific Plan Area; and
- Santa Rita Union School District – Approval of site for the construction of two new elementary schools and one middle school

Federal Agencies

The following federal agencies also have approval authority over some aspects of the project, though these agencies are not subject to CEQA and instead are required to comply with the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.):

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and
- U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Future Projects

All individual future development projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area will be reviewed to determine their individual CEQA compliance requirements. The type of CEQA analysis required would be determined at the time a project is proposed.

It is noted that the Specific Plan provides a very high level of design detail for certain components of the project. To the extent that sufficient detail is available in the Specific Plan, a full project-level analysis is provided in this EIR. Examples of a full project level analysis would include topics that are related to the physical acreage affected (i.e., the project footprint), as opposed to the number of units, land uses/zoning, or other design parameters. Topics such as Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hydrology/Water Quality are analyzed at a project-level analysis in this EIR given that these are physical environmental resources, and the area of impact is fully defined. Additionally, the Specific Plan includes a substantial level of detailed information that allows for a project-level analysis of topics such as Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change, Noise, Population and Housing, Transportation and Circulation, and Utilities. The analysis for these topics is driven by the number of units and square footage of development, which is detailed in the land use design and development projections. In some cases, there may be specific commercial uses that have design details developed at a later date that cannot reasonably be analyzed at a project-level at this time. Additionally, the design of the school facilities and other public facilities are not known at this time, so they are not able to be analyzed at a project-level.

This EIR examines the planning, construction and operation of the project. The program-level approach, with some project-level analysis, is appropriate for the project because it allows comprehensive consideration of the reasonably anticipated scope of the development plan; however, as discussed above, not all design aspects of the future development phases are known at this stage in the planning process. Subsequent individual development that requires further discretionary approvals will be examined in light of this EIR to determine whether additional environmental documentation must be prepared.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 states that a program EIR is an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

1. Geographically,
2. As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions,
3. In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or
4. As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.

According to CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (c)(5), "[a] program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with later activities if it provides a description of planned activities that would implement the program and deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible." Later environmental documents (EIRs, mitigated negative declarations, or negative declarations) can incorporate by reference materials from the program EIR regarding regional influences, secondary impacts, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d][2]). These later documents need only focus on new impacts that have not been considered before (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d][3]).

Section 15168(c), entitled "Use with Later Activities," provides, in pertinent part, as follows:
Subsequent activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared:

1. If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration. That later analysis may tier from the program EIR as provided in Section 15152.
2. If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no subsequent EIR would be required, the agency can approve the activities as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required. Whether a later activity is within the scope of a program EIR is a factual question that the lead agency determines based on substantial evidence in the record. Factors that an agency may consider in making that determination include, but are not limited to, consistency of the later activity with the type of allowable land use, overall planned density and building intensity, geographic area analyzed for environmental impacts, and covered infrastructure, as described in the program EIR.

3. An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into later activities in the program.
4. Where the later activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were within the scope of the program EIR.

Here, the City anticipates preparing a written checklist or similar device whenever landowners within the Specific Plan area submit applications for site-specific approvals (i.e. tentative maps, conditional use permits, or other discretionary entitlements). The checklist would serve in part as a consistency checklist to determine if the application for site specific approval is consistent with the General Plan, Specific Plan, Conditions of Approval, and Mitigation Measures, and it would also include a review of the project details relative to what was anticipated and analyzed in the program EIR (i.e., whether there are new environmental effects that were not covered by the program EIR). The City's expectation, at least at present, is that the checklist will conclude that most, or all, components of the Specific Plan can be developed with no new analysis of environmental effects given that there is a high level of resolution with regard to the project details that have been analysis in this program EIR. In some cases, however, a site-specific application (i.e., a proposed commercial use) may have specific issues associated with the project, or business, that this program EIR could not anticipate given the information that was available at this time. In those situations, the detailed site-specific information from that application could have site-specific effects not wholly anticipated in this EIR and would require some additional environmental review. (See also CEQA Guidelines section 15063, subd. (b)(1)(C).)

Future site-specific approvals may also be narrowed pursuant to the rules for tiering set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15152. "'[T]iering is a process by which agencies can adopt programs, plans, policies, or ordinances with EIRs focusing on 'the big picture,' and can then use streamlined CEQA review for individual projects that are consistent with such…[first tier decisions] and are…consistent with local agencies' governing general plans and zoning.'" (*Koster v. County of San Joaquin* (1996) 47 Cal.App.4th 29, 36.) Section 15152 provides that, where a first-tier EIR has "adequately addressed" the subject of cumulative impacts, such impacts need not be revisited in second- and third-tier documents. Furthermore, second- and third-tier documents may limit the examination of impacts to those that "were not examined as significant effects" in the prior EIR or "[a]re susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means." In general, significant environmental effects have been "adequately addressed" if the lead agency determines that:

a. they have been mitigated or avoided as a result of the prior environmental impact report and findings adopted in connection with that prior environmental impact report; or
b. they have been examined at a sufficient level of detail in the prior environmental impact report to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the later project.

Here, as noted above, the City anticipates preparing a written checklist or similar device whenever landowners within the Specific Plan area submit applications for site-specific approvals (i.e., tentative maps, conditional use permits, or other discretionary entitlements). The checklist would serve in part as a consistency checklist to determine if the application for site specific approval is consistent with the General Plan, Specific Plan, Conditions of Approval, and Mitigation Measures, and it would also include a review of the project details relative to what was anticipated and analyzed in the program EIR (i.e., whether all significant environmental impacts identified have been "adequately addressed" in the program EIR). Thus, if a new analysis is required for these site-specific actions, it would focus on impacts that cannot be "avoided or mitigated" by mitigation measures that either (i) were adopted in connection with the Specific Plan or (ii) were formulated based on information in this EIR.

In addition, because the EIR addresses the effects of rezoning the land within the proposed Specific Plan area, future environmental review can also be streamlined pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.3 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. These provisions, which are similar but not identical to the tiering provisions, generally limit the scope of necessary environmental review for site-specific approvals following the preparation of an EIR for a "zoning action." For such site-specific approvals, CEQA generally applies only to impacts that are "peculiar to the parcel or to the project" and have not been previously disclosed, except where "substantial new information" shows that previously identified impacts would be more significant than previously assumed. Notably, impacts are considered not to be "peculiar to the parcel or to the project" if they can be substantially mitigated pursuant to previously adopted, uniformly applied development policies or standards. As noted above, the City anticipates that, in assessing the extent to which the Specific Plan EIR has previously addressed significant impacts that might occur with individual projects, the City may conclude that in some instances (e.g., with respect to agricultural resources, cultural resources, geology, soils, and paleontological resources), no further analysis beyond that found in the program EIR will be necessary.

Finally, for purely residential projects consistent with the Specific Plan, the City intends to preserve its ability to treat such projects as exempt from CEQA pursuant to Government Code section 65457. Subdivision (a) of that statute provides that "[a]ny residential development project, including any subdivision, or any zoning change that is undertaken to implement and is consistent with a specific plan for which an [EIR] has been certified after January 1, 1980, is exempt from the requirements of [CEQA]." The statutes go on to say, moreover, that "if after adoption of the specific plan, an event as specified in Section 21166 of the Public Resources Code occurs, the exemption provided by this subdivision does not apply unless and until a supplemental [EIR] for the specific plan is prepared and certified in accordance with the provisions of [CEQA]. After a supplemental [EIR] is certified, the exemption … applies to projects undertaken pursuant to the specific plan." (See also CEQA Guidelines section 15182.)

When purely residential projects are proposed, the City will consider whether they qualify for this exemption or whether the West Area Specific Plan EIR must be updated through a supplement to this EIR or a subsequent EIR as required by Public Resources Code section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15163.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The Notice of Preparation (hereinafter "NOP") of an EIR was circulated for public review and comment from October 15, 2015 to November 13, 2015 in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15082. Written responses to the NOP were received from the following interests/agencies:

1. Northern Salinas Valley Mosquito Abetment District (October 21, 2015)
2. California Department of Transportation (October 28, 2015)
3. Monterey-Salinas Transit (November 16, 2015)
4. Monterey County Resource Management Agency (November 16, 2015)
5. California Natural Resource Agency Division of Land Resource Protection (November 10, 2015)
6. Salinas Union High School District (November 10, 2015)
7. Ohlone/Costanoan-Esselen Nation (January 11, 2016)
8. Santa Rita Union School District (January 29, 2016)
9. Transportation Agency of Monterey County (March 31, 2016)

As part of the early consultation process and pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines section 15083 regarding early public consultation, a scoping meeting was held at the City of Salinas Rotunda (City Council chamber) on October 29, 2015. No specific comments were made about the scope of issues to be addressed in the EIR. Questions and comments were primarily focused on the project description and the project consideration process.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines sections 15023, subdivision (c), and 15087, subdivision (f), the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research was responsible for distributing environmental documents to State agencies, departments, boards, and commissions for review and comment. The City followed required procedures with regard to distribution of the appropriate notices and environmental documents to the State Clearinghouse. The State Clearinghouse was obligated to make, and did make, that information available to interested agencies for review and comment. The NOP was received by the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2006021072) and a 30-day public review period ended on November 13, 2015. The NOP and all comments received on the NOP are presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

An Initial Study was also prepared for the project. Included below is a brief summary of findings from the Initial Study on environmental topics that were either found to have no impact or be less than significant, or were found to be sufficiently addressed in the General Plan EIR, and thus are not included within individual sections of the Draft EIR. For full Initial Study Findings and individual topics found to be less than significant through the Initial Study process refer to Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

- **Aesthetics:** The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) noted that General Plan buildout would allow development to occur in the City in both vacant and underdeveloped portions of the community, and that the introduction/expansion of urban uses into these areas has the potential to interrupt views of natural features, open space, the hillsides, and agricultural resources, reducing

the aesthetic value of these resources. Additionally, new development in the City was found to increase the amount of light and glare in the community, particularly in areas planned for nonresidential development, such as retail and general commercial. It was also found that future development under the General Plan has the potential to change the visual character of the City.

To minimize and mitigate the impacts on aesthetics, the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) presented the following five mitigation measures: Mitigation Measure A1 requires the City to implement the City's Gateway Guidelines; Mitigation Measure A2 requires the City to strengthen and require compliance with the City's Design Guidelines; Mitigation Measure A3 requires the City to improve the Lighting Ordinance; Mitigation Measure A4 requires the City to implement landscaping requirements for all proposed projects; and Mitigation Measure A5 requires the City to review all discretionary projects for aesthetics impacts. The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) concluded that with the implementation of Mitigation Measures A1 through A5, the potential citywide aesthetics impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Subsequently, the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) indicated that aesthetic impacts associated with the FGAs, which includes the West Area Specific Plan, would not be different from those discussed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002). Any future development under the approved General Plan, which includes all development under the project, would be required to comply with the above referenced regulations, policies, and standards. Implementation of the project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed in the in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) and *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007). This topic did not warrant additional analysis and was not addressed further in the EIR.

- **Agriculture and Forest Resources:** The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) noted that General Plan buildout would result in the conversion of 3,525 acres of agriculture lands to urban uses. The *Final Environmental Impact Report* also indicates that General Plan buildout would result in agricultural activity in proximity to residential and other urban uses, which may result in conflicts between the uses. It is noted that agricultural activity can cause nuisances related to air quality and noise that may disturb surrounding development. Urban activities may also negatively affect nearby agricultural uses, as increased vandalism often occurs and the introduction of domestic animals may disturb certain agricultural activities.

  The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) concluded that with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AG1 through AG4, the impacts on potential compatibility issues would be reduced to a less than significant level; however, while the impacts on agricultural conversion would be reduced to the extent feasible, a significant and unavoidable impact would remain related to the loss of important farmland. Mitigation AG5 specifically addressed Agricultural

Land Conservation Easement Program, which states that the City will work with the County of Monterey and other local jurisdictions to create and implement an agricultural land conservation easement program, including such measures as securing the dedication of easements or by paying a mitigation fee that could be used to purchase easements through a mitigation bank. Additionally, in 2006, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 19422, approving the Agricultural Land Preservation Program. The resolution adopted a $750.00 per acre mitigation fee for agricultural lands currently designated by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping Program as "Prime" or "of Statewide Importance."

The City of Salinas certified the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002), adopted a statement of overriding considerations relative to this significant and unavoidable impact, and approved the Salinas General Plan.

Subsequently, the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) indicated that agricultural impacts associated with the FGAs, which includes the Specific Plan, would not be different from those discussed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002).

Any future development under the approved General Plan, which includes all development under the project, would be required to comply with the above-referenced regulations, policies, and standards. Implementation of the project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) and *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007). This topic did not warrant additional analysis and was not addressed further in the EIR.

- **Geology and Soils:** Implementation of the project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) and Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR (EDAW/AECOM 2007). This topic did not warrant additional analysis and was not addressed further in the EIR.

- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials:** While the Draft EIR analyzes Hazards and Hazardous Materials, several topics were determined to not warrant additional analysis within the Chapter.

  The land uses proposed within the Specific Plan Area would not be expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Additionally, these uses are not expected to 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. Furthermore, the project is not located in the vicinity of an airport or private airstrip; therefore, it would not result in a safety hazard related to air traffic for people residing or working in the Specific Plan Area. These topics did not warrant additional analysis and were not addressed further in the EIR.

Separately, the City has adopted a Multi-hazard Emergency Plan, which serves as extensions of the California Emergency Plan and the Emergency Resource Management Plan. The purpose of the Multi-hazard Emergency Plan is to respond to emergency situations with a coordinated system of emergency service providers and facilities. The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) in City Hall serves as the center of the City's emergency operations. The Plan also addresses evacuation and movement of people in the event of an emergency. The project does not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the Multi-hazard Emergency Plan. Implementation of the project would have a less than significant impact relative to this environmental topic and is not further analyzed or addressed further in the EIR.

Lastly, the project is not located in an area that is considered a high risk for wildfires. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact relative to this environmental topic and is not further analyzed or addressed further in the EIR.

- **Land Use and Planning:** The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) concluded that with the impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation.

  Subsequently, the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) indicated that impacts associated with the FGAs, which include the Specific Plan Area, would not be different from those discussed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002).

  The City certified the Final Supplemental EIR and approved annexation of the North of Boronda FGA, which includes the West Area Specific Plan. The project, as proposed, is consistent with the Greater Salinas Area Memorandum of Understanding (GSA MOU). All development under the project would be required to comply with the regulations, policies, and standards identifies in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002), and *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007). Implementation of the project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed within these supporting documents. This topic did not warrant additional analysis and is not addressed further in the EIR.

- **Mineral Resources:** It was determined in the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) that development of the FGA, including the Specific Plan Area, would not have a significant impact on mineral resources or mining activities. As such, implementation of the project would have no impact on mineral resources and this topic did not warrant additional analysis and is not addressed further in the EIR.

- **Population and Housing:** While the Draft EIR analyzes Population and Housing, several topics were determined to not warrant additional analysis within the Chapter.

The Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) noted that the General Plan would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing units or persons since the majority of the FGA designated for future development consists of vacant, agricultural, or redevelopment of nonresidential land. Additionally, any individual units that require removal would be offset by the increase in housing by the development of approximately 18,397 additional dwelling units at General Plan buildout.

The project would necessitate the removal of some existing houses within the Specific Plan Area; however, removal of any individual units would be offset by the increase in housing by the development of approximately 4,340 additional dwelling units at Specific Plan buildout. As such, the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people. Implementation of the project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed in the in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) and Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR (EDAW/AECOM 2007). This topic did not warrant additional analysis and is not addressed further in the EIR.

- **Recreation:** While the project would increase the demand for parks and other recreational facilities based on the population growth, the amount of parkland and open space provided within the Specific Plan Area sufficiently meets the City's parkland requirements. Construction of the parks would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) and Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR (EDAW/AECOM 2007). This topic did not warrant additional analysis and is not addressed further in the EIR.

- **Transportation and Circulation:** While the Draft EIR analyzes Traffic and Circulation, several topics were determined to not warrant additional analysis within the Chapter.

  The project is not located in the vicinity of an airport or airstrip; therefore, it would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Implementation of the project would have no impact relative to this environmental topic

The remaining issues areas and checklist questions are analyzed in the EIR. The EIR includes an analysis of the following issue areas:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Population and Housing

- Public Services
- Transportation and Circulation
- Utilities

The City circulated the DEIR for public and agency review on February 27, 2019. A public review period of 45 days was provided on the DEIR and ended on April 15, 2019. This period satisfied the requirement for a 45-day public review period as set forth in Section 15105 of the CEQA Guidelines.

V. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

In accordance with Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e), the record of proceedings for the City's decision on the project includes the following documents:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the project;

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;

- The Draft EIR for the project (February 2019) and all appendices;

- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;

- The Final EIR for the project, including comments received on the Draft EIR and the responses to those comments and appendices;

- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft EIR and Final EIR;

- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the project;

- All findings and resolutions adopted by the City Council in connection with the project and all documents cited or referred to therein;

- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared by the City, consultants to the City, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the City's action on the project;

- The Draft West Area Specific Plan;

- All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the project, up through the close of the Planning Commission public hearing, and the close of the City Council public hearing;

- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the City in connection with the project;

- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the City at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;

- The City of Salinas General Plan and all environmental documents prepared in connection with the adoption of the General Plan;

- Any and all resolutions approved by the City regarding the project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;

- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;

- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and

- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

The documents constituting the record of proceedings are available for review by responsible agencies and interested members of the public during normal business hours at the City of Salinas Community Development Department, 65 West Alisal Street, Salinas, California 93901. The custodian of these documents is the Community Development Director. Without exception, any documents set forth above not found in the project files fall into one of two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions of which the City Council was aware in approving the project. (See *City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission* (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 381, 391-392; *Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, fn. 6.) Other documents informed the experts who provided advice to City Staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the City Council. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the City Council's decisions relating to the approval of the project. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21167.6(e)(10); *Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866; *Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155.)

VI. CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE PLANS

This section includes a review of the project's relationship to the General Plan, other land use related documents/agreements, and to regional plans and identifies whether inconsistencies with these plans may exist.

Consistency with the Salinas General Plan

The Salinas General Plan states the City's vision for the community's future and outlines goals, policies and implementation measures to achieve its vision. The General Plan also projects the population, dwelling units, and non-residential building square footage associated with the future

buildout of the Land Use Plan, also referred to as General Plan buildout. Typically, General Plan buildout is decades beyond the 20-year General Plan planning cycle.

As described in CEQA Guidelines section 15125, subdivision (d), an EIR must discuss any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans. Such regional plans include, but are not limited to, the applicable air quality attainment or maintenance plan, area-wide waste treatment and water quality control plans, regional transportation plans, regional housing allocation plans, regional blueprint plans, plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, habitat conservation plans, and natural community conservation plans.

New Urbanism principles, a component of the General Plan Land Use Element, were used to design a land use plan for the project that is compact and pedestrian-friendly, with a mixture of uses surrounding activity centers/neighborhood local points in the Specific Plan Area. Higher density residential uses are proposed around retail, recreation, and public uses and all of these core activity centers are proposed to be connected with pedestrian, bicycle, and transit systems.

The quantifiable objectives of the project include the development of up to 4,340 residential dwelling units (with a minimum of 3,553 required under the General Plan), up to 571,500 square feet of commercial/mixed use building area, and up to 177 acres of public facilities (including three elementary schools, a high school, middle school, supplemental detention/retention basins and 11 parks). It is anticipated that Specific Plan Area will have up to 15,928 residents at project build-out. This is consistent with the expected intensity of development within the Specific Plan Area under General Plan buildout conditions as analyzed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002).

The Salinas General Plan requires the approval of Specific Plans prior to development of any land in the North of Boronda Future Growth Area (FGA). The West Area Specific Plan includes certain development regulations and design standards that are intended to be specific to the Specific Plan Area. Where there is a matter or issue not specifically covered by the Specific Plan development regulations and design standards, the Salinas Zoning Code would apply. Where there is a conflict between the Specific Plan and the Zoning Code, the Specific Plan would prevail.

The Specific Plan is intended to be adopted by the City Council and to serve as a tool for the City of Salinas to implement. The Specific Plan is to be used by designers, developers, builders, and planners, to guide development of the Specific Plan Area. The land use, development standards, and design guidelines are provided to ensure that all proposed developments remain consistent with the vision established by the Specific Plan as the project is built over time. The Specific Plan development concepts, design guidelines, and standards are in accordance with the City's General Plan, Municipal Ordinances, and City Specifications. The Specific Plan shall be used to review, process, and approve development proposals for individual parcels/project sites within the Specific Plan Area, including but not limited to site specific development applications and site improvement plans.

The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) noted that the General Plan may impact the related land use plans and policies that have

been adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. The Salinas Zoning Code, Salinas Redevelopment Plan, Greater Salinas Area Plan, Salinas Municipal Airport Master Plan, Monterey County Airport Land Use Plan, GSA MOU, are specifically mentioned. Of these seven documents, the project does not affect an existing Specific Plan, the Salinas Municipal Airport Master Plan, or the Monterey County Airport Land Use Plan, and the Salinas Redevelopment Plan is no longer in effect. These topics are not discussed further, but the other three are discussed below.

Salinas Zoning Code

The Specific Plan Area is currently zoned NI with a Specific Plan Overlay. The project includes a rezone to NE/Low Density Residential, NG-1/Medium Density Residential, NG-2/High Density Residential, VC, PS, P and OS. A Specific Plan Overlay District is also applicable to each Zoning District. The purpose of the rezone is to ensure consistency between the proposed General Plan Land Use Designations and Zoning. With the approval of the rezoning application, the Specific Plan would be consistent with the Salinas Zoning Code.

City/County Greater Salinas Area Memorandum of Understanding

In 2006, the City and the County adopted the GSA MOU to allow for annexation and development of specific parcels that are located outside of the Future Growth Areas as illustrated in the General Plan. These areas were not contemplated for annexation and development at the time the General Plan was adopted. These areas include, but are not limited to, the "Unikool", Boronda Road, and Fresh Express sites.

The GSA MOU describes the intent of each agency to consider annexation of the subject growth areas and identifies framework conditions under which annexations could be considered. The following excerpt from the Preface of the GSA MOU identifies its general intent:

"This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), by and between the County of Monterey (County) and the City of Salinas (City), is to set forth certain agreements between the parties to express their intent to jointly pursue action to assure orderly and appropriate land use development in the area designated in the General Plan of Monterey County as the Greater Salinas Area Plan area and in the City of Salinas. Specific objectives to be achieved through the implementation of the land use and associated policies included in this MOU are the preservation of certain agriculture land, the provision of future growth areas, and the provision of adequate financing for the services and facilities of benefit to the residents of the Greater Salinas Area Plan area and the City."

With the adoption of the GSA MOU, both the City and the County acknowledged that additional development outside the City's Future Growth Areas would be considered subject to amendment of the City's SOI and annexation of such areas to the City. The GSA MOU also includes a set of points of agreement that govern future annexations and associated development. Among other topics, the points of agreement address the future direction of City growth, agricultural mitigation, traffic impacts, and storm drainage. The GSA MOU states that the direction of future growth of the City shall be to the north and east of the current city limits, except as otherwise provided for in the GSA MOU.

To minimize and mitigate the potential impacts, the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) presented the following two mitigation measures: Mitigation Measure LU5 requires the City to continue to cooperate with the County of Monterey to implement the GSA-MOU, which directs that City growth generally to the north and east away from the most productive farmland; and Mitigation Measure LU6 requires the City to encourage City-centered growth and give priority to redevelopment and infill projects that reduce development pressure on agricultural lands. The City will also establish an incentive program to promote these projects, such as priority permit processing and density bonuses for such developments. The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) concluded that with the implementation of this mitigation measure, the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Subsequently, the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) indicated that impacts associated with the FGAs, which include the Specific Plan Area, would not be different from those discussed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002). The City certified this EIR and approved annexation of the North of Boronda FGA, which includes the WASP. The project as proposed is consistent with the GSA-MOU. All development under the project would be required to comply with the above-referenced regulations, policies, and standards.

Greater Salinas Area Plan

The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) noted that implementation of General Plan will result in development outside the existing City limits, into the Greater Salinas Planning Area. Development occurring outside of the City limits is subject to the Greater Salinas Area Plan. The implementation of the General Plan may conflict with the Greater Salinas Area Plan, resulting in a significant impact.

To minimize and mitigate the potential impacts, the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) presented Mitigation Measure LU2, which requires the City to be consistent with a portion of Draft Policy LU 3.4 of the Monterey County Draft General Plan, and to cooperate with LAFCO and the County of Monterey to direct growth outside the City limits to the Future Growth Area, on lands that are served or are planned to be served, with a full range of urban services, such as public water and sewer, an extensive road network, public transit, safety and emergency response services, parks, trails, and open space. The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) concluded that with the implementation of this mitigation measure, the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Subsequently, the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) indicated that impacts associated with the FGAs, which include the Specific Plan, would not be different from those discussed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002). The City certified this EIR and approved annexation of the North of Boronda Future Growth Area, which includes the Specific Plan. The project as proposed is consistent with the Greater Salinas Area Plan. All development

under the project would be required to comply with the above-referenced regulations, policies, and standards.

VII. FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute provides that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects." Section 21002 goes on to provide that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof."

The mandate and principles announced in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are required. For each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three permissible conclusions. The first such finding is that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR. The second permissible finding is that such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding, and that such changes have been adopted by, or can and should be adopted by, such other agency. The third potential conclusion is that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a).)

As explained elsewhere in these findings, "feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors. The concept of "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (*Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509 (court upholds CEQA findings rejecting alternatives in reliance on project's objectives); see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001 (*CNPS*) (an alternative "'may be found infeasible on the ground it is inconsistent with the project objectives as long as the finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record'") (quoting Kostka & Zischke, *Practice Under the Cal. Environmental Quality Act* [Cont.Ed.Bar 2d ed. 2009] (*Kostka*), § 17.309, p. 825); *In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166 (*Bay-Delta*) ([i]n the CALFED program, feasibility is strongly linked to achievement of each of the primary program objectives"; "a lead agency may structure its EIR alternative analysis around a reasonable definition of underlying purpose and need not study alternatives that cannot achieve that basic goal).) Moreover, "'feasibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133

Cal.App.3d 410, 417 (*City of Del Mar*); see also *CNPS, supra,* 177 Cal.App.4th 957 (after weighing "'economic, environmental, social, and technological factors,' ... 'an agency may conclude that a mitigation measure or alternative is impractical or undesirable from a policy standpoint and reject it as infeasible on that ground) (quoting Kostka, *supra,* § 17.29, p. 824))

For purposes of these findings (including the table described in Section IX below), the term "avoid" refers to the effectiveness of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to a less than significant level. In contrast, the term "substantially lessen" refers to the effectiveness of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce that effect to a less than significant level.

As explained above, CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt feasible mitigation measures or, in some instances, feasible alternatives to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. With respect to a proposed project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons that the agency found that the project's benefits outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects. The City of Salinas' Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project is included herein in Section XI below.

VIII. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (hereinafter "MMRP") has been prepared for the project, and is being approved by the City Council by Resolution 2019-__(N.C.S.). The City will use the MMRP to track compliance with project mitigation measures. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period. The Final MMRP is Exhibit "B" of the aforementioned resolution and is approved in conjunction with these Findings of Fact.

IX. SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The EIR identified a number of significant and potentially significant environmental effects (or impacts) that the project will cause or contribute to. Most of these significant effects can be fully avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Other effects, however, cannot be avoided by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or alternatives, and thus will be significant and unavoidable. Some of these unavoidable significant effects can be substantially lessened by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. Other significant, unavoidable effects cannot be substantially lessened or avoided. For reasons set forth in Section XI however, the City Council has determined that overriding economic, social, and other considerations outweigh the significant, unavoidable effects of the project.

The City Council's findings with respect to the project's significant effects and mitigation measures are set forth in the Table of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and CEQA Findings attached to these findings. The findings set forth in the table are hereby incorporated by reference.

This table does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the EIR. Instead, the table provides a summary description of each impact, describes the

applicable mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR or Final EIR and adopted by the City Council, and states the City Council's findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Draft and Final EIRs, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussions and analyses in those documents supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the projects' impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the City Council ratifies, adopts, and incorporates into these findings the analyses and explanations in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, and ratifies, adopts, and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Draft EIR and Final EIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

By Resolution 2019-__(N.C.S.), the City Council adopts all of the mitigation measures identified in the table.

X. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. Basis for Analysis of the Feasibility of Alternatives

Public Resources Code section 21002, a key provision of CEQA, provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" The same statute states that the procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects."

Where a lead agency has determined that, even after the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures, a project as proposed will still cause one or more significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided, the agency, prior to approving the project as mitigated, must first determine whether, with respect to such impacts, there remain any project alternatives that are both environmentally superior and feasible within the meaning of CEQA. Although an EIR must evaluate this range of *potentially* feasible alternatives, an alternative may ultimately be deemed by the lead agency to be "infeasible" if it fails to fully promote the lead agency's underlying goals and objectives with respect to the project. (*City of Del Mar, supra,* 133 Cal.App.3d at p. 417) "'[F]easibility' under CEQA encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*Ibid*.; see also *CNPS, supra,* 177 Cal.App.4th at p. 1001.) Thus, even if a project alternative will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the project, the decision-makers may reject the alternative if they determine that specific considerations make the alternative infeasible.

Under CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6, the alternatives to be discussed in detail in an EIR should be able to "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project [.]" For this reason, the Objectives described above provided the framework for defining possible offsite alternative project locations. (See *Bay-Delta, supra,* 43 Cal.4th at p. 1166). The project objectives are set out

above in section III.C. Based on the requirements of CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 and the Project's Objectives, the following alternatives to the project were identified:

No Project (No Build) Alternative

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[e]) require consideration of a no project alternative that represents the existing conditions, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved. For purposes of this analysis, the No Project (No Build) Alternative assumes that development of the Specific Plan Area would not occur, and the Specific Plan Area would remain in its current agricultural condition. It is noted that the No Project (No Build) Alternative would fail to meet the project objectives identified for the West Area Specific Plan and is inconsistent with the goals of the General Plan for the future growth areas of the City.

Reduced Land Area Project Alternative

Under this alternative, the Specific Plan Area would be developed with the same components as described in the Project Description, but the area utilized for the development (i.e., the project footprint) would be reduced by approximately 20 percent. Under this alternative, approximately 162 acres of land in the northeast corner of the Specific Plan Area would be removed. This removed area would include the 52.85-acre Mortensen property (APN 21101108) and the 108.32-acre Madolora/Global property (APN 21101109), which are shown on Figure 5.0-1. The resultant Specific Plan Area would include approximately 635 acres. The proposed land uses within this area identified for removal under this alternative would be incorporated into the remaining 635 acres of the Specific Plan Area, which would increase the residential density of the Specific Plan Area under this alternative, while retaining the same number of residences, mixed use commercial areas, schools, parks, etc. as the project. This alternative would establish a site for a third 10.0-acre elementary school to be developed by the Santa Rita Union School District (District). However, if the District decides against the elementary school siting, the area would instead be residential units.

Under this alternative the average residential density (units per net acre) would increase from 9.0 to approximately 11.3 units/acre. It is assumed that the number of NE parcels would be reduced, and the number of NG-1 parcels would increase. The proposed Village Center would remain unchanged under this alternative, and would still include up to 571,500 square feet of mixed use commercial floor area and a minimum of 91 dwelling units.

Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative

Under this alternative, the Specific Plan Area would be developed with a reduction in the overall residential intensity/density while maintaining the approximate overall project footprint. For the purposes of discussion, this option considers a 25 percent reduction in the intensity/density of the residential components of the project while maintaining the approximately 797-acre project footprint. This would result in fewer residential lots, but larger lot sizes. This alternative would result in up to 3,255 residential units. This alternative would retain the approximately 571,500 square feet of mixed commercial uses, the five proposed schools (three elementary, one middle, and one high school), and the same acreage of parks and detention basins as the project.

Under this alternative, the average residential density (units per net acre) would decrease from 9.0 to approximately 6.8 units/acre. It is assumed that the number of NE parcels would be increased, and the number of NG-1 and NG-2 parcels would increase. The proposed Village Center would remain unchanged under this alternative, and would still include up to 571,500 square feet of mixed use commercial floor area and a minimum of 91 dwelling units.

This alternative, based upon residential overall density, is inconsistent with the Salinas General Plan's standards for the Specific Plan Area, which require a minimum of 3,553 residential units within the Specific Plan Area, and the incorporation of New Urbanism concepts which mandates that new residential development have a minimum average density of 9 dwelling units per net residential acre. A General Plan Amendment would be required.

Smaller-scale Project Alternative

Under this alternative, the Specific Plan Area would be reduced by approximately 33 percent and the proposed residential and non-residential uses would also be reduced by approximately 33 percent. For the purposes of discussion, this alternative assumes that approximately 264 acres of land along the entire eastern boundary of the Specific Plan Area would be removed and remain as undeveloped agricultural land. The resultant Specific Plan Area under this alternative would be approximately 533 acres in size, and include up to 2,908 residential units, up to 382,905 square feet of commercial/mixed use building area, and up to 119 acres of public facilities (including two elementary schools, a high school, a middle school, open space (including supplemental detention/retention basins) and up to 8 parks). The number of residential units under this alternative would not meet the minimum of 3,553 residential units as provided within the City of Salinas General Plan. The residential densities under this alternative would be similar to the project.

The City Council finds that that a good faith effort was made to evaluate all potentially feasible alternatives in the EIR that are reasonable alternatives to the project and could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the project, even when the alternatives might impede the attainment of the project objectives and might be more costly. As a result, the scope of alternatives analyzed in the EIR is not unduly limited or narrow. The City Council also finds that all reasonable alternatives were reviewed, analyzed and discussed in the review process of the EIR and the ultimate decision on the project. (See, e.g., DEIR, pp. 6-5 to 6-55)

1. Significant, Unavoidable Impacts of the Project

The significant and unavoidable impacts of the project are set out in detail below in Section XI.A.

2. Scope of Necessary Findings and Considerations for Project Alternatives

As noted above, these findings address whether the various alternatives substantially lessen or avoid any of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with the project and also consider the feasibility of each alternative. Under CEQA, "[f]easible means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic,

environmental, legal, social, and technological factors." (CEQA Guidelines § 15364). As explained earlier, the concept of feasibility permits agency decision makers to consider the extent to which an alternative is able to meet some or all of a project's objectives. In addition, the definition of feasibility encompasses "desirability" to the extent that an agency's determination of infeasibility represents a reasonable balancing of competing economic, environmental, social, and technological factors supported by substantial evidence.

In identifying potentially feasible alternatives to the project, the following project objectives were considered:

1. Create a community with a compact form that promotes sustainable neighborhood design and is pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly.

2. Provide a variety of land uses in easy walking distance of housing including a mixed use village, parks, and schools to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

3. Provide parks and other public green space in accordance with General Plan standards that are designed to be safe and easily accessible to residents.

4. Provide a variety of low density, medium density, and high density housing to provide a variety of housing options for residents at various life stages.

5. Provide public services and infrastructure improvements that achieve and maintain City service standards.

6. Provide an inviting tree-lined street system which incorporates traffic calming and other measures.

7. Establish an interconnected sidewalk/path and open space system throughout the development which links to the greater FGA and City as a whole.

8. Create a sense of place and unique identity through the use of entry treatments, landscaping, streetscapes, public art, decorative street lighting, pedestrian amenities and other elements.

9. Provide for a reasonable jobs/housing balance.

10. Provide opportunities for senior housing.

11. Provide for a site/parcel-based post-construction SCMs/LID to the maximum extent practicable.

As noted near the beginning of these findings, moreover, the City is keenly aware that the State Legislature has declared that "California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions. The consequences of failing to effectively and aggressively confront this crisis are hurting millions of Californians, robbing future generations of the chance to call California home, stifling economic opportunities for workers and businesses, worsening poverty and homelessness, and undermining the state's environmental and climate objectives." (Government Code section 65589.5.) The Legislature notes that "California housing has become the most

expensive in the nation. The excessive cost of the state's housing supply is partially caused by activities and policies of many local governments that limit the approval of housing, increase the cost of land for housing, and require that high fees and exactions be paid by producers of housing." The Legislature further found that "Among the consequences of those actions are discrimination against low-income and minority households, lack of housing to support employment growth, imbalance in jobs and housing, reduced mobility, urban sprawl, excessive commuting, and air quality deterioration." The legislative intent of Government Code section 65589.5 is to "significantly increase the approval and construction of new housing for all economic segments of California's communities by meaningfully and effectively curbing the capability of local governments to deny, reduce the density for, or render infeasible housing development projects and emergency shelters. That intent has not been fulfilled." The State Legislature established its policy direction in the statute as follows: "It is the policy of the state that this section should be interpreted and implemented in a manner to afford the fullest possible weight to the interest of, and the approval and provision of, housing."

The following two overarching project objectives are therefore presented here as a response to: 1) the State Legislature's declaration of a housing crisis in California, 2) the State Legislature's policy direction for the provision of more housing, 3) the Salinas City Council's more than 30 years of planning for urban development within the FGAs, which includes the West Area Specific Plan, and 4) the Salinas City Council's policy direction as provided in the approved FGAs and General Plan:

- Objective 1: Respond to the State Legislature's declaration of a housing crisis in California, and their policy direction that local governmental agencies provide more housing, by including provisions for the construction of new housing supply within the West Area Specific Plan.
- Objective 2: Respond to the Salinas City Council's long-term vision and policy direction for new urban development to be focused in the Future Growth Areas, by including provisions the construction of new urban development consistent with the City of Salinas General Plan.

B. No Project (No Build) Alternative

In general, a CEQA "No Project Alternative" must "discuss the existing conditions …, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6, subd. (e)(2).) When the proposed project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy or ongoing operation, the "no project" alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy or operation into the future. In such an instance, the no project alternative consists of evaluating the projected impacts of the proposed plan to the impacts that would occur under the existing plan. "Typically, this is a situation where other projects initiated under the existing plan will continue while the new plan is developed. Thus, the projected impacts of the proposed plan or alternative plans would be compared to the impacts that would occur under the existing plan. (*Id.*, subd. (e)(3)(A).)

1. Analysis of No Project (No Build) Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Air Quality

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the Specific Plan Area would not be developed, and there would be no net change in emissions and no potential for a conflict with any adopted plans or policies related to air quality. As such, the project level and cumulative impacts would be greatly reduced when compared to the project.

Biological Resources

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the West Area Specific Plan would not be constructed, no habitat would be removed, no wetlands disturbed, and no ground disturbing activities would occur. The Specific Plan Area would remain open to migration, foraging, nesting, and other uses by wildlife. Therefore, potential for impacts to biological resources would be eliminated under the No Project (No Build) Alternative. Impacts to biological resources would be reduced as compared to the project.

Cultural Resources

The No Project (No Build) Alternative would continue to result in ground disturbing activities associated with the agricultural operations (i.e., soil tilling); however, because the ground disturbance associated with farming has occurred for an extended period of time with no cultural resources being found it is anticipated that the continuation of these operations under this alternative would have a significantly reduced potential to disturb or destroy cultural, historic, and archaeological resources, as well as paleontological resources. While the West Area Specific Plan is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural resources, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would result in slightly less potential for impacts to cultural resources as the entire Specific Plan Area would continue to be used for agriculture production.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the Specific Plan Area would not be developed, and there would be no net change in emissions and no potential for a conflict with any adopted plans or policies related to GHG reductions. As such, this impact would be reduced when compared to the project. This does not necessarily mean, however, that the No Project Alternative represents a better long-term policy outcome for climate than the project. California has a large housing need, and new housing will have to be built somewhere, if not the Specific Plan Area. As the California Supreme Court explained, "[g]iven the reality of growth, some greenhouse gas emissions from new housing and commercial developments are inevitable. The critical CEQA question is the cumulative significance of a project's greenhouse gas emissions, and from a climate change point of view it does not matter where in the state those emissions are produced." (*Center for Biological Diversity v. California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204, 220-221.)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, no new land uses would be introduced to the Specific Plan Area, and the potential for hazardous material release in the Specific Plan Area would be reduced. Ongoing pesticide use would occur within the area to remain in agriculture, and this has the potential to generate negative health effects on existing residents located in the areas south and west of the Specific Plan Area. However, there would not be long-term potential for hazards associated with use and generation of household and commercial hazardous wastes, because development would not occur. While the West Area Specific Plan is not anticipated to result in significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would result in less potential for impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, potential new water quality impacts from construction and operation of the West Area Specific Plan would be eliminated. Under this alternative, the land would be kept in its present state with the majority of the Specific Plan Area either fallow land or being used for agricultural purposes. The No Project (No Build) Alternative would have a greater chance of groundwater recharge because it would not introduce large areas of impervious surfaces as would the West Area Specific Plan. However, the beneficial impact of reducing the consumptive use of water by 2,078 acre-feet per year (AFY) (Cal Water, 2015) would not exist. This is a significant contribution in reducing overdraft in the Salinas Valley Ground Water basin.

The potential to result in the violation of water quality standards would be reduced under this alternative as compared with the project. However, there are some instances where the No Project (No Build) Alternative would have greater discharges of certain pollutants (such as erosion, sedimentation, pesticides release, etc.) when compared to the project. Nevertheless, overall, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be reduced under this alternative.

Noise

Existing agricultural activities within the Specific Plan Area sometimes involve on-going noise sources such as agricultural equipment (e.g., tractors, harvesters, planters, etc.). Such noise sources are part of the existing ambient noise levels in the Specific Plan Area. Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the Specific Plan Area would not be developed and there would be no potential for new noise sources; however, existing noise from agricultural operations would continue. As such, this alternative would have less impact relative to the project.

Population and Housing

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the Specific Plan Area would not be developed and the Specific Plan Area would not accommodate the City's anticipated growth. Growth would still be anticipated to occur within the region, but it would not be accommodated in the FGA, which has undergone extensive planning efforts by the City and community for over a decade. This outcome would not be consistent with the FGA and General Plan. The City would need to look

to other undeveloped areas of the region to develop for new housing, which would be expected to have environmental impacts that have not yet been assessed, but could well be worse than those of the West Area Specific Plan, particularly with respect to prime agricultural land, which is abundant in the region. Overall, this alternative would have a greater impact when compared to the project.

Public Services

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, there would be no increased demand for police, fire, schools, parks, or other public services. Alternatively, this alternative would result in no new school or park facilities, which are designed to accommodate more than the demand that is generated by the West Area Specific Plan. Overall, this alternative would have a slightly greater impact to public services when compared to the project.

Transportation and Circulation

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, there would be no new traffic generated within the Specific Plan Area. This alternative would also not result in new traffic improvements on the City's roadway system and it would not result in payments of traffic impact fees into the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that would be used for the roadway system. Existing deficiencies in the traffic system would not receive the benefit of improvements to improve existing deficiencies; however, this would be more than offset by the fact that there would be no new contribution to degrading traffic levels of service at a project and cumulative level. Overall, this alternative would have less of an overall traffic impact than the project. Still, the growth for which there is market demand would still be anticipated to occur somewhere else within the region, possibly in areas that could result in transportation effects worse than those of the West Area Specific Plan.

Utilities

Under the No Project (No Build) Alternative, the Specific Plan Area would not have an increased demand for wastewater, storm drainage, or solid waste disposal. There would be no new impacts on these utilities and there would be no need to construct new infrastructure. Therefore, overall, the impact on wastewater, solid waste, and storm drainage would be reduced under this alternative. In conclusion, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would not result in a beneficial impact to groundwater recharge. However, this alternative would decrease the amount of solid waste and wastewater generated at the site, and would not require construction of new utilities infrastructure. Overall, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would not add new impacts to wastewater, storm drainage, or solid waste disposal systems, but would not result in the beneficial impacts to the groundwater system.

2. Feasibility of No Project (No Build) Alternative

The No Project (No Build) Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it results in the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the project. However, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would fail to meet the project objectives identified for the

West Area Specific Plan and is inconsistent with the goals of the General Plan for the future growth areas of the City.

The City Council finds the No Project (No Build) Alternative to be infeasible for the above stated reasons, and rejects it as a viable alternative to the Project.

C. Reduced Land Area Project Alternative

1. Analysis of Reduced Land Area Project Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Air Quality

Under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, the Specific Plan Area would be developed with a 20 percent smaller development area, with an overall increase in residential density. Although the number of users would be the same under this alternative as compared with the project, this alternative has reduced mobile emissions when compared to the project, due to the more compact design of this alternative. It was assumed that mobile emissions under this alternative would be reduced by approximately twenty percent (as compared to the project), the same amount as the reduction in the size of this alternative's footprint when compared to the project. However, project operational activities under this alternative would still exceed the threshold of significance and generate a significant and unavoidable impact for reactive organic compounds (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}) at buildout.

This alternative would provide more compact development than the project, providing greater opportunities for non-motorized transportation choices (such as walking or cycling). This would slightly reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) as compared to the project, which would slightly the mobile source emissions.

The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would have greater impacts with respect to Air Quality Impact 3.1-1, which is identified as "the potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan." This is because the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), in consultation with the City of Salinas, included the North of Boronda FGA (inclusive of the West Area Specific Plan) within the AMBAG 2018 Regional Growth Forecast. The AMBAG 2018 Regional Growth Forecast feeds into the Monterey Bay Air Resources Board's (MBARD) 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) as well as the future version of the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Therefore, while an increase in density has the potential to reduce mobile source emissions if residents chose alternative transportation modes (i.e., walk/bike/transit instead of driving a vehicle), this is not guaranteed to occur given that the choice to drive is still convenient and economical for most residents under this residential density in a suburban environment. The increased residential density under this alternative was not specifically planned for in the MBARD planning documents and within the AMBAG forecasts. Nevertheless, due to the reduced footprint and slightly reduced VMT, this impact would be slightly reduced when compared to the West Area Specific Plan.

Biological Resources

Under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, less habitat would be removed, and fewer ground disturbing activities would occur. It is still anticipated that the drainage ditches along Boronda Road would be eliminated (i.e., fill activity). A portion of the Specific Plan Area (twenty percent) would remain open to migration, foraging, nesting, and other uses by wildlife. The balance of the Specific Plan Area (eighty percent of site) would be developed and no longer available for migration, foraging, nesting, and other uses by wildlife. This would still be a significant and unavoidable impact, and would be cumulatively considerable.

When compared to the Specific Plan, potential for impacts to biological resources would be reduced under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative proportionate to the reduction in developed area estimated at twenty percent.

Cultural Resources

The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would result in fewer ground disturbing activities and would have a slightly reduced potential to disturb or destroy cultural, historic, and archaeological resources, as well as paleontological resources. While the West Area Specific Plan is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation, the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would result in slightly less potential for impacts to cultural resources, as a portion of the Specific Plan Area would remain undeveloped.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would not develop approximately 162 acres that is proposed to be developed under the project. This would provide more compact development, creating more opportunities for non-motorized transportation options (such as walking or cycling). This is likely to reduce overall VMT as compared to the project. This would reduce mobile-related GHG emissions by an amount approximately equivalent to proportional reduction in the size of the Specific Plan Area (twenty percent) under this alternative, as compared with the project. Total operational emissions would be reduced by approximately 11 percent under this scenario, as compared to the project. However, Specific Plan Area operational activities under this alternative would be expected to generate a significant and unavoidable impact on operational greenhouse gases.

With a total projected service population of 16,785 (same as the project), this alternative would generate approximately 2.53 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO_2e)/service population/year in the mitigated scenario (in Year 2035). This value is above the derived per capita GHG threshold of 1.94 MT CO_2e/service population/year for Year 2035. However, this value is below the per service population estimate for the project of 2.84 MT CO_2e/service population/year (in Year 2035). Therefore, the emissions per capita under this alternative would be reduced as compared with the project. This impact would be slightly reduced when compared to the project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, the land area to be developed would be reduced by 20 percent and the potential for exposure to hazardous materials, or a release of hazardous materials would be reduced proportionately. Ongoing pesticide use would occur within the area to remain in agriculture, and this would have the potential to generate negative health effects on new residents in the development. Similar to the project, new development would introduce new sensitive receptors into an area that contains land that has historically utilized chemicals for agricultural production. Any negative health effects associated with the residuals of these chemicals would be alleviated through compliance with state and federal regulations that require remediation when above certain thresholds. There would be a long-term potential for hazards associated with use and generation of household and commercial hazardous wastes, although compliance with state and federal regulations would be required. While the West Area Specific Plan is not anticipated to result in significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials, the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would result in slightly less potential for impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of the West Area Specific Plan has the potential to result in the violation of water quality standards and waste discharge of pollutants into surface waters during both construction and long-term operations. Construction operations could result in temporary increases in runoff, erosion, sedimentation, soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas. The long-term operation of the West Area Specific Plan could result in long-term impacts to surface water quality from urban stormwater runoff and could enter groundwater or surface water systems. Additionally, the proposed project would result in new impervious surfaces that could reduce rainwater infiltration and groundwater recharge. Mitigation measures incorporated into the project would reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level. The West Area Specific Plan would not place persons or structures in a flood hazard zone.

Under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, potential water quality impacts from construction and operation of the West Area Specific Plan would be reduced. Under this alternative, the developed area would be reduced by 20 percent when compared with the project. The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would have a greater chance of groundwater recharge because it would reduce the amount of impervious surfaces by 20 percent as compared to the West Area Specific Plan. The areas that would not be developed (i.e., the 162 acres of land in the northeast corner of the Specific Plan Area) would remain under agricultural production. While the 162-acre agricultural area would provide opportunities for groundwater recharge, the agricultural uses would continue to require intensive groundwater pumping for the agricultural production. The higher amount of groundwater pumping required for the 162-acres of agricultural use under this alternative would result in a greater impact on the Salinas Valley Ground Water basin, when compared to the project. The amount of total consumptive water usage reduced by this alternative when compared to the existing uses in the Specific Plan Area would be approximately 1,666 AFY, compared with the approximately 2,078 AFY estimated to be saved by the proposed project. That is, buildout this alternative would save approximately 412

AFY less water than buildout of the proposed project. This would increase risks to the groundwater basin associated with seawater intrusion, when compared to the proposed project.

Under this alternative, there are some instances where the undeveloped portions of the Specific Plan Area would have greater discharges of certain pollutants (such as erosion, sedimentation, pesticides release, etc.) when compared to the project. Additionally, while the potential to result in water quality violations would be reduced under this alternative when compared with the project, the higher amount of groundwater pumping under this alternative would result in a greater impact on the Salinas Valley Ground Water basin, when compared to the proposed project. There would still be some benefit on the Salinas Valley Ground Water basin under this alternative because 80 percent of the land area would be converted into a use that would not require intensive groundwater pumping. As such, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be increased under this alternative when compared to the project.

Noise

Under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, development would be reduced by 20 percent when compared with the project. As a result of less development, noise levels associated with traffic, stationary sources, and construction would be expected to be reduced under this alternative. Receptors would be subject to ongoing agricultural noise under this alternative. It is noted that, despite this reduction in the size of development under this alternative, it is expected that some noise levels associated with traffic, stationary sources, and construction would still generate a significant and unavoidable impact. As such, this alternative would have a reduced impact relative to the project.

Population and Housing

Under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, the project footprint would be reduced by 20 percent when compared with the project. However, although the residential density would increase from approximately 9.0 to 11.3 residential units per acre under this alternative, the number of residences developed under this alternative would be the same as for the proposed project. Overall, this alternative would have a equal impacts when compared to the project.

Public Services

Under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, the development area would be reduced by 20 percent. Residential and non-residential development would be equal under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative; therefore, the demand for police, fire and other public services would be equal. This alternative would still result in development of public facilities (i.e. schools and parks) and would be required to pay the appropriate public safety impact fees. Overall, this alternative would have equal impacts to public services when compared to the project.

Transportation

Under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, the development area would be reduced by 20 percent. Residential and non-residential development would be equal under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative; therefore, traffic generated in the Specific Plan Area would be equal.

This alternative would still result in new traffic improvements on the City's roadway system to accommodate the new traffic generated. It would also still result in payments of traffic impact fees into the City's CIP program that would be used for the roadway system. Existing deficiencies in the traffic system would receive some benefit of improvements to improve existing deficiencies; however, there would still be significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts to this topic under this alternative.

The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would have "slightly greater" impact with respect to Transportation and Circulation Impact 3.10-7, which is identified as "impacts related to emergency access." The basis for this determination is that the increased density of the proposed project would increase congestion on existing and planned roadways as compared to the proposed project, given that fewer roadways would be developed under this alternative (because the APNs 211-011-008 and 211-011-009 would not be developed under this alternative). Specifically, Natividad Road (Major Arterial), Russell Road (Major Arterial), and Rogge Road would not be expanded with full frontage improvements under this alternative. Congestion is also expected to be slightly higher under this alternative compared to the proposed project, given the increased density of traffic (based on fewer roadway miles being developed under this alternative compared with the proposed project, and the increased density of the proposed project [to 11.3 residential units per acre under this alternative, compared to 9.0 residential units per acre under the proposed project]). This represents a slightly greater impact with respect to emergency access within the Specific Plan Area. It is noted that the significance determination under Transportation and Circulation Impact 3.10-7 would likely still be less than significant for the Reduced Land Area Alternative, similar to the proposed project; however, the roadway network will not have the same capacity as under the proposed project, so the determination remains "slightly greater."
Additionally, the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would have a "slightly greater" impact with respect to Transportation and Circulation Impact 3.10-8, which is identified as "conflict with adopted multi-modal circulation policies, plans, or programs" or a "decrease [in] the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities." The basis for this determination is that the following roadways would not be developed in full under this alternative:

- Natividad Road (Major Arterial) expansion frontage improvements (proposed Class II bike lane);
- Russell Road (Major Arterial) expansion (proposed Class II Bike Lane);
- Rogge Road frontage improvements.

Since these roadways would not be developed in full, as planned for by the proposed project, connectivity with the remainder of the City and County, including other areas within the City's FGA, would be more limited under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative as compared to the proposed project. Overall, this alternative would have slightly greater traffic impacts than the project.

Utilities

This alternative would not save as much groundwater when compared to the proposed project. The amount of total consumptive water usage reduced by this alternative when compared to the

existing uses in the Specific Plan Area would be approximately 1,666 AFY, compared with the approximately 2,078 AFY estimated to be saved by the proposed project. That is, buildout this alternative would save approximately 412 AFY less water than buildout of the proposed project. This is due to the dramatically higher water usage under the current irrigated agricultural cultivation uses as compared with developed residential and/or commercial uses. This would increase risks to the groundwater basin associated with seawater intrusion, when compared to the project.

Although this alternative would save less groundwater than the project, generate a similar amount of solid waste, and demand a similar amount of water, this alternative would reduce impacts to stormwater compared to the project. Overall, the demand for utilities would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the project.

2. Feasibility of Reduced Land Area Project Alternative

The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would slightly reduce impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, GHG and climate change, hazards, hydrology, noise, transportation, and utilities compared to the project. However, this alternative would potentially worsen impacts related to groundwater supplies and recharge (cumulative and project-level), population and housing, emergency vehicle access, and conflicts with adopted multi-modal circulation policies, plans, or programs. Further, this alternative does not meet the following project objectives:

- Provide public services and infrastructure improvements that achieve and maintain City service standards;
- Establish an interconnected sidewalk/pathway and open space system throughout the development which links to the greater FGA and City as a whole.

The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative does not fully meet the project objective to "Provide public services and infrastructure improvements that achieve and maintain City service standards" because the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would develop fewer roadways, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, and other infrastructure improvements (such as well sites) when compared with the project.

Under this alternative, APNs 211-011-008 and 211-011-009, as shown in Figure 5.0-1 of the Draft EIR, would not be developed. The effect of this area not developing in accordance with the General Plan would be that the following roadways and infrastructure improvements would not be developed:

- Natividad Road (Major Arterial) expansion frontage improvements;
- Russell Road (Major Arterial) expansion;
- Rogge Road frontage improvements;
- The proposed water well #3 and water treatment site;
- The supplemental stormwater basins along Natividad Road; and
- Neighborhood Park WA-3 (3-acre park).

Therefore, based on the above list of roadways and infrastructure improvements that would not be developed under this alternative, the ability of the City to provide public services and infrastructure improvements in accordance with the adopted General Plan would be hampered under the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative.

The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative does not meet the project objective to "Establish an interconnected sidewalk/pathway and open space system throughout the development which links to the greater FGA and City as a whole" because this alternative would leave undeveloped a portion of the land that would be developed under project (i.e., APNs 211-011-008 and 211-011-009), as shown in Figure 5.0-1 of the Draft EIR. This is an area located adjacent to the future Central Area Specific Plan (within the City's FGA). If this area were to remain undeveloped, there would be fewer interconnected sidewalks/pathways and available open space areas for City residents, and connectivity would be limited between the West Area Specific Plan (the project) and the planned for Central Area Specific Plan (a planned Specific Plan Area that would be located just to the east of the proposed project). This reduced connectivity means that the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would not establish an interconnected sidewalk/pathway and open space system that fully links with the greater FGA and with the City as a whole. Notably, this rationale is also the basis for determining that the Smaller-Scale Project Alternative would not meet this Specific Plan objective. Specifically, the following roadways would not be developed under this alternative:

- Natividad Road (Major Arterial) expansion frontage improvements (proposed Class II bike lane);
- Russell Road (Major Arterial) expansion (proposed Class II Bike Lane); and
- Rogge Road frontage improvements.

The Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would lessen many of the potentially significant environmental effects of the project. For example, some of the potentially significant impacts related to the following topics would be reduced or slightly reduced under this alternative: air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gases and climate change, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation and circulation, and utilities. It is noted, however, that this alternative would also result in greater, slightly greater, or equal impacts as compared to the project in the following topics: air quality plan consistency, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, public services, transportation and circulation, and utilities.

Ultimately, the significant and unavoidable environmental effects anticipated with the project would still occur under this Reduced Land Area Project Alternative due to the location, size and scope of the alternative. The significant and unavoidable impacts may occur to a lesser extent than under the project under this alternative, but the impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. For example, a significant and unavoidable impact related to increased traffic noise levels at existing receptors would occur under the project and the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative as there is a possibility of not being able to feasibly install sounds walls in some locations that would be warranted. It is noted that, due to decreased noise levels associated with this alternative, the noise at existing receptors would likely decrease. However, the cumulative traffic noise level increases would exceed the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) CEQA substantial increase criteria of 1.5 to 5 dB.

The City Council finds the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative to be infeasible for the above stated reasons, and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

D. Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative

1. Analysis of Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Air Quality

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, there would be a 25 percent reduction in the intensity/density of the residential portions of the Specific Plan Area, with an overall decrease in residential density.

It was assumed that overall criteria pollutant emissions under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 25 percent when compared to the project, consistent with the reduction in the intensity/density of the residential portions of the Specific Plan Area under this alternative. However, project operational activities under this alternative would still exceed the threshold of significance and generate a significant and unavoidable impact for ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} at buildout.

Although less compact development generally increases overall per capita VMT, the smaller number of residential units under this alternative as compared with the project would reduce overall air quality emissions, including under area sources, mobile sources, and energy sources. As such, this impact would be reduced when compared to the project.

Biological Resources

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, an equivalent amount of habitat would be removed as under the project, and a similar level of ground disturbing activities would occur as compared with the project. Therefore, there would be an approximately equal potential for impacts to biological resources under this alternative as compared with the project.

Cultural Resources

The Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would result in a similar level of ground disturbing activities and would have a similar potential to disturb or destroy cultural, historic, and archaeological resources, as well as paleontological resources. While the West Area Specific Plan is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation, the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would result in equal potential for impacts to cultural resources.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, there would be a 25 percent reduction in the intensity/density of the residential portions of the Specific Plan Area. It

was assumed that overall GHG emissions under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 25 percent when compared to the project, consistent with the reduction in the intensity/density of the residential portions of the Specific Plan Area under this alternative. Total operational emissions would be reduced by approximately 25 percent under this scenario, as compared to the project. However, Specific Plan Area operational activities under this alternative would be expected to generate a significant and unavoidable impact on operational greenhouse gases.

With a total projected service population of 12,803 under this alternative (this is equivalent to a 25 percent smaller residential population but the same number of workers, when compared to the project), this alternative would generate approximately 2.79 MT CO_2e/service population/year in the mitigated scenario (in Year 2035). This value is above the derived per capita GHG threshold of 1.94 MT CO_2e/service population/year for Year 2035, but lower than the per service population estimate for the project of 2.84 MT CO_2e/service population/year (in Year 2035). Therefore, this impact would be slightly reduced when compared to the project.

The slight reduction does not necessarily mean that the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative represents a better long-term policy outcome for climate than the project. California has a large housing need, and new housing will have to be built somewhere, if not in the Specific Plan Area. As the California Supreme Court explained, "[g]iven the reality of growth, some greenhouse gas emissions from new housing and commercial developments are inevitable. The critical CEQA question is the cumulative significance of a project's greenhouse gas emissions, and from a climate change point of view it does not matter where in the state those emissions are produced." (*Center for Biological Diversity v. California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204, 220-221.)

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, the intensity/density of the residential components would be reduced by 25 percent as compared with the project. Similar to the project, new development would introduce new sensitive receptors into an area that contains land that has historically utilized chemicals for agricultural production. Any negative health effects associated with the residuals of these chemicals would be alleviated through compliance with state and federal regulations that require remediation when above certain thresholds. There would be a long-term potential for hazards associated with use and generation of household and commercial hazardous wastes, although compliance with state and federal regulations would be required. Overall, given the reduction in the intensity-density of this alternative as compared with the project, it is expected that the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would have a slightly reduced impact to this topic relative to the project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, potential water quality impacts from construction and operation would be slightly reduced. Under this alternative, the intensity/density of the residential uses would be reduced by 25 percent when compared with the project, although the footprint would remain the same. This would result in fewer residential lots, but larger lot sizes. Since the residential lot sizes under this alternative would be larger when

compared with the project, there would be less impervious surface, and therefore there would be a greater chance of groundwater recharge under this alternative. As such, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be reduced under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Alternative when compared to the project.

Noise

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, the intensity/density of the residential uses would be reduced by 25 percent when compared with the project. As a result of less development, noise levels associated with traffic, stationary sources, and construction would be expected to be reduced under this alternative. Despite this reduction in the size of intensity of development under this alternative, it is expected that some noise levels associated with traffic, stationary sources, and construction would still generate a significant and unavoidable impact. As such, this alternative would have less impact relative to the project.

Population and Housing

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, the intensity/density of the residential uses would be reduced by 25 percent when compared with the project. Development of housing would still occur under this alternative, but fewer units would be built. Growth would still be anticipated to occur within the region, but it would not be fully accommodated in the North of Boronda FGA, which has undergone extensive planning efforts by the City and community for over a decade. This would not be consistent with the FGA and General Plan. The City would need to look to other undeveloped areas of the region to develop for new housing which would be expected to have environmental impacts that have not yet been assessed but could well be worse than those of the West Area Specific Plan, particularly with respect to prime agricultural land, which is abundant in the region. The lower density of this alternative would also not meet the minimum number of residential units required for New Urbanism principles that are established in the General Plan for the Specific Plan Area. Overall, this alternative would have a greater impact when compared to the project.

Public Services

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, the intensity/density of the residential uses would be reduced by 25 percent; therefore, the demand for police, fire and other public services would be reduced. This alternative would still result in development of public facilities (i.e. schools and parks) and would be required to pay the appropriate public safety impact fees. Overall, this alternative would have a slightly reduced impact to public services when compared to the project.

Transportation and Circulation

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative, the intensity/density of the residential uses would be reduced by 25 percent; therefore, traffic generated in the Specific Plan Area would be reduced. This alternative would still result in new traffic improvements on the City's roadway system to accommodate the new traffic generated. It would also still result in payments of traffic impact fees into the City's CIP program that would be used for the roadway

system. Existing deficiencies in the traffic system would receive some benefit of improvements to improve existing deficiencies; however, there would still be significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts under this alternative. Overall, this alternative would have less of an overall traffic impact than the project.

Utilities

Under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Alternative, the Specific Plan Area would be developed with a reduction in the overall residential intensity/density while maintaining the approximate overall project footprint as in the project. For the purposes of discussion, this option considers a 25 percent reduction in the intensity/density of the residential components of the project while maintaining the approximately 797-acre project footprint. This would result in fewer residential lots, but larger lot sizes. This alternative would result in up to 3,255 residential units. This alternative would retain the approximately 571,500 square feet of mixed commercial uses, the five proposed schools (three elementary, one middle, and one high school), and the same acreage of parks and detention basins as the project.

The total quantity of infrastructure installed would not be reduced, but the demand for wastewater and solid waste services would be less than would be required for the project. For example, is expected that this alternative would generate approximately 0.8 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater and approximately 37,777 pounds per day (lbs/day) of solid waste, smaller than would be generated by the project, since this alternative would generate fewer residents when compared to the project.

Separately, the total storm drainage runoff under this alternative would be approximately the same when compared to the project, due to the project footprint remaining the same for this alternative when compared to the project. Additionally, this alternative would save approximately the same amount of groundwater when compared to the project, since the project footprint would remain the same for this alternative as compared to the project. Overall, the demand for wastewater and solid waste services would be less than would be required for the project, and the amount of storm drainage runoff would be approximately the same. Therefore, demand for utilities would be slightly reduced under this alternative when compared to the project.

2. Feasibility of Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative

The Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would slightly reduce impacts to air quality, cultural resources, GHG and climate change, hydrology, noise, public services, transportation, and utilities compared to the project. However, this alternative would potentially worsen impacts related to conflicts with applicable air quality plans and population and housing. Further, this alternative does not meet the following project objectives:

- Create a community with a compact form that promotes sustainable neighborhood design and is pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly;
- Provide a balance of low density, medium density, and high density housing to provide a variety of housing options for residents at various life stages;
- Provide a reasonable jobs/housing balance.

The Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative does not fully meet the project objective to "Create a community with a compact form that promotes sustainable neighborhood design and is pedestrian, bicycle, and transit friendly" because the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would result in fewer lots with larger lot sizes than will occur under the project. Larger lot sizes are inherently not compact, and development of these larger lot sizes may result in larger block sizes, which are less conducive to travel by walking, bicycles, and transit. Based upon residential overall density, this alternative is inconsistent with the Salinas General Plan's standards for the Specific Plan Area, which require a minimum of 3,553 residential units within the Specific Plan Area, and the incorporation of New Urbanism concepts, which mandate that new residential development have a minimum average density of 9 dwelling units per net residential acre.

The Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative does not fully meet the project objective to "Provide a balance of low density, medium density, and high density housing to provide a variety of housing options for residents at various life stages" because the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would provide fewer medium- and high-density housing units than the project. The number of low-density housing options would increase compared to the project, and these units would replace otherwise varied density housing options.

Furthermore, the reduction in housing units under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would be less consistent than the project in meeting statewide legislative goals of building housing units in order to address the statewide housing crisis. Given the enormous unmet demand for housing in California, the City believes that it has an obligation to facilitate the construction of more, rather than fewer, housing units when opportunities for residential development arise.

Similarly, the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative does not fully meet the project objective to "Provide a reasonable jobs/housing balance" because the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would result in 1,085 fewer housing units than the project, but the same amount of commercial uses. This would impact the jobs/housing balance because fewer residents would be live in the Specific Plan Area, which proximity is vital to ensuring the success of the businesses in the Specific Plan Area.

The Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would lessen many of the potentially significant environmental effects of the project. For example, some of the potentially significant impacts related to the following topics would be reduced or slightly reduced under this alternative: air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gases and climate change, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, public services, transportation and circulation, and utilities. It is noted, however, that this alternative would also result in greater, slightly greater, or equal impacts as compared to the project in the following topics: air quality plan consistency, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, population and housing, transportation and circulation, and utilities.

Ultimately, the significant and unavoidable environmental effects which are anticipated with the project would still occur under this Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative due to the location, size and scope of the alternative. The significant and unavoidable impacts

may occur to a lesser extent under this alternative than under the project, but the impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. For example, a significant and unavoidable impact related to violation of an air quality standard would occur under both the project and the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative. As shown in Table 5.0-4 of Chapter 5.0 of the Draft EIR, the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would exceed the threshold of significance for ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} at buildout. Although the emissions would be less than with the project, this alternative would also cause a violation of an air quality standard. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

The City Council finds the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative to be infeasible for the above stated reasons, and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

E. Smaller Scale Project Alternative

1. Analysis of Smaller Scale Project's Ability to Reduce Significant Unavoidable Project Impacts

Air Quality

Under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative, the overall size of the project would be scaled down by approximately 33 percent as compared with the project. This would reduce Specific Plan Area operational emissions by an approximately equivalent amount (33%) as compared to the project. However, project operational activities under this alternative would still exceed the threshold of significance and generate a significant and unavoidable impact for ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} at buildout.

Nevertheless, overall air quality emissions under this alternative would be reduced compared to the project, due to the smaller size of this alternative, including for area sources, mobile sources, and energy sources. As such, this impact would be reduced when compared to the project.

Biological Resources

Under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative, an area of about 264 acres would not be developed, and fewer ground disturbing activities would occur. It is still anticipated that the drainage ditches along Boronda would be eliminated (i.e., fill activity). The 264 acres would remain open to migration, foraging, nesting, and other uses by wildlife. The balance of the Specific Plan Area would be developed and no longer available for migration, foraging, nesting, and other uses by wildlife. This would still be a significant and unavoidable impact, and would be cumulatively considerable.

When compared to the Specific Plan, potential for impacts to biological resources would be reduced under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative proportionate to the reduction in developed area.

Cultural Resources

The Smaller-scale Project Alternative would result in a reduced level of ground disturbing activities and would therefore have slightly less potential to disturb or destroy cultural, historic, and archaeological resources, as well as paleontological resources. While the West Area Specific Plan is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to cultural resources with mitigation, this alternative would result in slightly less potential for impacts to cultural resources.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

The Smaller-scale Project Alternative would reduce the level of development by approximately 33 percent as compared with the project. This would reduce Specific Plan Area operational GHG emissions by an approximately equivalent amount (33%) when compared to the project. Total operational emissions would be reduced by approximately 33% under this scenario, as compared to the project. However, Specific Plan Area operational activities under this alternative would be expected to generate a significant and unavoidable impact on operational greenhouse gases.

With a total projected service population of 11,190 under this alternative (this is equivalent to a 33% reduction in both residential and worker population, when compared to the project), this alternative would generate approximately 2.84 MT CO_2e/service population/year in the mitigated scenario (in Year 2035). This value is above the derived per capita GHG threshold of 1.94 MT CO_2e/service population/year for Year 2035. Additionally, this emissions-per-capita value would be the same as those generated by the project. Therefore, this impact would be equal when compared to the project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Smaller-scale Project Alternative would reduce the level of development by approximately 33 percent and the potential for exposure to hazardous materials, or a release of hazardous materials would be reduced proportionately. Ongoing pesticide use would occur within the area to remain in agriculture, and this would have the potential to generate negative health effects on new residents in the development. Similar to the project, new development would introduce new sensitive receptors into an area that contains land that has historically utilized chemicals for agricultural production. Any negative health effects associated with the residuals of these chemicals would be alleviated through compliance with state and federal regulations that require remediation when above certain thresholds. There would be a long-term potential for hazards associated with use and generation of household and commercial hazardous wastes, although compliance with state and federal regulations would be required. While the West Area Specific Plan is not anticipated to result in significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials, the Smaller-scale Project Alternative would result in slightly less potential for impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative, potential water quality impacts from construction and operation would be reduced. Under this alternative, the overall level of development (including the size of the site and the overall development area per use) would be reduced by approximately 33 percent. An area of approximately 264 acres that would be developed as part of the project would not be developed as part of this alternative. The areas that would not be developed would remain under agricultural production, and while they would have better

recharge in those areas, they would continue to require intensive groundwater pumping for the agricultural production. The higher amount of groundwater pumping under this alternative would result in a greater impact on the Salinas Valley Ground Water basin, when compared to the project. There would still be some benefit on the Salinas Valley Ground Water basin under this alternative because 66 percent of the land area would be converted into a use that would not require intensive groundwater pumping.

There are some instances where the 264 acres of Specific Plan Area that remains undeveloped would have greater discharges of certain pollutants (such as erosion, sedimentation, pesticides release, etc.) when compared to the project. Additionally, overall, while the potential to result in the violation of water quality standards would be reduced under this alternative when compared with the project, overdraft conditions would worsen in the Salinas Valley Ground Water basin under this alternative when compared to the project. As such, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be increased under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative when compared to the West Area Specific Plan.

Noise

Under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative, the overall level of development would be reduced by 33 percent as compared with the project. As a result of less development, noise levels associated with traffic, stationary sources, and construction would be expected to be reduced under this alternative. Despite this reduction in the size and intensity of development under this alternative, it is expected that some noise levels associated with traffic, stationary sources, and construction would still generate a significant and unavoidable impact As such, this alternative would have less impact relative to the project.

Population and Housing

Under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative, the overall level of development would be reduced by 33 percent as compared with the project. Development of housing would still occur under this alternative, but fewer units would be built. Growth would still be anticipated to occur within the region, but it would not be fully accommodated in the FGA, which has undergone extensive planning efforts by the City and community for over a decade. This would not be consistent with the FGA and General Plan. The City would need to look to other undeveloped areas of the region to develop for new housing, which would be expected to have environmental impacts that have not yet been assessed but could well be worse than those of the West Area Specific Plan, particularly with respect to prime agricultural land, which is abundant in the region. Overall, this alternative would have a greater impact when compared to the project.

Public Services

Under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative, the overall level of development and the number of residential/non-residential uses would be reduced by 33 percent; therefore, the demand for police, fire and other public services would be reduced. This alternative would still result in development of public facilities (i.e., schools and parks) and would be required to pay the appropriate public safety impact fees. Overall, this alternative would have a slightly reduced impact to public services when compared to the project.

Transportation and Circulation

Under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative, the overall level of development and the number of residential/non-residential uses would be reduced by 33 percent; therefore, traffic generated in the Specific Plan Area would be reduced. This alternative would still result in new traffic improvements on the City's roadway system to accommodate the new traffic generated. It would also still result in payments of traffic impact fees into the City's CIP program that would be used for the roadway system. Existing deficiencies in the traffic system would receive some benefit of improvements to improve existing deficiencies; however, there would still be significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts. Overall, this alternative would have less of an overall traffic impact than the project.

Utilities

Under the Smaller-scale Project Alternative, the Specific Plan Area would be reduced by approximately 33 percent and the proposed residential and non-residential uses would also be reduced by approximately 33 percent. This alternative assumes that approximately 264 acres of land along the entire eastern boundary of the Specific Plan Area would be removed and remain as undeveloped agricultural land. The resultant Specific Plan Area under this alternative would be approximately 533 acres in size, and include up to 2,908 residential units, up to 382,905 square feet of commercial/mixed use building area, and up to 119 acres of public facilities (including two elementary schools, a high school, middle school, open space (including supplemental detention/retention basins) and up to 8 parks).

The total quantity of infrastructure installed would be reduced, and the demand for wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste services would be less than would be required for the project. For example, is expected that this alternative would generate approximately 0.7 MGD of wastewater and approximately 33,473 lbs/day of solid waste, less than what would be generated by the project, since this alternative would generate fewer residents when compared to the project.

Separately, the total storm drainage runoff under this alternative would be reduced by approximately 33% when compared to the project, due to the project footprint being reduced by 33% when compared to the project.

However, this alternative would not save as much groundwater when compared to the project. The amount of total water usage reduced by this alternative when compared to the existing uses in the Specific Plan Area would be approximately 1,389 AFY, compared with the approximately 2,078 AFY estimated to be saved by the project. That is, buildout this alternative would save approximately 689 AFY less water than buildout of the project. This would increase risks to the groundwater basin associated with seawater intrusion, when compared to the project. However, in general, the demand for utilities would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the project.

2. Feasibility of Smaller-scale Project Alternative

The Smaller-scale Project Alternative would slightly reduce impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, GHG and climate change, hazards, hydrology, noise, public

services, transportation, and utilities compared to the project. However, this alternative would potentially worsen impacts related to conflicts with applicable air quality plans, groundwater supplies and recharge (cumulative and project-level), population and housing, emergency vehicle access, and conflicts with adopted multi-modal circulation policies, plans, or programs. Further, this alternative does not meet the following project objectives:

- Provide public services and infrastructure improvements that achieve and maintain City service standards;
- Establish an interconnected sidewalk/pathway and open space system throughout the development which links to the greater FGA and City as a whole.

The Smaller-scale Project Alternative does not fully meet these two project objectives because, similar to the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative, this alternative would leave 33 percent of the Specific Plan Area undeveloped, which would include 264 acres of land along the entire eastern boundary of the Specific Plan Area. This eastern area is located adjacent to the future Central Area Specific Plan (within the City's FGA). This means that there would be fewer interconnected sidewalks/pathways and available open space areas for City residents, and that there would be limit connectivity between the West Area Specific Plan (the project) and the future Central Area Specific Plan (a planned Specific Plan Area that would be located just to the east of the proposed project). This reduced connectivity means that the Reduced Land Area Project Alternative would not establish an interconnected sidewalk/pathway and open space system which fully links with the greater FGA and the City as a whole. Specifically, the following roadways would not be developed under this alternative:

- Natividad Road (Major Arterial) expansion frontage improvements (proposed Class II bike lane);
- Russell Road (Major Arterial) expansion (proposed Class II Bike Lane); and
- Rogge Road frontage improvements.

Furthermore, the reduction in housing units under the Reduced Residential Intensity/Density Project Alternative would be less consistent than the project in meeting statewide legislative goals of building housing units in order to address the statewide housing crisis. Given the enormous unmet demand for housing in California, the City believes that it has an obligation to facilitate the construction of more, rather than fewer, housing units when opportunities for residential development arise.

The Smaller-scale Project Alternative would lessen many of the potentially significant environmental effects of the project. For example, some of the potentially significant impacts related to the following topics would be reduced or slightly reduced under this alternative: air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, greenhouse gases and climate change, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, transportation and circulation, and utilities. It is noted, however, that this alternative would also result in greater, slightly greater, or equal impacts as compared to the project in the following topics: air quality plan consistency, greenhouse gases and climate change, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, transportation and circulation, and utilities.

Ultimately, the significant and unavoidable environmental effects anticipated with the project would still occur under this Smaller-scale Project Alternative due to the location, size and scope of the alternative. The significant and unavoidable impacts may occur to a lesser extent under this alternative than under the project, but the impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. For example, a significant and unavoidable impact related to violation of an air quality standard would occur under both the project and the Smaller-scale Project Alternative. As shown in Table 5.0-7 of Chapter 5.0 of the Draft EIR, the Smaller-scale Project Alternative would exceed the threshold of significance for ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} at buildout. Although the emissions would be less than the proposed project, this alternative would also cause a violation of an air quality standard. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

The City Council finds the Smaller- scale Project Alternative to be infeasible for the above stated reasons, and rejects it as a viable alternative to the project.

XI. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, the City of Salinas's approval of the West Area Specific Plan will result in a significant adverse environmental effect that cannot be avoided even with the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures; and there are no feasible project alternatives that would mitigate or substantially lessen all of these impacts. Despite the occurrence of these effects, however, the City Council, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15093, chooses to approve the project because, in the Council's view, the economic, social, and other benefits that the project will produce will render the significant effects acceptable.

A. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The project will result in the following potentially significant and unavoidable impacts, even with the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures:

- **Air Quality Operation.** The Specific Plan would exceed the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) thresholds of significance for operations for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}, even after mitigation. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-19 through 3.1-23)
- **Cumulative Air Quality.** As is currently proposed, the Specific Plan is expected to be built out under a staged approach, and all mitigation would be applicable to each stage. However, even with the application of mitigation measures, operational emissions levels would remain above the defined thresholds of significance. Exceedance of the threshold within an area designated as nonattainment would be a cumulatively considerable impact. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-31 through 3.1-32)
- **Wildlife Movement and Corridors.** Development of the project would eliminate any movement habitat through the Specific Plan Area, along with any upland habitat adjacent to the movement corridors. There are no mitigation measures that can fully mitigate this impact and, given the fact that once the land is converted, it will no longer be a viable migration corridor for any species. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-46 through 3.2-47)
- **Cumulative Biological Resources.** Development of the project would eliminate any movement habitat through the Specific Plan Area, along with any upland habitat adjacent to the movement corridors. Given the rareness of CTS and CRLF in the Bioregion, the incremental loss of movement habitat from the project, when considered alongside all

past, present, and probable future projects (inclusive of all communities within the Bioregion), is a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact, and the Specific Plan's incremental contribution to this impact is itself cumulatively considerable. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-52 through 3.2-53)

- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** The project would generate GHG emissions, directly and indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. While mitigation measures would result in reduced GHGs, it is possible that individual projects within the Specific Plan Area may not achieve GHG reductions needed for their individual impacts to be less than significant. (DEIR, pp. 3.4-31 through 3.4-38)
- **Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** Implementation of the project will still generate GHG emissions that would not otherwise exist without the project. Given the length of construction activities for a project of this size, the construction emissions would be a long-term release of approximately 168,734.3 MT CO_2e. The operational emissions would be a long-term release totaling approximately 51,939.2 MT CO2e per year without mitigation, and 47,684.9MT CO_2e per year with mitigation. Because it is possible that individual projects within the Specific Plan Area may not achieve GHG reductions needed for their individual impacts to be less than significant, implementation of the Specific Plan would have a cumulatively considerable contribution and significant and unavoidable impact to GHGs. (DEIR, pp. 3.4-48 through 3.4-49)
- **Traffic Noise at Existing Receptors.** The project would cause increased noise levels exceeding the City of Salinas 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard at existing residential receptors. Additionally, traffic noise level increases would exceed the FICON CEQA substantial increase criteria of 1.5 to 5 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-14 through 3.7-23)
- **Cumulative Traffic Noise.** The project would cause increased noise levels exceeding the City of Salinas 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard at existing residential receptors. Therefore, there would be a cumulative exposure of existing and future noise-sensitive land uses to increased noise resulting from cumulative development. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-33 through 3.7-37)
- **School Facilities.** Project implementation may result in the need for the construction of new schools, which has the potential to cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts. Development of a school within the proposed Specific Plan Area would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality (Impacts 3.1-2, and 3.1-7), biological resources (Impacts 3.2-9 and 3.2-12), greenhouse gases (Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-4), noise (Impacts 3.7-1 and 3.7-8), and transportation and circulation (Impacts 3.10-3 and 3.10-4). (DEIR, pp. 3.9-19 through 3.9-21)
- **Park Facilities.** Project implementation may result in effects on parks, or require the construction of park facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impact. Development of 49.76 acres of park land within the Specific Plan Area would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality (Impacts 3.1-2 and 3.1-7), biological resources (Impacts 3.2-9 and 3.2-12), greenhouse gases (Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-4), noise (Impacts 3.7-1 and 3.7-8), and transportation and circulation (Impacts 3.10-3 and 3.10-4). (DEIR, pp. 3.9-22 through 3.9-23)
- **Cumulative Public Facilitates.** The construction and operation of future public facilities required to serve cumulative development (including the West Area Specific Plan Area) could potentially cause significant impacts. Cumulative development, including

additional parks, schools, library, and other public facilities within the city and service area, would contribute to significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts that have been identified within this EIR related to: air quality (Impact 3.1-7), biological resources (Impact 3.2-12), greenhouse gases (Impact 3.4-4), noise (Impact 3.7-8), and transportation and circulation (Impacts 3.10-3 and 3.10-4). (DEIR, pp. 3.9-24 through 3.9-26)

- **Cumulative Plus Project Traffic.** Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would conflict with the transportation performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans. (DEIR, pp. 3.10-63 through 3.10-70)
- **Cumulative Plus Central Area Specific Plan Plus Project Traffic.** Under Cumulative Plus Project with Central Area Specific Plan conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would with the transportation performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans (DEIR, pp. 3.10-76 through 3.10-81)

B. Overriding Considerations

In the City Council's judgment, the project and its benefits outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. The following statement identifies the specific reasons why, in the City Council's judgment, the benefits of the project as approved outweigh its unavoidable significant effects. Any one of these reasons is sufficient to justify approval of the project. Thus, even if a court were to conclude that not every reason is supported by substantial evidence, the City Council would stand by its determination that each individual reason is sufficient. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings, which are incorporated by reference into this section (XI), and in the documents found in the Record of Proceedings, as defined in section V.

1. The project will substantially expand employment opportunities for local residents.

It is anticipated that local employment would be increased to provide administrative, management, and retail services. The project is expected to require both full-time and part-time employees. It is anticipated that the employment growth would be met both by existing residents and through the attraction of new residents. Data from U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2018) indicates that the City has an unemployment rate of approximately 4.9%, as of November 2018, which is higher than the State and national averages at 4.2% and 3.7%, respectively (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018). Many of the newly created jobs are expected to be in the retail/commercial sector and would be opportunities well-suited for second wage earners in households, the younger workforce, and others, which generally depend on the local workforce. Due to the fact there is currently a surplus of unemployed workforce within the City, it is likely that current residents would fill the majority of new positions. Additional population growth induced by the creation of new businesses could be supported by the available housing within Salinas as well as new housing planned as part of the West Area Specific Plan.

The construction of new developments within the Specific Plan Area would increase temporary construction jobs in the area. New employment opportunities are critical to the residents of the

City as a basis to reduce the City's higher than average unemployment rate and to improve the balance between jobs and housing.

The creation of new jobs has a variety of other co-benefits that lead to improved quality of life. These benefits include enhancing overall economic activity in the City, which leads to increased revenue to fund and maintain city services and facilities such as public safety, parks, recreation centers and libraries and related programs that support a high quality of life. Benefits also include improving community health through crime reduction, improving economic productivity, decreasing traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the number of residents that must travel out of the city to find employment.

2. The project will help attract economic investment.

Currently, Salinas lags behind the region in private economic investment. This lack of investment can be quantified in terms of the number of building permits pulled and the associated building valuation. For example, from June 1, 2018 to June 21, 2019, 1,765 permits with a building valuation of approximately $5,116,481.85 were pulled in Salinas.[1] This is a fraction, 10.0 percent, of the private investment in the City of Monterey totaling a valuation of $51,289,904 (422 permits).[2] This is especially significant considering Salinas (162,797) has more than five times the population of the City of Monterey (28,448).

The project streamlines opportunities for economic investment in the City by positioning the Specific Plan Area for development. The project creates the land use and zoning entitlements and provides specific guidance about how development is to proceed needed to catalyze economic development in the form of individual development projects.

3. The project will generate sales and property taxes for the City.

The project will generate substantial sales tax revenue from the planned commercial and retail uses and property tax revenue from the planned residential uses. The City can use this revenue to fund City programs that benefit the City's residents. The project has been designated with land uses that are intended to generate jobs and tax revenue for the City, while providing recreational facilities, retail opportunities, and housing opportunities.

4. The project will help improve the quality of life for City residents.

The City is experiencing significant retail leakage to surrounding communities and the region resulting in the loss of sales tax revenue. The 2008 Buxton Retail Leakage and Surplus Analysis, estimated that as much as $250 million in annual retail sales could be recaptured by the City through targeted retail development which offers goods and services now sought from businesses located outside the City. The City's total revenue per capita figures demonstrate the impacts of this leakage. In 2016, Salinas' total revenue per capita was $752 dollars compared to Monterey at $2,224 dollars per capita. (California Controller, 2016)

[1] CRW Systems. City of Salinas Permits Issued for the Period 6/1/2018 thru 6/1/2019. Provided by Kristy Parker, City of Salinas Permit Center Coordinator, on June 24, 2019.
[2] City of Monterey Permits Issued for the Period 6/1/2018 thru 6/1/2019. Provided by Lisa Feliciano, City of Monterey Permit Inspection Services Division, on June 14, 2018.

The project would include a central core area with retail and professional services. The retail and professional service uses would help increase annual retail sales and reduce retail leakage. Residents of the Specific Plan Area and the surrounding City and unincorporated areas could shop at the planned core area retail and professional service facilities located within the central core area.

The Specific Plan focuses on individual neighborhoods, parks, schools, and other civic gathering spaces; the tree-lined streets with pedestrian amenities; a Main Street and Town Square surrounded by shops and restaurants; and mixing of land uses that encourages residents to frequently walk and bicycle in their community. The Specific Plan also contains goals and policies which require and/or encourage the necessary services to enhance residents' quality of life. The Specific Plan includes design and management strategies that aim to specifically increase the quality of life for the future residents and employees of the Specific Plan Area. For example, the Specific Plan includes sections regarding traffic calming and landscaping in order to create safe and attractive streets, parks, and landscaped areas.

Quality of life is also an important factor in the ability of the City to attract and retain businesses. The Specific Plan addresses improving safety, improving access to open space and recreational opportunities, and the adequate provision of public services. If currently unemployed residents become employed and increase their earnings through new businesses resulting from development of the Specific Plan, it is expected that their income level and standard of living will improve.

5. The project will revitalize the local infrastructure.

The proposed Specific Plan circulation and infrastructure policies promote investment in infrastructure systems including water supply, wastewater and storm drainage conveyance and disposal facilities that are critical to support the proposed uses. Section 7.3.4.1 of the Specific Plan outlines the Public Facilities Impact Fee program. Section 7.5 of the Specific Plan includes funding policies that will govern the funding of infrastructure and public facilities for the Specific Plan Area.

6. The project will implement the Salinas General Plan.

The Specific Plan will serve as a bridge between the Salinas General Plan and individual development applications in the Specific Plan Area, applying—and adding greater specificity to—the goals, policies and concepts of the General Plan for that area. The Specific Plan provides a complete blueprint for development of the Specific Plan Area, including:

- A description of proposed land uses,
- Policies, regulations and standards to support the Specific Plan,
- Infrastructure needed to support the Specific Plan, and
- Implementation and administrative processes needed for plan development.

The Specific Plan has been crafted to be consistent with overall community goals as expressed in the General Plan, as well as more specific policies and implementation measures contained in other documents.

The 2002 General Plan identifies areas for growth within the FGAs (which includes the Specific Plan Area). The Salinas General Plan Land Use Table LU-3 identifies the development capacity of the FGAs. This includes 15,873 residential units, resulting in an additional population of 58,253 within the City's FGAs. The proposed West Area Specific Plan development proposes 4,340 units with the potential to increase the population of the city by an estimated 16,101 persons, which is within the projections identified in the Salinas General Plan.

Additionally, the General Plan identified FGAs as areas of the City where future urban development will be directed. FGAs are established as a part of the General Plan maps, and include the Specific Plan Area, as well as other nearby areas. The General Plan provides development guidance within the FGAs so that they are developed as urban neighborhoods using the principles of New Urbanism. The principles of new urbanist design are further detailed in Chapter 37 (Zoning) of the City's Municipal Code. The Specific Plan Area is currently designated New Urbanism Interim (NI) by the City's zoning map**.** The purpose of the NI zoning district is to provide a transitional zone for the FGAs of the City located north of East Boronda Road (including the Specific Plan Area) that are within the City limits and are subject to the preparation of specific plans and subsequent subdivision maps.

The New Urbanism Districts promote the principles of New Urbanism and the creation of distinct identifiable neighborhoods that have Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) characteristics as expressed in the Salinas General Plan and that are intended to guide the development of the North of Boronda FGA. The FGA is also subject to a Specific Plan Overlay. The Overlay requires that a Specific Plan be approved by the City prior to the development of any land located in the FGA. As such, an approved Specific Plan will ultimately regulate the development in the FGA. The New Urbanism districts identified in the City's zoning code and the West Area Specific Plan are as follows: Neighborhood Edge/Low Density Residential (NE), Neighborhood General 1/Medium Density Residential (NG-1), Neighborhood General 2/High Density Residential (NG-2), and Village Center (VC).

The development allowed by the project will be consistent with the development types and intensities identified in the General Plan and its associated Final Program EIR. The project does not change limits, amount, type, or intensity of development allowed in the Plan Area beyond what was analyzed in the certified Final Program EIR for the General Plan and Supplemental EIR for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR (SCH#2007031055).

7. The project will provide much-needed housing.

One of the core goals of the Specific Plan is to provide a variety of low-density, medium-density, and high-density housing and a variety of housing options for residents at various life stages. As emphasized earlier, the State Legislature has declared that "California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions. The consequences of failing to effectively and aggressively confront this crisis are hurting millions of Californians, robbing future generations of the chance to call California home, stifling economic opportunities for workers and

businesses, worsening poverty and homelessness, and undermining the state's environmental and climate objectives." (Government Code section 65589.5.) The Legislature notes that "California housing has become the most expensive in the nation. The excessive cost of the state's housing supply is partially caused by activities and policies of many local governments that limit the approval of housing, increase the cost of land for housing, and require that high fees and exactions be paid by producers of housing." The Legislature further found that "Among the consequences of those actions are discrimination against low-income and minority households, lack of housing to support employment growth, imbalance in jobs and housing, reduced mobility, urban sprawl, excessive commuting, and air quality deterioration." The legislative intent of Government Code section 65589.5 is to "significantly increase the approval and construction of new housing for all economic segments of California's communities by meaningfully and effectively curbing the capability of local governments to deny, reduce the density for, or render infeasible housing development projects and emergency shelters. That intent has not been fulfilled." The State Legislature established its policy direction in the statute as follows: "It is the policy of the state that this section should be interpreted and implemented in a manner to afford the fullest possible weight to the interest of, and the approval and provision of, housing."

The City of Salinas has recognized the need for additional housing supply for its citizens for many decades. The project will provide much-needed housing in an area of the City that has been recognized and planned for future growth.

C. Conclusion

As explained above, the City Council has balanced these benefits and considerations against the significant unavoidable environmental effects of the project and has concluded that the impacts are outweighed by these benefits, among others. After balancing environmental costs against project benefits, the City Council has concluded that the benefits the City of Salinas community and economy will derive from the project outweigh the risks. The City Council believes the project benefits outlined above override the significant and unavoidable environmental costs associated with the project.

Attachment

Impacts, Mitigation Measures and CEQA Findings Summary Table

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
AIR QUALITY			
Impact 3.1-1: The project has the potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (Less than Significant) AMBAG, in consultation with the City of Salinas, included the North of Boronda Future Growth Area (inclusive of the West Area Specific Plan) within the AMBAG 2018 Regional Growth Forecast. The 2018 Regional Growth Forecast provides the region's population, housing, and employment forecasts for inclusion for AMBAG's 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) as well as for the future version of the AQMP. The City of Salinas has worked closely with AMBAG to ensure that City population estimates are included within AMBAG's 2018 Regional Growth Forecast, which will feed into the next AQMP. The population estimates for the West Area Specific Plan are included in these growth forecasts. As such, the City has met the action recommended by MBARD in the *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines* (MBARD, 2008a) to ensure consistency with the applicable air quality plan (i.e. "*Ensure that the jurisdiction's population forecasts are updated in the next AQMP by working with AMBAG or the appropriate local agency*."). The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the latest air quality plan. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-18 through 3.1-19)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.1-2: Project operation has the potential to cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (Potentially Significant) Buildout of the Plan Area is expected to exceed some of the MBARD operational criteria pollutant emissions thresholds, as modelled. Mitigation measures are provided below to reduce emissions to the maximum extent feasible. Upon full buildout, the Specific Plan would exceed the MBARD thresholds of significance for operations	**Mitigation Measure 3.1-1:** Prior to approval of development review permits including tentative maps, the project applicant(s) shall incorporate the following features into project plans and specifications, as directed by the City of Salinas: • Provide traffic calming measures wherever feasible, within the Specific Plan Area; • Provide preferential carpool/vanpool parking spaces;	SU	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment. Even so, the effects remain significant and unavoidable, and no additional mitigation is available to fully avoid the effects. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.1-1 through 3.1-8, the Specific Plan would exceed the MBARD thresholds of significance for operations for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}. Therefore, the impact is significant and unavoidable. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10}, even after mitigation. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-19 through 3.1-23)	• Provide electric-vehicle parking spaces; • Require the use of low-VOC paint for all new building architectural coatings within the Specific Plan Area, consistent with or better than, what is required by the City's Municipal Code. **Mitigation Measure 3.1-2:** Prior to approval of development review permit(s), the project applicant(s) shall incorporate effective methods to encourage the use of cleaner alternative fuel vehicles and carpooling within the Specific Plan Area. Effective methods may include the installation of alternative fuel (e.g. electric) charging stations at locations spaced throughout the Specific Plan Area, consistent with or better than what is required by the City's Municipal Code and Specific Plan. Additionally, this can be achieved by providing preferential parking for alternatively-powered vehicles, including electric cars, and/or by providing carpool/vanpool parking spaces. **Mitigation Measure 3.1-3:** Prior to approval of development review permit(s), the project applicant(s) shall incorporate the use of alternative energy for the residential and mixed-use/commercial developments, including by implementing alternative energy (e.g. PV solar) building requirements, consistent with or better than, what is required by the City's Municipal Code. Project applicant(s) shall also ensure that pre-installed electrical hookups and/or charging stations, as applicable, are incorporated into all project plans and specifications. **Mitigation Measure 3.1-4:** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant(s) shall provide plans that demonstrate that low-flow (high-efficiency) indoor water fixtures will be installed throughout the Specific Plan Area, including for bathroom and kitchen faucets, toilet fixtures, and showers, in both residential and non-residential buildings, in compliance with or better than the standards required within the most recent version of the California Green Building Standards Code. **Mitigation Measure 3.1-5:** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant(s) shall provide plans that demonstrate that water-		outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	efficient irrigation systems will be installed throughout the Specific Plan Area, consistent with or better than the requirements contained within the State's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, the City's Water Conservation Ordinance and the Salinas Zoning Code Landscaping and Irrigation requirements. **Mitigation Measure 3.1-6:** Prior to approval of improvement plans or development review permits, as applicable, the project applicant(s) shall ensure that pedestrian/bicycle facilities (e.g. pedestrian paths, outdoor bike racks, etc.) are provided within the Specific Plan Area, in coordination with and subject to approval by the City of Salinas. The project proponent shall also provide bicycling parking near the entrance to commercial establishments within the Specific Plan Area, consistent with or better than the requirements contained within the City's Municipal Code. **Mitigation Measure 3.1-7:** Prior to the issuance of development review permit(s), the project applicant(s) shall incorporate of one or more of the following additional Specific Plan Area requirements, as determined by the City of Salinas: • Install secured bicycle storage facilities (bike lockers, cages, interior space, or similar as approved by the City Engineer) at all commercial and public facilities with 50 employees or more; • Incorporate a park-and-ride lot; • Install Level 2 electric vehicle (EV) charge stations at workplace sites with 50 or more employees (10% of total available parking spaces); and • Install publicly-available dual post Level 2 charge within commercial zones, and/or other zones as deemed acceptable by the City of Salinas. (Note: The 'level' of the charging station refers to the voltage that the electric vehicle charger uses. Level 1 charging is your typical traditional home outlet, while level 2 is a 240 Volt Portable Cordset or Wall-		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	mounted Charging Station (2-10 hours charging). **Mitigation Measure 3.1-8**: Prior to the approval of individual phases (i.e. tentative maps, commercial design review, etc.), the project applicant(s) shall develop an offsite mitigation program that provides funding to offset the project-generated air emissions that are still above the Air District's operational criteria pollutant thresholds after the adoption of other applicable air quality mitigation measures. The offsite mitigation program is subject to the review and approval of the Air District and the City of Salinas on a project-by-project basis (of phase-by-phase), and is intended to be in addition to offsets that are obtained through any on-site mitigation measures. Example projects that could be included in the offsite mitigation program may include, but are not limited to, the following: • Replace existing agricultural combustion-based generators/pumps with electric agricultural water pumps (in place of generators/pumps; • Replace combustion school buses with electric school buses within the local community; • Install adaptive traffic control systems; • Install solar photovoltaic (PV) systems.		
Impact 3.1-3: Project construction has the potential to cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (Potentially Significant) The Specific Plan maximum daily unmitigated emissions during construction of the Plan Area buildout in a single year is not expected to exceed the MBARD threshold of significance (82 pounds per day) for construction-generated PM_{10}. Nevertheless, since it is possible that future development proposed within the Plan Area could involve grading that exceeds 2.2 acres per day, MBARD recommends the implementation Mitigation Measure 3.1-9. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-23 through 3.1-25)	**Mitigation Measure 3.1-9**: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall prepare a grading plan subject to review and approval by the City. In the event that ground-disturbance exceeds 2.2 acres per day for initial site preparation activities that involve extensive earth-moving activities (e.g., grubbing, excavation, rough grading), and 8.1 acres per day for activities that involve minimal earth-moving (e.g., finish grading), the required grading plans shall include the following measures to be implemented as needed to prevent visible dust emissions: • Water all active construction sites to prevent visible dust emissions. Frequency should be based on the type of operation, soil, and wind exposure; • Prohibit grading and earthmoving	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.1-9 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.1-9 requires preparation of a grading plan with measures to prevent visible dust emissions. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-9 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	activities, and cover stock piles, during periods of high wind (over 15 mph); • Limit vehicle speed on construction sites to 15 mph. • Apply chemical soil stabilizers on inactive construction areas (disturbed lands within construction projects that are unused for at least four consecutive days); • Apply non-toxic binders (e.g., latex acrylic copolymer) to exposed areas after cut and fill operations and hydroseed area; • Maintain at least 1-foot of freeboard in each haul truck; • Provide windbreaks on the windward perimeter of construction projects where adjacent to open land; • Cover inactive storage piles; • Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site; and/or • Post a publicly visible sign written in English and Spanish which specifies the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) shall be visible to ensure compliance with Rule 402 (Nuisance). The sign shall be in accordance with MBARD and/or City requirements, as applicable; • Use cleaner construction equipment that conforms to EPA's Tier 3 or Tier 4 emission standards; and/or • Further, where feasible construction should include the use of alternative fuels such as compressed natural gas (CNG), propane, electricity or biodiesel.		
Impact 3.1-4: The proposed project has the potential to have carbon monoxide hotspot impacts (Less Than Significant) This project is located in an area that is designated	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
attainment-unclassified for carbon monoxide. Therefore, no project-level conformity analysis is necessary for CO. Substantial concentrations of carbon monoxide are not expected at or along any streets or intersections affected by the development of the Plan Area. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-25 and 3.1-26)			
Impact 3.1-5: The proposed project has the potential for public exposure to toxic air contaminants (Potentially Significant) While implementation of the West Area Specific Plan, in and of itself, would not result in an increased exposure of sensitive receptors to localized concentrations of TACs, there is a potential for future commercial business activity, as permitted under the West Area Specific Plan, to result in increased exposure of sensitive receptors to localized concentrations of TACs. The emission sources could be stationary sources and/or mobile source (i.e. diesel truck traffic). Because, at the Specific Plan level of land use planning, the City does not yet know the precise locations, configurations, and sizes of any future land uses within the Specific Plan that uses may generate sufficient levels of TACs to create the possibility of adverse health effects, it is premature, at the Specific Plan stage, to undertake an overall health risk assessment for the Specific Plan. Future health risk assessments will be performed where warranted, as required by Mitigation Measure 3.1-10. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-26 through 3.1-30)	**Mitigation Measure 3.1-10:** Prior to issuance of building permits or commencing operation of any commercial building/use that would emit toxic air contaminants (such as gas stations or dry cleaning operations), the project applicant shall, at a minimum, perform prioritization screening in accordance with the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program, Facility Prioritization Guidelines (July 1990) and the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act. The prioritization screening shall be performed in accordance with the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association Air Toxic "Hot Spots" Program guidance. The prioritization screening shall also be conducted consistent with the guidance provided by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District, which will be responsible for determining which facilities based on their prioritization screening score, must perform a health risk assessment. In determining the need to prepare a health risk assessment, the Monterey Bay Air Resources District considers the potency, toxicity, quantity, and volume of hazardous materials released from the facility, the proximity of the facility to potential receptors, and any other factors specific to the facility that indicate that it may pose a significant health risk. If a health risk assessment is warranted for a facility based on its prioritization score, the project applicant shall assess the facilities for the potential to expose the public to toxic air contaminants in excess of the applicable thresholds (utilizing an air dispersion modelling program such as AERMOD). As of the time of this writing, the commonly accepted threshold for cancer risk is 10 in a million for carcinogens, and the reference exposure level for non-carcinogens (HI = 1). Facilities that exceed the applicable threshold(s) have the potential to expose the public to toxic air contaminants levels that would be considered significant. Facilities that exceed the applicable threshold(s) must incorporate mitigation to reduce the risks from emission of toxic air contaminants to an acceptable level (i.e.,	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.1-10 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.1-10 requires performance of a prioritization screening in accordance with the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program, Facility Prioritization Guidelines (July 1990) and the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-10 would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	to a level that does not exceed the applicable threshold[s]). Potential mitigation includes: reducing the size of the facility area; rearranging the site to reduce the potential for impacts on the nearest sensitive receptors; and utilizing products that reduce the level of toxic air contaminants, or removal of such products from the operational phase of the project.		
Impact 3.1-6: The proposed project has the potential for exposure to odors (Less than Significant) The Specific Plan does not propose sensitive receptors that could be exposed to odors in the vicinity; nor does it propose uses that would create odors that could expose receptors in the area. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in significant objectionable odors. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-30 and 3.1-31)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.1-7: Cumulative impact on the region's air quality (Potentially Significant) As discussed under Impact 3.1-2, implementation of the Specific Plan would result in increased emissions primarily from vehicle miles travelled associated with project implementation and area sources. The MBARD has established operations-related emissions thresholds of significance and it was determined that the Specific Plan annual emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} at full buildout would exceed the MBARD's thresholds of significance for these pollutants, even with mitigation. As is currently proposed, the Specific Plan is expected to be built out under a staged approach, and all mitigation would be applicable to each stage. However, even with the application of mitigation measures, operational emissions levels would remain above the defined thresholds of significance. Exceedance of the threshold within an area designated as nonattainment would be a cumulatively considerable impact. (DEIR, pp. 3.1-31 and 3.1-32)	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.1-1 through 3.1-9.	CS and SU	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment. Even so, the effects remain significant and unavoidable, and no additional mitigation is available to fully avoid the effects. The City Council has directed that Mitigation Measures 3.1-1 through 3.1-9 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.1-1 through 3.1-9, which have been required or incorporated into the Project, will substantially lessen the severity of the significant effect, but will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. No mitigation is available to render the effects less than significant. The effects therefore remain significant and unavoidable. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
Impact 3.2-1: The proposed project has the potential to, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS - Invertebrates (Less Than Significant) Based on field surveys, habitat conditions, and records searches, there are no special status invertebrate species that have the potential to be present within the Specific Plan Area. The proposed project would not, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect on invertebrate species through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-30)			
Impact 3.2-2: The proposed project has the potential to, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS - Reptile and Amphibian (Potentially Significant) There are numerous locations for refugia (debris, burrows, crevices, barns, sheds, etc.) within the Plan Area that could be used by migrating California tiger salamander (CTS). Higher quality upland habitat is found to the east; however, the Specific Plan Area cannot be completely discounted as having potential refuge sites. It is noted that there is not any known CTS taking refuge in the Specific Plan Area during their estivation period. It is also theoretically possible that a breeding CTS would emerge from the breeding basin and migrate west of Natividad Road to find refugia in the Specific Plan Area. The areas with potential upland habitat in the Specific Plan Area include the farmland fringe, irrigation ditch, roadside ditch, and farmland residence. The paved roads, dirt roads, and tilled farmland provide	**Mitigation Measure 3.2-1:** Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, the project applicant, assisted by a qualified biologist, shall consult with the USFWS and CDFW to obtain the appropriate regulatory approvals and authorizations regarding CTS. This is may, or may not, include the need to submit an application for incidental take to both the USFWS (Section 7 Consultation) and CDFW (2081 incidental take permit). If either USFWS, CDFW, or the City's Community Development Director determines that an incidental take permit is required, the project applicant shall obtain such a permit before engaging in any grading or other site-treatment activities in areas deemed to be viable CTS habitat. **Mitigation Measure 3.2-2:** Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, in order to avoid and minimize impacts to California tiger salamander, the proposed project activities shall be compliant with all Avoidance and Minimization Measures imposed by the USFWS and/or CDFW during Construction Activities. Examples of standard avoidance and minimization measures include: 1) conducting environmental education training for all construction personnel, 2) having a biologist with a scientific collecting permit for CTS to be	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.2-1 through 3.2-4 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.2-1 would ensure a final concurrence is obtained from the regulatory agencies to ensure that there is no illegal take for CTS even though they are well documented as a hybrid population. Mitigation Measure 3.2-2 would require activities to avoid and minimize impacts to CTS to the extent feasible. Mitigation Measure 3.2-3 would ensure a final concurrence is obtained from the regulatory agencies to ensure that there is no illegal take for CRLF. Mitigation Measure 3.2-4 would require activities to avoid and minimize impacts to CRLF to the extent feasible. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
limited habitat because of the frequency of disturbance in these areas. Given that the entire Specific Plan Area is within the 1.3-mile migration radius, and there is potential aquatic breeding and upland habitat, the proposed project will affect this breeding population of CTS. There are numerous documented occurrences of California red-legged frog (CRLF) in the vicinity of the Specific Plan Area. Higher quality upland and aquatic habitat is found to the east; however, the Specific Plan Area cannot be completely discounted as having potential habitat within the drainage features (i.e. ditches). It is noted that there is not any known CRLF within the Specific Plan Area. The foothill yellow-legged frog (FYLF) is not documented in the vicinity of the Specific Plan Area. The ditches within the Specific Plan Area provide some limited habitat for FYLF. This species is known to occur in aquatic habitats, such as creeks or rivers in woodland, forest, mixed chaparral, and wet meadow habitats with rock and gravel substrate and low overhanging vegetation along the edge. They are usually found near riffles with rocks and sunny banks nearby. The conditions of the Plan Area, including the drainages, are not ideal for this species and they are presumed absent. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-30 through 3.2-38)	responsible for overseeing any hand excavation of burrows using hand-trowels and spades per the regulatory agency protocols, 3) erecting drift fencing around the work areas if occurring during the migration/breeding season, 4) inspection of drift fencing by biologist with a scientific collecting permit every 72 hours during the migration/breeding season 5) installation of pit traps to capture CTS migrating during the rain events with a check twice daily (morning prior to construction start and evening after construction ends), 6) relocation of any CTS found immediately to a site designated by the USFWS and CDFW per protocol; and 7) post construction report. **Mitigation Measure 3.2-3:** Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, the project applicant, assisted by a qualified biologist, shall consult with the USFWS and CDFW to obtain the appropriate regulatory approvals and authorizations regarding CRLF. This may, or may not, include the need to submit an application for incidental take to both the USFWS (Section 7 Consultation) and CDFW (2081 incidental take permit). If either USFWS, CDFW, or the City's Community Development Director determines that an incidental take permit is required, the project applicant shall obtain such a permit before engaging in any grading or other site-treatment activities in areas deemed to be viable CRLF habitat. **Mitigation Measure 3.2-4:** Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, in order to avoid and minimize impacts to CRLF, the proposed project activities shall be compliant with all Avoidance and Minimization Measures imposed by the USFWS and CDFW during Construction Activities. Examples of standard avoidance and minimization measures include: 1) conducting environmental education training for all construction personnel, 2) having a biologist with a scientific collecting permit for CRLF to be responsible for overseeing any hand excavation of burrows using hand-trowels and spades per the regulatory agency protocols, 3) erecting drift fencing around the work areas if occurring during the migration/breeding season, 4) inspection of drift fencing by biologist with a scientific collecting permit every 72 hours during the migration/breeding season 5) installation of pit		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	traps to capture CRLF migrating during the rain events with a check twice daily (morning prior to construction start and evening after construction ends), 6) relocation of any CRLF found immediately to a site designated by the USFWS and CDFW per protocol; and 7) post construction report.		
Impact 3.2-3: The proposed project has the potential to, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS - Birds (Potentially Significant) Construction activities in the Specific Plan Area would create temporary sources of noise and light that could affect nesting songbirds if they are located adjacent to the Specific Plan Area in the future. The ongoing activities associated with the operational phase (i.e., human and/or domesticated animal presence, light, noise, etc.) could disrupt nesting birds if they are located adjacent to the Specific Plan Area in the future. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-38 through 3.2-40)	**Mitigation Measure 3.2-5:** Building and grading permits and plans issued for development in the Specific Plan Area shall note the following: If construction activities occur during the avian breeding season (February 1 – September 15) then the project proponent shall conduct pre-construction surveys to prevent impacts to nesting birds. No more than 15 days prior to the start of construction a bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to identify any active nests within 300 feet of the construction zone, and shall be submitted to the City. If construction stops for a period of 15 days or more during the avian breeding season than an additional bird survey shall be conducted. The biologist will conduct a survey within 300 feet of the construction zone for all special-status birds protected by the federal and state ESA, MBTA and CFGC. The biologist shall map all nests that are within, and visible from, 300 feet of the construction zone. If nests are identified, the biologist shall map the location and establish a minimum 300-foot buffer zone around active nests. Construction activity shall be prohibited within the buffer zones until the young have fledged. Nests shall be monitored at least twice per week during the nesting season and a report submitted to the City and CDFW monthly.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.2-1 through 3.2-5 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.2-5 would ensure a final concurrence is obtained from the regulatory agencies to ensure that there is no illegal take for CRLF. Mitigation Measure 3.2-4 requires a preconstruction survey of the Plan Area and immediate vicinity for all special-status birds protected by the federal and state ESA, MBTA and CFGC prior to construction. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.2-4: The proposed project has the potential to, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS - Fish (Less Than Significant) field surveys, habitat conditions, and records searches, there are no fish species that have the potential to be present within the Specific Plan Area. The proposed project would not, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect on fish	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
species through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-41)			
Impact 3.2-5: The proposed project has the potential to, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS - Mammals (Potentially Significant) The Specific Plan Area provides potential habitat for several special-status bats, including: Mexican free-tailed bat (*Tadarida brasiliensis),* California mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*), big brown bat (*Eptesicus fuscus),* Hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus),* spotted bat (*Euderma maculatum),* Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii),* pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), western pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus Hesperus),* small-footed myotis/bat (*Myotis ciliolabrum*), long-eared myotis/bat (*Myotis evotis*), California myotis (*Myotis californicus),* long-legged myotis/bat (*Myotis volans*), Yuma myotis/bat (*Myotis yumanensis*), and little brown bat *(Myotis lucifugus).* These species are not federal or State listed; however, most of them are considered California Species of Special Concern and/or are tracked by the CNDDB. Bats are found in a variety of habitats in the region, including buildings, bridges, mines, caves, tree cavities, under bark or rocks, etc. There is the potential for bats to roost in the two on-site farmland residence complexes along San Juan Grade Road, and/or the complexes located along Natividad Road. There is no evidence that bats are present in these locations at this time; however, they can become occupied at some future date. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-41 through 3.2-43)	**Mitigation Measure 3.2-6:** Grading and/or building permits and plans issued for development in the Specific Plan Area shall note the following: Fifteen days prior to construction activities within 200 feet of the residential complexes located along Natividad Road and San Juan Grade Road, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist familiar with bat biology to perform a preconstruction survey for roosting special-status bats; and shall be submitted to the City. The survey shall include a minimum of one daytime and one evening survey. The survey shall cover the trees, structures, and debris located within these complexes. If active roosting is observed, removal of the tree or building shall be avoided until the bats can be excluded. All active non-maternity roosting sites shall be fitted with passive exclusion devices, such as one-way flaps or doors, and all bats shall be allowed to leave voluntarily. Once it is confirmed that all bats have left the roost (minimum of five days), crews shall be allowed to continue work in the area. If a maternity roosting site is discovered, a minimum 50-foot buffer shall be established around the roost. The project applicant shall consult with the qualified biologist in order to determine if a greater buffer is warranted based on the bat species, roost location, and specific construction activities to be performed in the vicinity. The buffer shall stay in effect until all young are determined to be volant (i.e., able to fly and feed independently) by a qualified biologist. Once it is determined that all young are volant (generally by August 1st), passive exclusion devices shall be installed and all bats shall be allowed to leave voluntarily. Once it is determined by a qualified biologist that all bats have left the roost (minimum of five days), crews shall be allowed to work within the buffer zone. Project Improvement Plans will include this measure as a note in the plans.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.2-6 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.2-6 requires avoidance and minimization measures to avoid impacts to bat species. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact 3.2-6: The proposed project has the potential to, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS – Plants (Less Than Significant) The records search identified numerous special-status plants located within the region. Field surveys and habitat evaluations were performed in 2004 by Biotic Resources Group: March (26th and 31st), April (14th and 30th), May (17th), June (17th), July (26th). Additional field surveys were performed by De Novo Planning Group in 2015 September (11th) and in 2016 (April 18th). The collection of field surveys included surveys that coincided with the blooming period for special many status plants known to occur within the region. The conditions of the Specific Plan Area are highly disturbed due to the active agricultural operations. No special-status plants were observed within the Specific Plan Area during field surveys. The proposed project would not, directly or indirectly, have a substantial adverse effect on plant species through habitat modifications or reductions, cause populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, substantially eliminate a community, or substantially reduce the number of, or restrict the range of, an endangered, rare or threatened species, including those considered candidate, sensitive, or special status in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-43)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.2-7: The proposed project has the potential to have substantial adverse effect on federally - or state-protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means (Potentially Significant) The Specific Plan Area contains a roadside ditch located along the north side of East Boronda Road. The ditch was constructed to support agricultural operations, and drains agricultural runoff from most of the Specific Plan Area into the existing City storm water drainage system	**Mitigation Measure 3.2-7**: Prior to grading/building permit issuance in an area that would disturb the irrigation ditches and/or roadside ditches, the project applicant shall obtain a jurisdictional determination from the USACE and CDFW for the ditches that are proposed to be disturbed. If these regulatory agencies concur that these facilities are exempt, then no further mitigation is necessary. If it is determined that these facilities are not exempt, authorization for fill from the regulatory agencies (USACE-404 permit, RWQCB-401 certification, 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement) will be	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.2-7 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.2-7 requires a 1:1 replacement of acreage and function of all wetlands and other waters that would be removed, lost, or degraded as a result of project implementation or operations. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
The USACE has regulatory responsibility for navigable waters as well as "all other waters such as...streams ...wetlands...and natural ponds, the use, degradation or destruction of which could affect interstate or foreign commerce" (33 CFR 323.2) under Section 404 of the CWA. A formal jurisdictional determination must be made by the USACE relative to the protected wetlands and jurisdictional waters within the Specific Plan Area. The agricultural irrigation ditches are manmade and believed to solely function to drain upland agricultural runoff. As such, they are expected to be exempted from the USACE jurisdiction under the Irrigation Ditch Exemption pursuant to Federal Regulations (33 CFR 323.4(a)(3)). However, a final determination must be made by the USACE prior to any filling of these ditches for urban use. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-43 through 3.2-45)	necessary and a permit shall be adhered to throughout the construction phase. At a minimum, the project applicant shall replace on a "no net loss" basis (minimum 1:1 ratio) the acreage and function of all wetlands and other waters that would be removed, lost, or degraded as a result of project implementation or operations, although a higher mitigation measure may be required by the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW through their permitting processes. Wetland habitat shall be replaced at acreage and location agreeable to the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW and as determined during the Section 401, 404, and 1600 permitting processes.		
Impact 3.2-8: The proposed project has the potential to have substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Less Than Significant) The records search and field surveys did not reveal the presence of any riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities within the Specific Plan Area. The conditions of the Specific Plan Area are highly disturbed due to the active agricultural operations. The proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW or UFWSF. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-45 and 3.2-46)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.2-9: The proposed project has the potential to interfere substantially with the movement of native fish or wildlife species or with established wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites (Potentially Significant) The proposed project has the potential to interfere substantially with the movement of native fish or wildlife species or with established wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Development of the proposed project would eliminate any movement habitat through the Specific Plan Area, along with any upland habitat adjacent to the movement corridors. (DEIR, pp.	No mitigation measures are feasible.	CS and SU	The EIR identified no mitigation measures to address this particular significant effect on the environment. Thus, the effect remains significant and unavoidable, and no mitigation is available to substantially lessen or avoid the effect. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
3.2-46 through 3.2-47)			
Impact 3.2-10: The proposed project has the potential to conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan (Less Than Significant) The proposed project is not subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-47)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.2-11: The proposed project has the potential to conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (Less Than Significant) The proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project proponent is required to comply with the provisions of the City's General Plan and Municipal Code. The proposed project is generally consistent with the above relevant open space and conservation policies of the General Plan, as well as the City's Municipal Code. (DEIR, pp. 3.2-47 through 3.2-52)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.2-12: Cumulative loss of biological resources including habitats and special status species (Potentially Significant) The project would result in impacts to biological resources including habitats and special status species. Development of the proposed project would eliminate any movement habitat through the Specific Plan Area, along with any upland habitat adjacent to the movement corridors. Given the rareness of CTS and CRLF in the Bioregion, the incremental loss of movement habitat from the proposed project, when considered alongside all past, present, and probable future projects (inclusive of all communities within the Bioregion), is a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact, and the Specific Plan's incremental contribution to this impact is itself cumulatively considerable**.** (DEIR, pp. 3.2-52 and 3.2-53)	No mitigation measures are feasible.	CS and SU	The EIR identified no mitigation measures to address this particular significant effect on the environment. Thus, the effect remains significant and unavoidable, and no mitigation is available to substantially lessen or avoid the effect. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.
CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES			
Impact 3.3-1: Project implementation may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines	**Mitigation Measure 3.3-1:** In the event that evidence of archaeological or historical features or deposits (e.g., ceramic shard, trash scatters,	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
§15064.5 (Potentially Significant) No historical resources were found during field surveys for the proposed project. Additionally, there are no historical resources that have been identified in the Specific Plan Area on maps and files maintained by the Northwest Information Center (NWIC). There have been three previous cultural resource studies that examined approximately three-quarters of the Specific Plan Area and no historical resources were documented. The Monterey County Historic Property Data File Directory and National Register of Historic Resources do not list any historical resources in the Specific Plan Area. It is not anticipated that ground disturbing activities would result in impacts to historical resources given that none are believed to be present. However, as with most projects in California that involve ground disturbing activities, there is the potential for discovery of a previously unknown historical resource. Project implementation may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. (DEIR, pp. 3.3-12 and 3.3-13)	lithic scatters) are uncovered (discovered) during excavation and/or grading, all work shall stop in the area of the subject property until an appropriate data recovery program can be developed and implemented by a qualified archaeologist. This archaeologist shall determine whether the uncovered deposits or features qualify as either "historical resources" within the meaning of CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, subdivision (a), "unique archaeological resources" as defined in Public Resources Code section 21083.2, subdivision (g), or "tribal cultural resources," as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074. If historical resources, unique archaeological resources, or tribal cultural resources are present, the project proponent shall preserve any such resources or implement any feasible mitigation measures identified by the archaeologist and imposed by the City. Recommended mitigation measures shall be reviewed by the City Planner and shall be approved if feasible in light of project design, logistics, and cost considerations and, if approved, shall be implemented and completed prior to commencing further work for which grading or building permits were issued, unless otherwise directed by the City Planner. Data recovery shall be an option if preservation in place is infeasible. Where resources have been determined to be "unique archaeological resources" but not "historical resources" or "tribal cultural resources," the project proponent's obligations shall be limited as set forth in Public Resources Code section 21083.2, subdivisions (d), (e), and (f). Grading/building permits and plans shall note this measure.		The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 requires work to stop if an archaeological or historical feature or deposit is found during construction, as well as steps to follow once construction has stopped. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.3-2: Project implementation may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (Potentially Significant) No archaeological resources were found during field surveys for the proposed project. Additionally, no archaeological resources have been identified in the Plan Area on maps and files maintained by the NWIC. There have been three previous cultural resource studies that examined approximately three-quarters of the Specific Plan Area and no archaeological resources were documented. The Monterey County Historic Property Data File Directory and National Register of Historic	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.3-1	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 requires work to stop if an archaeological or historical feature or deposit is found during construction, as well as steps to follow once construction has stopped. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Resources do not list any archaeological resources in the Specific Plan Area. It is not anticipated that ground disturbing activities would result in impacts to archaeological resources given that none are believed to be present. However, as with most projects in California that involve ground disturbing activities, there is the potential for discovery of a previously unknown archaeological resource. Project implementation may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. (DEIR, pp. 3.3-13)			
Impact 3.3-3: Project implementation may directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource (Potentially Significant) A search of the University of California, Berkeley Museum of Paleontology collections database of Paleontology Localities did not identify any paleontological resources (fossils or fossil formations) within the Specific Plan Area. The Monterey County General Plan Draft EIR (2007) included a review of known fossil localities conducted by paleontologists in 2001. Twelve fossil sites were identified as having outstanding scientific value. For the most part, the fossils at these 12 sites reflect the type of assemblages found throughout the county (microorganisms or invertebrates); however, each has special characteristics that make it unique or rare, or in some way provide important stratigraphic or historic information. None of the 12 identified high value sites are located on or near the Specific Plan Area. Additionally, the Salinas General Plan Final EIR (2002) does not identify any high value sites in the Specific Plan area or in the City as a whole. However, unknown important paleontological resources have the potential to occur within the planning area including the undeveloped future growth areas, which include the Specific Plan Area. The construction of new development would involve grading and other earthwork that can disturb important fossils. Therefore, project implementation may directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource. (DEIR, pp. 3.3-13 and 3.3-14)	**Mitigation Measure 3.3-2**: If paleontological resources are discovered during the course of construction, work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the discovery, the City of Salinas shall be notified, and a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. If the paleontological resource is considered significant, it should be excavated by a qualified paleontologist and given to a local agency, State University, or other applicable institution, where the resource could be curated and displayed for public education purposes. Grading/ building permits and plans shall note this measure.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.3-2 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-2 requires work to stop if a paleontological resource is found during construction, as well as steps to follow once construction has stopped. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.3-4: Project implementation may disturb human remains, including those interred outside of	**Mitigation Measure 3.3-3:** If human remains are found during construction within the Specific	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
formal cemeteries (Potentially Significant) No human remains or known burial sites were found during field surveys for the proposed project. Additionally, there are no human remains or known burial sites that have been identified in the Plan Area on maps and files maintained by the NWIC. It is not anticipated that ground disturbing activities would result in impacts to human remains or known burial sites given that none are believed to be present. However, as with most projects in California that involve ground disturbing activities, there is the potential for discovery of previously unknown human remains or known burial sites. Project implementation may disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (DEIR, pp. 3.3-14 and 3.3-15)	Plan Area, or at off-site infrastructure improvement locations, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until a qualified archeological monitor and the coroner of Monterey County are contacted. If it is determined that the remains are Native American, the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent (MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD may then make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code section 5097.98. The landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance if: a) the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the commission; b) the descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or c) the landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner. Grading permit/building permits and plans shall note this measure.		environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 requires work to stop if human remains are found during construction, as well as steps to follow once construction has stopped. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.3-5: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on known and undiscovered cultural resources (Less Than Significant) While there are extensive documented cultural resources in Salinas and unincorporated Monterey County, there are no cultural resources that were found during field surveys of the proposed project. Additionally, there are no cultural resources that have been identified in the Plan Area on maps and	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
files maintained by the NWIC. The Monterey County Historic Property Data File Directory and National Register of Historic Resources do not list any cultural resources in the Plan Area. Any significant discoveries during construction would be required to be preserved in place or mitigated through relocation or documentation; and the project is not anticipated to considerably contribute to a significant reduction in cultural resources. The proposed project, when considered alongside all past, present, and probable future projects (inclusive of buildout of the various General Plans within Monterey County), would not be expected to cause any significant cumulative impacts. The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts associated with cultural resources. (DEIR, pp. 3.3-15 and 3.3-16)			
GREENHOUSE GASES, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND ENERGY			
Impact 3.4-1: Potential to generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (Potentially Significant) Short-term construction GHG emissions are a one-time release of GHGs and are not expected to significantly contribute to global climate change over the lifetime of the Specific Plan. Even after incorporation of the mitigation measures provided in Section 3.1: Air Quality, overall GHGs generated by the proposed project are expected to be greater than the applicable thresholds of 1,150 MT of CO_2e per year for construction emissions, 1.94 MT CO_2e/service population/year for operational emissions during Year 2035, and 0.80 MT CO_2e/service population/year for operational emissions during Year 2050. The project would generate GHG emissions, directly and indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. (DEIR, pp. 3.4-31 through 3.4-38)	**Mitigation Measure 3.4-1**: Prior to the approval of the tentative maps and development review permits, as applicable, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15183.5(b), Plans for the Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the project applicant shall prepare a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan (GGRP) aimed at achieving specific performance standards. The GGRP shall include the following: 1) The GGRP shall achieve a per capita operational emissions level of 1.94 MT CO_2e/service population/year by year 2035, and 0.80 MT CO_2e/service population/year by year 2050. 2) Calculation of GHG emissions projection using an acceptable modeling tool such as the most recent version of CalEEMod. GHG reduction measures may include building and site energy reduction measures, measures to reduce project-generated vehicle miles traveled, or other measures. Off-site measures such as participation in a community-wide GHG reduction program(s), if any are adopted, or payment of GHG reduction fees (carbon offsets) into a qualified existing program, if one is in place, may be considered after all feasible on-site reduction measures are considered. The effectiveness of the GHG reduction measures included in the GGRP must be verifiable based	SU	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment. Even so, the effects remain significant and unavoidable, and no additional mitigation is available to fully avoid the effects. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-1, it is possible that individual projects within the Plan Area may not achieve GHG reductions needed for their individual impacts to be less than significant. Therefore, the impact is significant and unavoidable. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	on evidence presented in the GGRP. Representative GHG reduction measures which may be considered may include, but are not limited to: • Measures identified by the California Air Pollution Control Officers' Association in Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures: A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures or updates to this document as may occur from time to time. • Applicable measures identified in guidance from MBARD, if any, and/or in guidance provided by other regional air districts such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District, or other agencies with adopted GHG reduction guidance that is applicable on the date the project application is deemed complete by the City. If sufficient feasible GHG reduction measures are unavailable to reduce GHG emissions to below the threshold of significance, the project applicant shall include evidence in the GGRP to this effect. The GGRP shall be subject to review and approval of the City of Salinas Community Development Department prior to approval of the tentative map or development review application, as applicable. Implementation of this mitigation measure shall not be required if the City has a qualified GHG reduction plan in place on the date a future individual project application is deemed complete, the qualified GHG reduction plan reflects the most recent legislatively-adopted GHG reduction targets (e.g., the 2030 target set by SB 32), includes an inventory of projected GHG emissions from development within the Specific Plan Area, and includes GHG reduction measures applicable to development within the Specific Plan Area whose implementation is required as a condition of approval of such projects.		
Impact 3.4-2: Potential to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-1.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases (Potentially Significant) The Specific Plan would generate GHG emissions that could conflict with the State's long-term GHG Reduction targets, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.1-1 through 3.1-9 contained within Section 3.1: Air Quality. The Specific Plan would not interfere with the *2008 Monterey Bay Regional Energy Plan* objectives. (DEIR, pp. 3.4-38 through 3.4-42)			environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 would ensure that GHG reduction measures required pursuant to it are consistent with the intent of current and future statewide GHG reduction legislation and regulations, and with current and future expectations of local, regional, and State stakeholders regarding the City's effort to reduce GHG emissions from new development, including Executive Order B-30-15 and S-03-05. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-1, new development of the Plan Area would consistent with Executive Orders B-30-15 (and SB 32) and S-03-05. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.4-3: Project implementation may result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources (Less Than Significant) The proposed project would use energy resources for the operation of project buildings (electricity and natural gas), for on-road vehicle trips (e.g. gasoline and diesel fuel) generated by the proposed project, and from off-road construction activities associated with the proposed project (e.g. diesel fuel). Each of these activities would require the use of energy resources. The proposed project would be in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations regulating energy usage. Overall, the incorporation of mitigation measures would ensure that the proposed project would avoid and reduce inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. The proposed project would comply with all existing energy standards, including those established by the City of Salinas, the local air district (MBARD), and the State of California, and would not be expected to result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. (DEIR, pp. 3.4-42 through 3.4-48)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.4-4: Cumulative impact on climate change from increased project-related greenhouse gas emission (Potentially Significant) Implementation of the proposed project will generate GHG emissions that would not otherwise exist without the proposed project. Given the length of construction activities for a project of this size, the construction emissions would be a long-term release of approximately 168,734.3 MT CO_2e. The operational emissions would be a long-term release totaling approximately 51,939.2 MT CO2e per year without mitigation, and 47,684.9MT CO_2e	Implement Mitigation Measure 3.4-1.	CS and SU	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment. Even so, the effects remain significant and unavoidable, and no additional mitigation is available to fully avoid the effects. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 would ensure that GHG reduction measures required pursuant to it are consistent with the intent of current and future statewide GHG reduction legislation and regulations, and with current and future expectations of local, regional, and State stakeholders regarding the City's effort to reduce GHG emissions from new

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
per year with mitigation. The City of Salinas's planning efforts included targeted growth that accommodates the economic and social needs of the community, while recognizing and seeking to mitigate environmental impacts when growth occurs. The State of California continues to implement measures that are intended to reduce emissions on a State-wide scale (i.e. vehicle fuel efficiency standards in fleets, low carbon fuels, etc.) that are consistent with AB 32 and SB 32. These types of statewide measures will benefit the proposed project (and city as a whole) in the long-term as they come into effect; however, the City does not have the jurisdiction to create far-reaching (i.e. statewide) measures to reduce GHG emissions. (DEIR, pp. 3.4-48 through 3.4-49)			development, including Executive Order B-30-15 and S-03-05. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-1, new development of the Plan Area would consistent with Executive Orders B-30-15 (and SB 32) and S-03-05. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Impact 3.5-1: Potential to be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment (Potentially Significant) The hazards assessments included site reconnaissance, interviews, historical land use research, database research, and soils testing. The project has the potential to be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. (DEIR, pp. 3.5-24 through 3.5-26)	**Mitigation Measure 3.5-1**: Prior to issuance of grading permits or building permits, (including the issuance of demolition permits for agricultural support buildings) as applicable, the applicant shall hire a qualified consultant to: 1) Provide a final evaluation of the soils around the agricultural operations support buildings (residences, warehouses, barns, etc.) before they are demolished. If toxic levels of residual agrichemicals or surface staining are found, the contaminated soil shall be excavated and disposed of at an off-site disposal facility permitted to accept such waste. Any contaminated areas shall be remediated by the project applicant in accordance with recommendations made by the Monterey County Health Department Hazardous Materials Management Services, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control, or other appropriate federal, State, or local regulatory agencies. 2) Investigate structures for asbestos-containing materials and lead. If asbestos-containing materials and/or lead are found in the buildings, a Cal-OSHA certified ACBM and lead based paint contractor shall be retained to remove the asbestos-containing materials and lead in accordance with U.S. EPA and California	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.5-1 through 3.5-3 be adopted. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures 3.5-1 requires a final evaluation of the soils around the agricultural operations support buildings and investigation of structures for asbestos-containing materials and lead. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures 3.5-2 requires destruction of existing water wells. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures 3.5-2 requires that water wells serving the proposed building be constructed and tested for water quality under permit from the Monterey County Health Department Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) standards. In addition, all activities (construction or demolition) in the vicinity of these materials shall comply with Cal/OSHA asbestos and lead worker construction standards. Any ACBM and lead shall be disposed of properly at an appropriate offsite disposal facility. **Mitigation Measure 3.5-2**: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, existing water wells within the grading area shall be destroyed under permit from the City of Salinas and/or the Monterey County Health Department, as applicable. Any destruction of these facilities shall be in accordance with the Monterey County Well Standards for Abandonment/Destruction. The project applicant shall provide the City of Salinas with a copy of the permit and a report or other information documenting the appropriate destruction of these facilities. **Mitigation Measure 3.5-3:** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the water well or wells that will be providing water for the applicable portion of the Specific Plan Area, shall be constructed and tested for water quality under permit from the Monterey County Health Department. The project applicant shall provide the City of Salinas with a copy of the permit and a report or other information documenting the appropriate construction and operation of these facilities.		
Impact 3.5-2: Create a significant hazard to school sites due to siting or the placement of infrastructure (Potentially Significant) The proposed project does not pose significant hazards from existing natural gas transmission piping, and mitigation measures identified under Impact 3.5-1 would ensure water well construction and abandonment impacts would be less than significant. However, implementation of the project may create a significant hazard to school sites due to siting or the placement of infrastructure (i.e., the due to the citing of school sites near power lines). (DEIR, pp. 3.5-26 through 3.5-28)	**Mitigation Measure 3.5-4:** The property line of all school sites (even if it is a joint use agreement as described in subsection (o) of § 14010) shall be at least the following distance from the edge of respective power line easements as identified in the California Code of Regulations Title 5, Article 2. School Sites § 14010. Standards for School Site Selection (c). • 100 feet for power lines that are between 50 and 133 kV.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.5-4 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-4 ensures all future electrical transmission alignments are required to comply with California Code of Regulations Title 5, Article 2 (School Sites) § 14010 (Standards for School Site Selection) setback requirements. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.5-3: Cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials (Less Than Significant) The proposed project includes the approval and	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
subsequent implementation of an approximately 797-acre Specific Plan Area that includes residential, mixed use commercial, a community park, neighborhood parks, small parks, schools, and open space (with supplemental storm water detention/retention basins). These uses are not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Additionally, these uses are not expected to 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. The proposed Specific Plan land uses are not expected to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Mitigation measures have been included to minimize the risk of on-site hazards. (DEIR, pp. 3.5-28 through 3.5-29)			
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
Impact 3.6-1: The proposed project has the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction (Potentially Significant) Grading, excavation, removal of vegetation cover, and loading activities associated with construction activities could temporarily increase runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. Construction activities also could result in soil compaction and wind erosion effects that could adversely affect soils and reduce the revegetation potential at construction sites and staging areas. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-21 through 3.5-23)	**Mitigation Measure 3.6-1:** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project proponent shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the City of Salinas prior to submitting to the RWQCB to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ). The SWPPP shall be designed with Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the RWQCB has deemed to be effective at reducing erosion, controlling sediment, and managing runoff. These include: covering disturbed areas with mulch, temporary seeding, soil stabilizers, binders, fiber rolls or blankets, temporary vegetation, and permanent seeding. Sediment control BMPs, installing silt fences or placing straw wattles below slopes, installing berms and other temporary run-on and runoff diversions. These BMPs are only examples of what should be considered and shall not preclude the use of equally or more effective new or innovative approaches currently available or being developed. Final selection of BMPs will be subject to approval by City of Salinas. The SWPPP will be kept on site during construction activity and will be made available upon request	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 requires the use of BMPs during construction activities in order to reduce erosion, control sediment, and manage runoff from the Plan Area. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	to representatives of the RWQCB.		
Impact 3.6-2: The proposed project has the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation (Potentially Significant) The long-term operations of the proposed project (all phases) could result in long-term impacts to surface water quality from urban stormwater runoff. The proposed Project would result in new impervious areas associated with roadways, driveways, parking lots, buildings, and landscape areas. Normal activities in these developed areas include the use of various automotive petroleum products (i.e. oil, grease, and fuel), common household hazardous materials, heavy metals, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and sediment. Within urban areas, these pollutants are generally called nonpoint source pollutants. The pollutants pollutant levels vary based on factors such as time between storm events, volume of storm event, type of uses, and density of people. The proposed project has the potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during operation. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-23 through 3.6-26)	**Mitigation Measure 3.6-2:** Prior to the approval of site improvement plans, the project applicant shall submit to the Salinas Public Works Department a Stormwater Control Plan detailing plans and calculations for water quality best management practices (BMPs) and water quality detention/retention basins designed to meet the applicable regulatory requirements and to reduce contaminant loadings to receiving waters to the maximum extent practicable. The Improvement Plans shall be consistent with the City's NPDES permit requirements at the time of permitting. The NPDES permit granted to the City of Salinas by the Central Coast RWQCB (CCRWQCB, 2012) requires the following: I. Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs – Erosion control and sediment control BMPs shall be designed, installed, and maintained to reduce the discharge of pollutants from construction sites to the maximum extent practical (MEP) and protect water quality; II. Erosion and sediment from slopes and channels shall be controlled by implementing an effective combination of erosion control (source control) and other sediment control BMPs; and II. Soil Stabilization – Stabilization of disturbed areas shall, at a minimum, be initiated immediately whenever any clearing, grading, excavating, or other earth disturbing activities have permanently ceased. Additionally, the Improvement Plans shall be consistent with the requirements of the City's Stormwater Development Standards for New and Redevelopment Projects. The City of Salinas Stormwater Standards for New and Redevelopment Projects (City of Salinas, 2013) require the following practices: I. Limit disturbance of creeks and natural drainage features and provide setbacks according to the City's latest NPDES permit; II. Minimize compaction of highly permeable	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.6-2 through 3.6-4 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 requires submittal of a Stormwater Control Plan that includes calculations, BMPs and plan of sufficient detail to confirm that contaminant loadings to receiving waters will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable. Mitigation Measures 3.6-3 and 3.6-4 require submittal of detailed plans and calculations for the water quality BMPs, water quality detention basins, and supplemental retention and peak flow control. The BMPs will be designed to meet regulatory requirements and to reduce peak flows during storm events below peak flows under pre-project conditions. The various RWQCBs have evaluated the effectiveness of the types of BMPs required by Mitigation Measures 3.6-2 through 3.6-4 and have determined that BMPs are known to be effective in protecting receiving waters. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	soils; and II. Limit clearing and grading of native vegetation to the minimum needed to build the project and provide fire protection. **Mitigation Measure 3.6-3:** Prior to the approval of site improvement plans, the project applicant shall submit to the Salinas Public Works Department a Stormwater Control Plan detailing plans and calculations for water quality best management practices (BMPs) and water quality detention basins designed to prevent to the maximum extent practicable the creation of new sources of polluted runoff. The detailed plans and calculations shall be subject to review and approval by the Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.6-4:** Prior to the approval of site improvement plans, the project applicant shall submit to the Salinas Public Works Department detailed plans and calculations for supplemental retention and peak flow control. BMPs will be designed to meet regulatory requirements and to reduce peak flows during storm events below peak flows under pre-project conditions. The detailed plans and calculations shall be subject to review and approval by the Salinas Public Works Department.		
Impact 3.6-3: The proposed project has the potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge (Potentially Significant) The proposed project, without mitigating features, would reduce infiltration of rainwater and runoff into the local groundwater system due to the increase in impermeable area. This may deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The total annual rainfall depth in an average year is approximately 16 inches and the project surface area is approximately 797 acres, producing an annual rainfall volume of approximately 1,060 AF. Nearly all of this area is currently in agriculture, while the proposed project could convert as much as 60 percent of the area to impervious surfaces, resulting in a reduction in groundwater recharge in the range of 400 to 600 AF. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-26 through 3.6-29)	**Mitigation Measure 3.6-5:** Prior to the approval of site improvement plans, the project applicant shall site, and design and include an Operation and Maintenance Plan for stormwater retention/infiltration basins and infiltration promoting BMPs sufficient to assure that there is no reduction in groundwater recharge. In order to assure there is no reduction in recharge, the plan shall result in circumstances which maintain infiltration to support baseflow and interflow to wetlands and surface waters, and deep vertical infiltration to groundwater. The site, design, and installation shall be consistent with the requirements of the City's Stormwater Development Standards for New and Redevelopment Projects. The contents of the site, design, and installation shall be included in a stormwater control plan. The stormwater control plan shall be reflected on the Improvement Plans, subject to review and approval by the Salinas Public Works Department.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.6-5 and 3.6-6 be adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-5 requires an Operation and Maintenance Plan for stormwater retention/infiltration basins and infiltration promoting BMPs sufficient to assure that there is no reduction in groundwater recharge. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-6 requires an Operation and Maintenance Plan for post-construction BMPs and supplemental stormwater detention basins in accordance with City of Salinas stormwater development standards. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	Mitigation Measure 3.6-6: Prior to the approval of site improvement plans, the project applicant shall site, design, and include an Operation and Maintenance Plan for post-construction BMPs and supplemental stormwater detention basins in accordance with City of Salinas stormwater development standards. Maintenance procedures (including frequency of procedure, cleaning schedules, applicant responsibility for each procedure, performance standards, or other means) and funding mechanisms shall be established for those facilities to assure adequate long-term performance and success in treating the water and controlling infiltration into the groundwater. The Improvement Plans and Operation and Maintenance Plan shall be subject to review and approval by the Salinas Public Works Department.		
Impact 3.6-4: The proposed project has the potential to alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, flooding, or polluted runoff (Less than Significant) The proposed project will not alter drainage patterns in a manner which will cause flooding, erosion, or siltation. Surface runoff from the area will be managed via parcel-based LID measures, detention/retention basins, and flow reducing BMPs to prevent local flooding within the site. These features will also reduce peak flows from the Plan Area to receiving creeks and storm drains to amounts less than such flows under existing conditions. Sediment in the stormwater flows will be captured in detention ponds designed to prevent siltation. Flooding, erosion, or siltation is not anticipated by the proposed project given the storm drain design and best management practices that will be implemented. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-29 through 3.6-30)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.6-5: The proposed project has the potential to otherwise substantially degrade water quality (Potentially Significant) The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The use of BMPs are intended to treat runoff close to the source during the construction and long term operational phase of the project to reduce stormwater quality impacts. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-30 through 3.6-31)	Implement **Mitigation Measure 3.6-1**.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 requires the use of BMPs during construction activities in order to reduce erosion, control sediment, and manage runoff from the Plan Area. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact 3.6-6: Place housing or structures that would impede/redirect flows within a 100-year, or 200-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map (Less than Significant) The project would no place housing or structures that would impede/redirect flows within a 1-percent annual chance flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. Provided that the storm drain system and detention/retention facilities to be installed as part of the proposed development are adequately sized and properly installed and maintained, additional flooding and/or impedance or redirection of flows will not be induced by the proposed project. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-31)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.6-7: The proposed project has the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (Less than Significant) The proposed project would not result in the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-31 through 3.6-32)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.6-8: Cumulative increases in peak stormwater runoff from the plan area (Less than Significant) With the design and construction of flood control improvements, the West Area Specific Plan would not increase peak stormwater runoff. The proposed project, when considered alongside all past, present, and probable future projects (inclusive of buildout of the various General Plans within Monterey County), would not be expected to cause any significant cumulative impacts given that mitigation measures would control peak stormwater runoff. The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts associated with stormwater runoff. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
32 through 3.6-33)			
Impact 3.6-9: Cumulative impacts related to degradation of water quality (Less than Significant) The proposed project, when considered alongside all past, present, and probable future projects (inclusive of buildout of the various General Plans within Monterey County), would not be expected to cause any significant cumulative impacts given that mitigation measures would control storm water quality. The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts associated with water quality. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-33 through 3.6-35)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.6-10: Cumulative impacts related to degradation of groundwater supply or recharge (Less than Significant) The proposed project, when considered alongside all past, present, and probable future projects (inclusive of buildout of the various General Plans within Monterey County), would not be expected to cause any significant cumulative impacts given that mitigation measures require maintaining water quality standards and preserving the infiltration of rainwater within the aquifer. The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts associated with groundwater supply/recharge. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-35 through 3.6-36)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.6-11: Cumulative impacts related to flooding (Less than Significant) Future development in the area must be sited and designed in accordance with the aforementioned City flood damage regulations (i.e., Article VI, Flood Damage Prevention, of the City's Code). The proposed project, when considered alongside all past, present, and probable future projects (inclusive of buildout of the various General Plans within Monterey County), would not be expected to cause any significant cumulative impacts given that mitigation measures require designs that ensure structures are outside the base flood elevation and that storm water flows are maintained to prevent downstream flooding. The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts associated with flooding. (DEIR, pp. 3.6-36 through 3.6-38)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
NOISE			
Impact 3.7-1: The proposed project has the potential to increase traffic noise levels at existing receptors (Potentially Significant) As shown in Tables 3.7-8 through 3.7-11, some noise-sensitive receptors located along the Plan Area roadways are currently exposed to exterior traffic noise levels exceeding the City of Salinas 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard for residential uses. These receptors would continue to experience elevated exterior noise levels with implementation of the proposed project. As shown in Table 3.7-8, the segment of Natividad Road south of E. Boronda Road would experience unacceptable noise levels under Existing Plus Project conditions. The project would cause noise levels along this segment to increase by 1.6 dB. As shown in Table 3.7-9, the segment of Natividad Road south of E. Boronda Road would experience unacceptable noise levels under Existing Plus Project Plus CASP conditions. As shown in Table 3.7-10, the following roadway segments would experience unacceptable noise levels under Cumulative Plus Project conditions: • E. Boronda Road from San Juan Grade to McKinnon (2.4 dB increase); • E. Boronda Road from Independence to Hemmingway (1.8 dB increase); • E. Boronda Road from N. Sanborn to Williams (2.4 dB increase); • Natividad Road south of E. Boronda (3.7 dB increase); and • Natividad Road from E. Boronda to Future Russell Road (3.0 dB increase). As shown in Table 3.7-11, significant traffic noise increases are anticipated under the Cumulative Plus Project Plus CASP traffic condition include the following segments: • Constitution Blvd., South of E. Boronda – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.5 dB from 62.2 dB to 65.7 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +3 dB where no project noise levels are between 60 to 65 dB,	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.7-1 and 3.7-8.	SU	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which substantially lessen the significant effects on the environment. Even so, the effects remain significant and unavoidable, and no additional mitigation is available to fully avoid the effects. Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 requires adherence to the requirements of the City of Salinas Municipal Code with respect to hours of operation during project construction. Mitigation Measure 3.7-2 requires all equipment to be fitted with factory equipped mufflers and in good working order. Mitigation Measure 3.7-3 requires sound walls for residents located along the primary Plan Area roadways, adjacent to proposed residential dwellings, in order to achieve the City's exterior noise standards. Mitigation Measure 3.7-4 requires 3-coat stucco and windows having a Sound Transmission Class (STC) 35, or higher, rating to be installed in second floor facades and rooms that have windows or doors that abut E. Boronda Road and/or Natividad Road. Mitigation Measure 3.7-5 requires mechanical ventilation for the first row of all residential dwellings that abut E. Boronda Road and/or Natividad Road. Mitigation Measure 3.7-6 requires the center of active play areas, such as football fields, soccer fields or other athletic fields, to be located at a minimum distance of 90-feet from the nearest residential property lines. Mitigation Measure 3.7-7 includes various project design requirements where commercial, business professional, office, or similar uses abut residential uses or where loading docks or truck circulation routes abut residential areas. Mitigation Measure 3.7-8 includes various project design requirements fort the well and treatment plant facilities. Even with implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.7-1 through 3.7-8, there is the potential for noise levels to exceed the acceptable levels in some cases if encroachment into private property proves for the construction of sounds walls proves to be infeasible. Therefore, the impact is significant and unavoidable. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, Main to San Juan Grade – noise levels are predicted to increase by 1.5 dB from 66.5 dB to 68.1 dB L_{dn}. This would equal the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, San Juan Grade to McKinnon – noise levels are predicted to increase by 2.6 dB from 65.3 dB to 67.9 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, El Dorado to Natividad – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.3 dB from 64.1 dB to 66.1 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +3 dB where no project noise levels are between 60 to 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, Natividad to Independence – noise levels are predicted to increase by 2.6 dB from 66.6 dB to 69.3 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, Independence to Hemmingway – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.5 dB from 65.1 dB to 68.6 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, Hemmingway to Constitution – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.0 dB from 58.2 dB to 61.3 dB L_{dn}. This would not exceed the FICON criteria of 5 dB where existing noise levels are less than 60 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7, but would cause a new exceedance of the City's 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard at outdoor activity areas of the nearest residential receptors. • E. Boronda Road, N. Sanborn to Williams – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.1 dB from 59.6 dB to 62.7dB L_{dn}. This would not exceed the FICON criteria of 5 dB where existing noise levels are less than 60 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7, but would cause a			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
new exceedance of the City's 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard at outdoor activity areas of the nearest residential receptors. • Natividad Road., South of E. Boronda – noise levels are predicted to increase by 4.5 dB from 63.0 dB to 67.5 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +3 dB where no project noise levels are between 60 to 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • Natividad Road., E. Boronda to Future Russell Road – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.8 dB from 63.0 dB to 67.5 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +3 dB where no project noise levels are between 60 to 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. However, it should be noted that this roadway segment is located between the West Area Specific Plan and Central Area Specific Plan projects and future sensitive receptors along this roadway would be constructed with noise control measures designed to achieve compliance with the City of Salinas exterior and interior noise level standards. • Russell Road, West of San Juan Grade – noise levels are predicted to increase by 1.9 dB from 67.5 dB to 69.4 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. (DEIR p. 3.7-14 through 3.7-23)			
Impact 3.7-2: The proposed project has the potential to increase noise levels associated with construction activities (Potentially Significant) Noise would also be generated during the construction phase by increased truck traffic on area roadways. The proposed project has the potential to increase noise levels associated with construction activities. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-23 and 3.7-24)	**Mitigation Measure 3.7-1:** Prior to the approval of site improvement plans and respective permits, plans shall note that construction activities shall adhere to the requirements of the City of Salinas Municipal Code with respect to hours of operation. **Mitigation Measure 3.7-2:** Prior to the approval of site improvement plans and respective permits, plans shall note that all equipment shall be fitted with factory equipped mufflers and in good working order. All stationary noise generating equipment (i.e. generators) shall be located at least 300 feet from a sensitive receptor. All construction staging areas shall be located at least 300 feet from a sensitive receptor.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.7-1 and 3.7-2 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 requires adherence to the requirements of the City of Salinas Municipal Code with respect to hours of operation during project construction. Mitigation Measure 3.7-2 requires all equipment to be fitted with factory equipped mufflers and in good working order. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact 3.7-3: The proposed project has the potential to increase noise vibration association with construction activities (Less Than Significant) The proposed project would not increase noise vibration associated with construction activities. Therefore, construction vibrations are not predicted to cause damage to existing buildings or cause annoyance to sensitive receptors. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-24 and 3.7-25)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.7-4: The proposed project has the potential to expose new sensitive receptors to excessive transportation noise (Potentially Significant) Table 3.7-14 data indicate that noise barriers 6- to 8-feet in height would generally be sufficient to achieve compliance with the City of Salinas 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard for the proposed residential uses. However, for the residential uses located along E. Boronda Road and Natividad Road, sound walls of 6- to 8-feet in height would only reduce exterior noise levels to 62 to 65 dB L_{dn}. While these noise level do not meet the City's preferred 60 dB L_{dn} noise standards, they would comply with the City's conditionally acceptable standard of 60 to 70 dB L_{dn}. Predicted interior noise levels would exceed the City's 45 dB L_{dn} interior noise level standard at the first row of residential uses located closest to E. Boronda Road and Natividad Road. Therefore, additional interior noise control measures would be required for these residential uses along E. Boronda Road and Natividad Road. To reduce interior noise levels to 45 dB L_{dn}, or less, it is likely that second floor facades would require windows having a Sound Transmission Class (STC) 35 rating, or higher. Exterior walls would also likely require 3-coat stucco and RC-channels. This would specifically apply to the first row of homes along E. Boronda Road and Natividad Road and would not apply to facades facing away from the roadway. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-25 through 3.7-28)	**Mitigation Measure 3.7-3:** Prior to the approval of site improvement plans and respective permits, the plans shall note the location, design and constructions details of the eight-foot to nine-foot tall sound attenuation walls and/or landscaped berm/wall combinations, as applicable, that will be constructed along the primary Specific Plan Area roadways, adjacent to proposed residential dwellings, in order to achieve the City's exterior noise standards. At the City's discretion, wall heights which achieve the City's conditionally acceptable 60-70 dB L_{dn} noise standard may be allowed. See the Draft EIR Table 3.7-14 for specific noise barrier/wall heights along each roadway. Noise barrier walls shall be constructed of concrete panels, concrete masonry units, stucco or manufactured materials (with a density of four pounds per square foot or greater), earthen landscaped berms, or any combination of these materials as determined appropriate by the City of Salinas. The design/appearance of the wall is subject to the design approval by the City of Salinas based upon the standards contained in the West Area Specific Plan and the Salinas Zoning Code, as applicable to ensure that it is visually pleasing. Wood is not permitted due to eventual warping and degradation of acoustical performance. The walls shall not have gaps or penetrations which allow sound to flank through or around the walls. Small gaps which may occur using materials such as "keystone" blocks shall be avoided. Additionally, in accordance with Section 5-03.19 of the City's Municipal Code, best management practices shall be incorporated into the sound wall design in order to control graffiti and/or mitigate the potential impacts of graffiti. These graffiti prevention best management practices may include, without limitation: (1) The use or the installation and maintenance of ant-graffiti materials and	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.7-3 through 3.7-5 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.7-3 requires sound walls for residents located along the primary Plan Area roadways, adjacent to proposed residential dwellings, in order to achieve the City's exterior noise standards. Mitigation Measure 3.7-4 requires 3-coat stucco and windows having a Sound Transmission Class (STC) 35, or higher, rating to be installed in second floor facades and rooms that have windows or doors that abut E. Boronda Road and/or Natividad Road. Mitigation Measure 3.7-5 requires mechanical ventilation for the first row of all residential dwellings that abut E. Boronda Road and/or Natividad Road. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	surface treatments approved by the City on likely graffiti-attracting surfaces. (2) Installation and maintenance of landscaping to discourage defacement of and/or protect likely graffiti-attracting surfaces. (3) Installation and maintenance of lighting to protect likely graffiti-attracting surfaces. (4) Immediate removal of graffiti by appropriate means within seventy-two hours. (5) Incorporation of architectural or design elements or features to discourage graffiti defacement in accordance with the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). (6) Authorizing right of access by city employees or contract agents to remove graffiti if not removed within specified time periods. (7) Supplying the city at its request with paint (of the appropriate color and type), cleaning agents, and/or other materials acceptable to the city to abate or to deter graffiti. (8) Other requirements, as deemed reasonably feasible by the city planner, to deter, to protect or to reduce the potential for graffiti defacement. **Mitigation Measure 3.7-4:** Prior to the approval of building permits, the first row of residential dwellings located along E. Boronda Road and Natividad Road shall include windows having a Sound Transmission Class (STC) 35, or higher, rating installed in second floor facades and rooms that have windows or doors that abut E. Boronda Road and/or Natividad Road. Exterior walls shall also require 3-coat stucco and RC-channels, sheathing, or another acceptable construction application that effectively attenuates noise intrusion to the interior of the house. The exterior wall specifications would specifically apply to the first row of homes that abut E. Boronda Road and/or Natividad Road and only applies to the facades facing these roadways. These specifications do not apply to single story homes,		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	or the first floor of a two-story home, both of which are attenuated by the sound wall. These requirements shall be included in the building plans for the specific dwelling units and noted on the building permits. A detailed analysis of any additional interior mitigation measures shall be conducted when building plans are available and prior to building permit issuance to verify these requirements. These requirements shall also be noted in the site improvement plans prior to approval by the City. **Mitigation Measure 3.7-5:** Prior to the approval of building permits, mechanical ventilation shall be required in the first row of all residential dwellings that abut E. Boronda Road and/or Natividad Road, sufficient to allow residents, as desired for acoustical isolation, to keep their doors and windows closed and still maintain acceptable interior temperature and noise levels. This requirement shall be included in the building plans for the specific dwelling units and noted on the building permits. This requirement shall also be noted in the site improvement plans prior to approval by the City.		
Impact 3.7-5: The proposed project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial noise from proposed park and school uses (Potentially Significant) Children playing at neighborhood parks or outdoor recreational fields (softball, soccer, basketball, tennis) are often considered potentially significant noise sources which could adversely affect adjacent noise-sensitive land uses. Typical noise levels associated with groups of approximately 50 children playing at 50 feet generally range from 55 to 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 to 75 dB L_{max}. It is expected that park activities would occur primarily during daytime hours. Therefore, noise levels from the playgrounds would need to comply with the City of Salinas exterior noise level standards of 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 dB L_{max} at the nearest residential uses. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-29 and 3.7-30)	**Mitigation Measure 3.7-6:** Prior to the approval of site improvement plans, as applicable, when parks or play areas are located near residential uses, the center of active play areas, such as football fields, soccer fields or other athletic fields, shall be located at a minimum distance of 90-feet from the nearest residential property lines. Large active play areas shall comply with the 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 dB L_{max} standards, and shall include these further noise level evaluations during the design phases of future park areas. Parks shall be designed such that residences front, or side in limited locations where approved by the City Planner, to the park. Minimum 6-foot tall sound walls and/or landscaped berms shall be constructed where school site directly abuts a residential property line in instances where site design (i.e., minimum distances, siting of activity areas, etc.) cannot achieve the 60 dB L_{eq} and 70 dB L_{max} noise standards. No wall shall be required where residential uses are fronted towards a park or school site and separated by a roadway or a walkway. Noise barrier walls shall be constructed of concrete panels, concrete masonry units, stucco	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.7-6 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.7-6 requires the center of active play areas, such as football fields, soccer fields or other athletic fields, to be located at a minimum distance of 90-feet from the nearest residential property lines. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	or manufactured materials (with a density of four pounds per square foot or greater), earthen landscaped berms, or any combination of these materials as determined appropriate by the City of Salinas. The design/appearance of walls is subject to the design approval by the City of Salinas based upon the standards contained in the West Area Specific Plan and the Salinas Zoning Code, as applicable to ensure that it is visually pleasing. Wood is not permitted due to eventual warping and degradation of acoustical performance. The walls shall not have gaps or penetrations which allow sound to flank through or around the walls. Small gaps which may occur using materials such as "keystone" blocks shall be avoided. Additionally, in accordance with Section 5-03.19 of the City's Municipal Code, best management practices shall be incorporated into the sound wall design in order to control graffiti and/or mitigate the potential impacts of graffiti (see mitigation 3.7.3 for further discussion of best management practices.)		
Impact 3.7-6: The proposed project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial noise from proposed commercial mixed-uses (Potentially Significant) Mixed-use commercial land use activities can produce noise levels which affect adjacent sensitive land uses. The primary noise sources generally include truck deliveries, trash pickup, parking lot use, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment operation. These sources may result in noise levels exceeding the City's standards at nearby receptors. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-30 through 3.7-31)	**Mitigation Measure 3.7-7:** Prior to the approval of development review permits, the plans shall demonstrate: where commercial, business professional, office, or similar uses abut residential uses or where loading docks or truck circulation routes abut residential areas, the following measures shall be included in the project design: • All HVAC equipment shall be located within mechanical rooms where possible or shielded from view with solid or grated barriers; • Emergency generators shall comply with the City's noise criteria at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers; • Delivery/loading activities shall comply with the Salinas Zoning Code standards and regulations; and • The applicant shall submit a noise study to verify that the appropriate noise control measures have been incorporated into the project design and will achieve compliance with the City's noise level standards.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.7-7 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.7-7 includes various project design requirements where commercial, business professional, office, or similar uses abut residential uses or where loading docks or truck circulation routes abut residential areas. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.7-7: The proposed project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial noise from	**Mitigation Measure 3.7-8:** The potential well and treatment plant sites are shown in the	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
proposed well sites (Potentially Significant) Typical noise levels for well sites at 50 feet are expected to be 60 dB L_{eq}. If a backup generator is present and running, a noise level of 70 dB L_{eq} at 50 feet would be expected. It is expected that wells could operate during daytime or nighttime hours. Long-term operation of the backup generator would only occur under emergency conditions and would therefore not be subject to the City of Salinas exterior noise level standards for Class A noise. However, weekly exercising of the generator may be subject to the City's 60 dB L_{eq} daytime exterior noise level standard at the nearest noise-sensitive residential receptors. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-32)	Specific Plan. The actual well and treatment plant facilities are subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) by the City pursuant to the requirements of the Salinas Zoning Code and the West Area Specific Plan. The potential well and treatment plant sites and the CUP requirement for said facilities shall be clearly noted on the site improvement plans. Prior to approval of the CUP and subsequent issuance of the building permits for the well and treatment plant facilities, the plans shall demonstrate that the following measures shall be included in the project design: • The well and treatment facilities have been designed and will be built to not exceed a noise level of 55 dB L_{eq} at the nearest residential or school property line during normal operation of the facilities; • The generators shall not be permitted to exceed the City's daytime noise standard of 60 dB L_{eq}; • The generators shall be tested only during daytime hours; and • Additionally, that the well and treatment facilities/sites have been designed (in accordance with the West Area Specific Plan) to incorporate decorative screen walls, landscaping and other features to ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses.		environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.7-8 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.7-8 includes various project design requirements fort the well and treatment plant facilities. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.7-8: Cumulative exposure of existing and future noise-sensitive land uses to increased noise resulting from cumulative development (Potentially Significant) Significant traffic noise increases under the Cumulative Plus Project Plus CASP traffic condition include the following segments: • Constitution Blvd., South of E. Boronda – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.5 dB from 62.2 dB to 65.7 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +3 dB where no project noise levels are between 60 to 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, Main to San Juan Grade – noise levels are predicted to increase by 1.5	No mitigation measures are feasible.	CS and SU	The EIR identified no mitigation measures to address this particular significant effect on the environment. Thus, the effect remains significant and unavoidable, and no mitigation is available to substantially lessen or avoid the effect. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
dB from 66.5 dB to 68.1 dB L_{dn}. This would equal the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, San Juan Grade to McKinnon – noise levels are predicted to increase by 2.6 dB from 65.3 dB to 67.9 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, El Dorado to Natividad – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.3 dB from 64.1 dB to 66.1 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +3 dB where no project noise levels are between 60 to 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, Natividad to Independence – noise levels are predicted to increase by 2.6 dB from 66.6 dB to 69.3 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, Independence to Hemmingway – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.5 dB from 65.1 dB to 68.6 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • E. Boronda Road, Hemmingway to Constitution – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.0 dB from 58.2 dB to 61.3 dB L_{dn}. This would not exceed the FICON criteria of 5 dB where existing noise levels are less than 60 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7, but would cause a new exceedance of the City's 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard at outdoor activity areas of the nearest residential receptors. • E. Boronda Road, N. Sanborn to Williams – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.1 dB from 59.6 dB to 62.7dB L_{dn}. This would not exceed the FICON criteria of 5 dB where existing noise levels are less than 60 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7, but would cause a new exceedance of the City's 60 dB L_{dn} exterior noise level standard at outdoor activity areas of the nearest residential			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
receptors. • Natividad Road., South of E. Boronda – noise levels are predicted to increase by 4.5 dB from 63.0 dB to 67.5 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +3 dB where no project noise levels are between 60 to 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. • Natividad Road., E. Boronda to Future Russell Road – noise levels are predicted to increase by 3.8 dB from 63.0 dB to 67.5 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +3 dB where no project noise levels are between 60 to 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. However, it should be noted that this roadway segment is located between the West Area Specific Plan and Central Area Specific Plan projects and future sensitive receptors along this roadway would be constructed with noise control measures designed to achieve compliance with the City of Salinas exterior and interior noise level standards. • Russell Road, West of San Juan Grade – noise levels are predicted to increase by 1.9 dB from 67.5 dB to 69.4 dB L_{dn}. This would exceed the FICON criteria of +1.5 dB where no project noise levels are greater than 65 dB, as outlined in Table 3.7-7. (DEIR, pp. 3.7-33 through 3.7-37)			
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
Impact 3.8-1: The proposed Project has the potential to induce substantial population growth in an area (Less Than Significant) The West Area Specific Plan proposes development on the 797-acre Specific Plan Area including housing units that would result in direct population growth. The project includes a maximum of 4,340 total residential units. The addition of 4,340 housing units at full buildout has the potential to increase the population of the city by an estimated 16,101 persons (based on a U.S. Census Bureau estimate of 3.71 persons per household) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). The 2002 General Plan identifies areas for growth within the FGAs (which includes the Specific Plan Area). The Salinas General Plan Land Use Table LU-3 identifies the development capacity of the FGAs.	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
This includes 15,873 residential units, resulting in an additional population of 58,253 within the City's FGAs. The proposed West Area Specific Plan development proposes 4,340 units with the potential to increase the population of the city by an estimated 16,101 persons, which is within the projections identified in the Salinas General Plan. Implementation of the West Area Specific Plan would increase employment in the area through development of a maximum of 571,500 square feet of commercial space. The Salinas General Plan designates land uses to ensure a balance between new residential development and job-creating uses. Within the FGAs (including the Specific Plan Area) the General Plan assumes a development capacity that includes 178,000 square feet of retail space, 30,000 square feet of office space, 599,000 square feet of general commercial space, and 2,613,000 square feet of mixed use area (Salinas General Plan pg. LU 37: Land Use Element Table LU-3 Development Capacity). The proposed maximum 571,500 square feet developable by the proposed project is within the development capacities stated in the Salinas General Plan. (DEIR, pp. 3.8-14 through 3.8-19)			
Impact 3.8-2: Cumulative impact on the potential to induce substantial population growth in an area (Less Than Significant) Development of the North of Boronda FGA is a component of the City's planned long-term growth as identified in the City's General Plan. Infrastructure needed to support development of the site and the FGAs, and the subsequent population, housing and employment increases expected through implementation of the West Area Specific Plan, have already been planned and evaluated. The proposed project, when considered alongside all past, present, and probable future projects (inclusive of buildout of the various General Plans within Monterey County), would not be expected to cause any significant cumulative impacts. The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts associated with population and housing. (DEIR, pp. 3.8-19 through 3.8-20)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
PUBLIC SERVICES			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact 3.9-1: The proposed project may require the construction of fire department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts (Potentially Significant) The site-specific environmental impact of constructing a new fire facility to serve the West Area Specific Plan will be reviewed under CEQA as part of the Central Area Specific Plan Draft EIR, which is expected to be circulated in 2019. The proposed project may require the construction of fire department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts. (DEIR, pp. 3.9-16 through 3.9-18)	**Mitigation Measure 3.9-1:** Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each dwelling unit (and prior to issuance of building permits for non-residential uses), the applicant shall pay all applicable project impact fees per the impact fee schedule.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measure 3.9-1 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.9-1 requires payment of the project impact fees for each dwelling unit. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.
Impact 3.9-2: The proposed project may result in, or have the potential to require the construction of police department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts (Less Than Significant) The proposed project would not result in, or have the potential to require the construction of police department facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts. Development of the Specific Plan Area did not directly trigger the need for a new facility; however, additional staffing and patrols are required to serve the proposed Specific Pan Area. The City collects impact fees from new development based upon projected impacts from the development. The City also reviews the adequacy of impact fees on an annual basis to ensure that the fee is commensurate with anticipated future facilities demands, assessed on a fair share basis for new development. (DEIR, pp. 3.9-18 through 3.9-19)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.9-3: Project implementation may result in the need for the construction of new schools, which has the potential to cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts (Potentially Significant) Physical impacts from construction of the school sites within the Specific Plan Area would be related to relevant environmental topics included in this EIR, such as: air quality (Section 3.1), biological resources (Section 3.2), cultural resources (Section 3.3), greenhouse gas emissions and climate change (Section 3.4), hazards and hazardous materials (Section 3.5), hydrology and water quality (Section 3.6), noise (Section 3.7) population (Section 3.8), public services (Section 3.9), transportation (Section 3.10), and utilities (Section 3.11). A	**Mitigation Measure 3.9-2:** Prior to the issuance of building permits for each dwelling unit, the applicant shall pay applicable school fees mandated by SB 50 to the Salinas Union High School District (SUHSD), and Santa Rita Union School District (SRUSD) and provide documentation of said payment to the City. Implement Mitigation Measures 3.1-1 through 3.1-7, 3.2-1 through 3.2-7, 3.3-1 through 3.3-3, 3.4-1, 3.5-1 through 3.5-4, 3.6-1 through 3.6-6, 3.7-1 through 3.7-8, and 3.10-1 through 3.10-34.	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.9-2, 3.1-1 through 3.1-7, 3.2-1 through 3.2-7, 3.3-1 through 3.3-3, 3.4-1, 3.5-1 through 3.5-4, 3.6-1 through 3.6-6, 3.7-1 through 3.7-8, and 3.10-1 through 3.10-34 be adopted. Mitigation Measure 3.9-2 requires payment of the applicable school fees. Under state law, the payment of school impact fees is deemed to be adequate mitigation for the need for new school facilities. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
detailed discussion of relevant operational and construction impacts can be found in each respective section of this EIR. Furthermore, site-specific environmental review would be required for each school by the responsible school district prior to approval of a design for the facility and would consider any site-specific impacts unknown at this time. Project implementation may result in the need for the construction of new schools, which has the potential to cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts. Potential environmental impacts associated with the future construction of each school within the Plan Area are addressed throughout this EIR. This EIR analyzes the physical environmental effects that may occur as a result of development and introduction of new urban land uses within the Plan Area. Each future school, if constructed, would fall within the range of environmental impacts disclosed in this EIR, and would be subject to relevant mitigation measures included in this EIR. It is noted, however, that development of a school within the proposed Plan Area would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality (Impacts 3.1-2, and 3.1-7), biological resources (Impacts 3.2-9 and 3.2-12), greenhouse gases (Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-4), noise (Impacts 3.7-1, and 3.7-8), and transportation and circulation (Impacts 3.10-3, and 3.10-4). (DEIR, pp. 3.9-19 through 3.9-21)			
Impact 3.9-4: Project implementation may result in effects on parks, or has the potential to require the construction of park facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impacts (Potentially Significant) Physical impacts from construction of the park sites within the Specific Plan Area would be related to relevant environmental topics included in this EIR, such as: air quality (Section 3.1), biological resources (Section 3.2), cultural resources (Section 3.3), greenhouse gas emissions and climate change (Section 3.4), hazards and hazardous materials (Section 3.5), hydrology and water quality (Section 3.6), noise (Section 3.7) population (Section 3.8), public services (Section 3.9), transportation (Section 3.10), and utilities (Section 3.11). A detailed discussion of relevant operational and construction impacts can be found in each	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.1-1 through 3.1-7, 3.2-1 through 3.2-7, 3.3-1 through 3.3-3, 3.4-1, 3.5-1 through 3.5-4, 3.6-1 through 3.6-6, 3.7-1 through 3.7-8, and 3.10-1 through 3.10-34.	SU	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which mitigate the significant effects on the environment. Even so, the effects remain significant and unavoidable, and no additional mitigation is available to fully avoid the effects. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
respective section of this EIR. Project implementation may result in effects on parks, or has the potential to require the construction of park facilities which may cause substantial adverse physical environmental impact. Potential environmental impacts associated with the future construction of park and other recreational facilities within the Plan Area are addressed throughout this EIR. This EIR analyzes the physical environmental effects that may occur as a result of development and introduction of new urban land uses within the Plan Area. Each future park, if constructed, would fall within the range of environmental impacts disclosed in this EIR, and would be subject to relevant mitigation measures included in this EIR. It is noted, however, that development of 49.76 acres of park land within the Plan Area would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality (Impacts 3.1-2, and 3.1-7), biological resources (Impacts 3.2-9 and 3.2-12), greenhouse gases (Impacts 3.4-1, 3.4-2, and 3.4-4), noise (Impacts 3.7-1, and 3.7-8), and transportation and circulation (Impacts 3.10-3, and 3.10-4). (DEIR, pp. 3.9-22 through 3.9-23)			
Impact 3.9-5: Project implementation may result in effects on other public facilities (Less than Significant) Project implementation may result in effects on other public facilities. The West Area Specific Plan would result in new demand for public facilities, including library facilities and recreational facilities. The West Area Specific Plan does not propose a library or other public facility such as a community building within the Plan Area, therefore, it does not have a direct physical impact on the environment. The West Area Specific Plan would be responsible for paying the applicable impact fees, and ongoing revenues from the Specific Plan would be generated from property taxes, sales taxes, and other appropriate fees/payments. Such fees/payments would be the financial contribution for any new demand created by the West Area Specific Plan. (DEIR, pp. 3.9-23 through 3.9-24)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.9-6: Under cumulative conditions the proposed project may result in effects on public facilities (Potentially Significant) The construction and operation of future public	Implement Mitigation Measures 3.1-1 through 3.1-7, 3.2-1 through 3.2-7, 3.3-1 through 3.3-3, 3.4-1, 3.5-1 through 3.5-4, 3.6-1 through 3.6-6, 3.7-1 through 3.7-8, and 3.10-1 through 3.10-34.	CS and SU	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which mitigate the significant effects on the environment. Even so, the effects remain significant and unavoidable, and no additional mitigation is available to fully

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
facilities required to serve cumulative development (including the West Area Specific Plan Area) could potentially cause significant impacts. Cumulative development including additional parks, schools, library, and other public facilities within the city and service area would contribute to significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts that have been identified within this EIR related to: air quality (Impact 3.1-7), biological resources (Impact 3.2-12), greenhouse gases (Impact 3.4-4), noise (Impact 3.7-8), and transportation and circulation (Impacts 3.10-3, and 3.10-4). (DEIR, pp. 3.9-24 through 3.9-26)			avoid the effects. The City Council concludes, however, that the Project's benefits outweigh the significant unavoidable impact of the Project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION			
Impact 3.10-1: Under Existing Plus Project conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would conflict with the performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans (Potentially Significant) Under Existing Plus Project conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would conflict with the performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans. Implementation of the Specific Plan, without mitigations, results in unacceptable operation at eight of the study intersections, and two of the U.S. 101 ramp junctions. All study segments of U.S. 101 performed within the County CMP standards. (DEIR, pp. 3.10-42 through 3.10-46)	**Mitigation Measure 3.10-1**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share funding for the installation of a traffic signal at San Juan Grade Road/Van Buren Avenue, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans for each stage of project development shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-2**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share funding for the optimization of the existing signal timing at San Juan Grade Road/East Boronda Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.10-1 through 3.10-9 be adopted. Mitigation Measures 3.10-1 through 3.10-9 require payment of the applicable fair-share funding for the various improvements that would be required in order to improve traffic conditions at the impacted study intersections and ramps. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-3**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share funding for the signalization of the intersection at Hemingway Drive/East Boronda Road or equivalent traffic control (such as a roundabout), in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. If this intersection is developed as a signalized intersection (instead of roundabouts), this measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-4**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share funding for the optimization of existing signal timings at North Main Street/Laurel Drive, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-5**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share funding for the widening of the intersection at Natividad Road/East Laurel Drive to add additional northbound and southbound through lanes, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. If this intersection is developed as a signalized intersection (instead of a roundabout), this measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-6**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share funding for the installation of a traffic signal or equivalent traffic control (such as a roundabout) at the intersection of North Sanborn Road/East Boronda Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. If this intersection is developed as a signalized intersection (instead of a roundabout), this measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-7**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share funding for the optimization of existing signal timings and to add an eastbound left turn pocket at the intersection of Sherwood Drive/Natividad Road & East Bernal Drive/La Posada Way, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. This mitigation includes the addition of an eastbound left turn pocket and optimization of the existing signal timing to better accommodate the expected changes in traffic distribution and volume with implementation of the proposed project. The final improvement plans shall note		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-8**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share funding for the addition a southbound left turn lane and optimization of the traffic signal's timing at the intersection of Salinas Street/North Main Street/West Market Street/East Market Street, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share requirement. This measure shall consider the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-9**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall contribute its fair-share funding to the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) Regional Development Impact Fee (RDIF) Program and the City of Salinas' Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program, as determined by the TAMC and the City of Salinas, respectively, in proportion to the area planned for development by each project applicant. These programs include improvements to U.S. 101 that would improve mainline and ramp junction operations, which would mitigate the proposed project's impact to the U.S. 101 ramp junctions affected by the proposed project (i.e. the Northbound Road Off-Ramp and Northbound West Laurel Drive Off-Ramp). Fees are payable prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design.		
Impact 3.10-2: Under Existing Plus Project and Central Area Specific Plan conditions, implementation	**Mitigation Measure 3.10-10**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
of the proposed Specific Plan may conflict with the performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans (Potentially Significant) Under Existing Plus Project and Central Area Specific Plan conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may conflict with the performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in unacceptable operation at ten of the study intersections, and two of the U.S. 101 ramp junctions, under the Existing Plus Project and Central Area Specific Plan scenario. All study segments of U.S. 101 performed within the County CMP standards. (DEIR, pp. 3.10-53 through 3.10-56)	Plan Area shall provide its fair-share of funding to optimize the existing traffic signal timing and splits at intersection of North Main Street/East Boronda Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-11**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share of funding to convert the eastbound right turn lane to a shared through-right turn lane at Natividad Road/East Laurel Drive, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-12**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share of funding for addition of an eastbound right turn pocket at the intersection of North Sanborn Road/East Boronda Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-13**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share of funding for the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Williams Road/East Boronda Road, in proportion to the area planned for		environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.10-10 through 3.10-14 be adopted. Mitigation Measures 3.10-10 through 3.10-14 require payment of the applicable fair-share funding for the various improvements that would be required in order to improve traffic conditions at the impacted study intersections and ramps. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-14**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share of funding to optimize the existing traffic signal timing and splits at the South Sanborn/North Sanborn/John Street intersection, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department.		
Impact 3.10-3: Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may conflict with the transportation performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans (Potentially Significant) Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may conflict with the transportation performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans. Implementation of the Specific Plan under the cumulative Plus Project scenario would result in unacceptable operation at seventeen of the study intersections, and three of the freeway segments. All ramp junctions perform at or above the minimum standards set by the County CMP under this scenario. (DEIR, pp, 3.10-63 through 3.10-70)	**Mitigation Measure 3.10-15**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall contribute its fair-share of funding to the TAMC Regional Development Impact Fee provides mitigation for this impact identified as the installation of a traffic signal at intersection of U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps/Echo Valley Road/Crazy Horse Canyon Road. Regional fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas in consultation with TAMC. Fees are payable prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development. This measure shall consider the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-16**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.10-15 through 3.10-27 be adopted. Mitigation Measures 3.10-15 through 3.10-27 require payment of the applicable fair-share funding for the various improvements that would be required in order to improve traffic conditions at the impacted study intersections and segments. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	Plan Area shall contribute its fair-share of the TAMC Regional Development Impact Fee to provide mitigation for this impact identified as the installation of a traffic signal at intersection of U.S. 101 Northbound Ramps/Crazy Horse Canyon Road. Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas in consultation with TAMC. Fees are payable prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development. This measure shall consider the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-17**: Prior to the approval of final improvement plans for each tentative map, each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a traffic signal at intersection of Crazy Horse Canyon Road/San Juan Grade Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant. Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall consider the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-18**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a traffic signal at intersection of Natividad Road/Rogge Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-19**: Each project		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a traffic signal at intersection of Natividad Road/Russell Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-20**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of southbound and westbound left turn lanes at the intersection of North Main Street/East Boronda Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-21**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a southbound left turn lane at the intersection of Constitution Boulevard/East Laurel Drive, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-22**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	for the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Old Stage Road/Williams Road/Private Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-23**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a northbound through lane, the addition of a northbound right turn overlap phase, and the conversion of the westbound through lane to a westbound shared through-left turn lane at the intersection of North Main Street/East Bernal Drive, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note these improvements and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-24**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a northbound and southbound through lanes at the intersection of Sherwood Drive/Natividad Road & East Bernal Drive/La Posada Way, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement.		

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	Mitigation Measure 3.10-25: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a westbound left turn lane at the intersection of South Davis Road/Blanco Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-26**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of an eastbound left turn lane and a southbound left turn lane at the intersection of Salinas Street/North Main Street/West Market Street/East Market Street, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-27**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a northbound left turn lane at the intersection of South Main Street/West Blanco Road/East Blanco Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement.		
Impact 3.10-4: Under Cumulative Plus Project with Central Area Specific Plan conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may conflict with the transportation performance measures established by	**Mitigation Measure 3.10-28**: Prior to the approval of final improvement plans for each tentative map, each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the	LTS	Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into the project, which avoid the significant effects on the environment. The City Council hereby directs that Mitigation Measures 3.10-

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans (Potentially Significant) Under Cumulative Plus Project with Central Area Specific Plan conditions, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan may conflict with the transportation performance measures established by the City of Salinas, Monterey County, and Caltrans. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in unacceptable operation at twenty-two of the study intersections, and four of the freeway segments, under the cumulative Plus Project with Central Area Specific Plan scenario. All ramp junctions perform at or above the minimum standards set by the County CMP under this scenario. (DEIR, pp, 3.10-76 through 3.10-81)	installation of a traffic signal at intersection of Old Stage Road/Hebert Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant. Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. This measure shall include the use of currently available Adaptive Traffic Control Systems (ATCS) in the intersection design, as specified by the City of Salinas Public Works Department. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-29**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of northbound and southbound through lanes on Natividad Road and for the conversion of the existing eastbound right turn lane on East Laurel Drive to a shared through-right turn lane, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-30**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of eastbound and southbound left turn lanes at Constitution Boulevard/East Laurel Drive, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-31**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a westbound left turn lane at the intersection of North Sanborn Road/Boronda Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to		28 through 3.10-33 be adopted. Mitigation Measures 3.10-28 through 3.10-33 require payment of the applicable fair-share funding for the various improvements that would be required in order to improve traffic conditions at the impacted study intersections and segments. Therefore, this impact is less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
	issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-32**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of an eastbound left turn lane at Williams Road/East Boronda Road, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement. **Mitigation Measure 3.10-33**: Each project applicant for development within the Specific Plan Area shall provide its fair-share contribution for the installation of a southbound left turn lane at the intersection of East Front Street/Sherwood Drive/Market Street, in proportion to the area planned for development by such project applicant, in accordance with City policies (payable prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for residential and prior to building permit issuance for non-residential development). Total fees shall be determined by the City of Salinas. The final improvement plans shall note this improvement and the fair-share funding requirement.		
Impact 3.10-5: Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in changes to air traffic patterns (Less than Significant) The nearest air facility to the Specific Plan boundaries is Salinas Municipal Airport, located approximately four miles to the southeast. Additionally, Marina Municipal Airport is located approximately six miles to the southwest. The Specific Plan Area contains no existing or planned airport facilities. The proposed land use changes to and development of the Specific Plan Area are expected to have no effect on the Salinas Municipal Airport or Marina Municipal Airport approach or departure zones, or any other airport approach or	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
departure zones. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in changes to air traffic patterns. (DEIR, pp, 3.10-81 through 3.10-82)			
Impact 3.10-6: Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (Less than Significant) Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature. Development within the Specific Plan Area would include new streets, access points, paths, and other circulation improvements that would be reviewed and checked for compliance with design and safety standards as part of the entitlement process conducted by the City of Salinas. (DEIR, pp, 3.10-82)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.10-7: Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in impacts related to emergency access (Less than Significant) Buildout of the proposed Specific Plan would result in increased development densities and land use intensities within the Specific Plan Area. As a result of buildout of the West Area Specific Plan, which includes the development of an internal transportation network within the Plan Area, the volume of users travelling within the Specific Plan Area is expected to increase. Emergency access along proposed and existing roadways must be accommodated in conjunction within the expected population and employment growth. Plans submitted for individual developments to be constructed in the Specific Plan Area would be reviewed for compliance with emergency access requirements by public safety officials during the City's entitlement process. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not result in impacts related to emergency access. (DEIR, pp, 3.10-82)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.10-8: Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with adopted multi-modal circulation policies, plans, or programs, and would not decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities (Less than Significant) Implementation of the Specific Plan would be consistent with, and would expand upon, the pedestrian and bicycle network identified in the 2002 *Salinas Bikeways Plan*. The Specific Plan	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
would improve the existing bicycle and pedestrian circulation infrastructure within the Specific Plan Area, as well as adjacent areas in the City of Salinas. The West Area Specific Plan is estimated to generate approximately 1,000 new transit trips on a daily basis, as well as 140 trips in the morning peak hour and 150 trips in the evening peak hour (Fehr & Peers, 2018). These new transit trips alone are not expected to overburden existing transit service in the area. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with adopted multi-modal circulation policies, plans, or programs, and would not decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. (DEIR, pp, 3.10-83 through 3.10-84)			

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
UTILITIES			
Impact 3.11-1: The proposed project has the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (Less than Significant) Wastewater generated within the Plan Area would be conveyed by the City of Salinas wastewater conveyance system to M1W Regional Treatment Plant. M1W, a regional agency, owns and operates M1W Treatment Plant. The wastewater treatment system treats domestic wastewater from residential and commercial sources. Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) Order No. R3-2018-0017 provides waste discharge requirements for M1W Treatment Plant, and a supply capacity of up to 29.6 MGD. Implementation of West Area Specific Plan would be covered under the existing capacity and would not exceed the wastewater discharge requirements in this Order. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-9)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.11-2: The proposed project has the potential to result in a determination by the wastewater treatment and/or collection provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments (Less than Significant) The City of Salinas Sanitary Sewer Master Plan projects new development would increase the total wastewater discharge to an average dry weather flow to a maximum of approximately 22.1 MGD at full build-out of the entire City Sphere of Influence. The estimated wastewater discharge for full buildout of the proposed project would be approximately 1.0 MGD. The West Area Specific Plan would increase the amount of wastewater requiring treatment. The wastewater would be treated at M1W Treatment Plant. The (WDRs Order No. R3-2018-0017 allows M1W Treatment Plant to accept up to 29.6 MGD. Given a current demand of approximately 16 MGD (as provided by M1W Treatment Plant Engineer Jennifer Gonzalez), the M1W Treatment Plant currently has an additional capacity of approximately 11 MGD; given 1.0 MGD generated by the project, there is sufficient plant capacity. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-10 through 3.11-11)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact 3.11-3: The proposed project has the potential to require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (Less than Significant) The West Area Specific Plan project does not trigger a need to expand the M1W Treatment Plant. There would be a network of sewer collection infrastructure installed throughout the Plan Area to serve the West Area Specific Plan. The potential for environmental impacts associated with the installation of the wastewater collection system, and all construction activities within the Plan Area, are addressed throughout this EIR. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-11 through 3.11-12)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.11-4: Cumulative impact on wastewater utilities (Less than Significant) The M1W plant is designed and constructed to handle 29.6 MGD; which is more than 4 MGD than the project 2055 demand, under the worst case scenario modelled. The 1.0 MGD expected to be generated by full buildout of the proposed project would thereby leave approximately 3.6 MGD available in 2055, under the worst case scenario modelled. Moreover, it is more than likely that this represents an overestimate of cumulative wastewater demand, given that this estimate utilizes the higher end of the range of projected wastewater at the M1W Regional Treatment Plant in the future. Additionally, buildout of the Specific Plan is expected to occur over an approximately 20 to 30 year timeframe; therefore buildout is expected to occur no later than approximately 2048 (at latest). Therefore, using the year 2055 as the analysis year serves as a conservative date for buildout of the proposed project. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-12 through 3.11-13)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.11-5: The proposed project has the potential to require construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (Less than Significant) The proposed project would not require construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The water infrastructure is sized to meet the	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
demand within the Plan Area. All offsite improvements are to be placed in or adjacent to existing streets to minimize potential impacts. Although the West Area Specific Plan would not require the expansion of existing water treatment facilities, the West Area Specific Plan may require the construction of a new centralized treatment facility within the Plan Area. This treatment facility would be specifically sized to serve the West Area Specific Plan and would not be upsized to ensure that it does not induce growth beyond what is anticipated by the West Area Specific Plan. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-37 through 3.11-38)			
Impact 3.11-6: The proposed project has the potential to have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources (Less than Significant) Water supplies are sufficient to meet the City's existing and projected future potable water demands, including those future water demands associated with the West Area Specific Plan, to the year 2035 under all hydrologic conditions. The three new groundwater wells would provide adequate groundwater for the proposed project. Additionally, the Cal Water Salinas District has sufficient water supply throughout its service area to serve the proposed project, even during the third year of a multi-year drought, and even if the proposed project's groundwater wells proved to not be sufficient to serve the entire Plan Area. Moreover, the development of the West Area Specific Plan would reduce consumption of groundwater (equivalent to increasing groundwater storage), when compared to the existing agricultural uses; this would also have the effect of reducing the potential for seawater intrusion into the groundwater basin, when compared to the existing agricultural uses. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-38 through 3.11-41)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.11-7: Cumulative Impact on Water Utilities (Less than Significant) There would be sufficient water resources available to provide supply for buildout of the cumulative scenario, so that no significant cumulative effect on the overall water supply would result. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-41 through 3.11-43)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact 3.11-8: The proposed project has the potential to require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (Less than Significant) No new or expanded existing off-site infrastructure is proposed or would be required. Proposed project storm water infrastructure would be developed on-site, with connections made to off-site existing storm drain pipes along existing rights-of-way (such as along McKinnon Street). Installation of storm drainage infrastructure would occur during the construction phase of the proposed project. The construction of the new on-site stormwater drainage facilities, which are associated with the proposed project, has the potential to cause environmental impacts. The potential for environmental impacts associated with the installation of the stormwater system, and all construction activities within the Plan Area, are addressed throughout this EIR. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-63)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.11-9: Cumulative Impact on Stormwater Facilities (Less than Significant) The West Area Specific Plan includes an extensive system of on-site stormwater collection, treatment and retention facilities to accommodate the increased stormwater flows that would originate in the Specific Plan Area. Surface runoff from the area will be managed via detention/retention basins and flow reducing Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent local flooding within the Specific Plan Area. These features will also reduce peak flows from the Specific Plan Area to receiving creeks and storm drains to amounts less than such flows under existing conditions. The construction, maintenance, and operation of all stormwater facilities are not anticipated to cause substantial adverse impacts. The proposed project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts associated with stormwater facilities. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-63 through 3.11-65)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Impact 3.11-10: The proposed project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste (Less than	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Significant) The West Area Specific Plan would be required to comply with applicable State and local requirements including those pertaining to solid waste, construction waste diversion, and recycling. The addition of the volume of solid waste associated with the West Area Specific Plan, approximately 24.5 tons per day at total buildout, would increase the total to the Johnson Canyon Landfill; however, this increase would not cause an exceedance of the landfill's remaining capacity. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-72)			
Impact 3.11-11: Cumulative Impact on Solid Waste Facilities (Less than Significant) The Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority service area is expected to add numerous developments through 2055. The Central Area Specific Plan, East Area Specific Plan, and the Economic Development Element (EDE) are three such areas, located within the City of Salinas. These new areas would generate an estimated 75 to 100 tons per day at total buildout. Buildout of other communities within the Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority' service area would also affect Johnson County Landfill. These jurisdictions within the region are likely to generate new sources of solid waste that would need to be processed at the landfill. The Johnson Canyon Landfill has the capacity to serve nearly three times as much waste per day as it does currently and will have sufficient capacity to serve communities within the Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority service area. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant cumulative impact relative to this environmental topic. (DEIR, pp. 3.11-72 through 3.11-73)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
OTHER ISSUES			
Aesthetics The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) noted that General Plan buildout would allow development to occur in the City in both vacant and underdeveloped portions of the community, and that the introduction/expansion of urban uses into these areas has the potential to interrupt views of natural features, open space, the hillsides, and agricultural resources, reducing the aesthetic value of these resources. Additionally, new development	To minimize and mitigate the impacts on aesthetics, the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) presented the following five mitigation measures: Mitigation Measure A1 requires the City to implement the City's Gateway Guidelines; Mitigation Measure A2 requires the City to strengthen and require compliance with the City's Design Guidelines; Mitigation Measure A3 requires the City to improve the Lighting Ordinance; Mitigation Measure A4 requires the	LTS	Three of the five mitigation measures included in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002), including Mitigation Measures A1, A2, and A3, are requirements for the City of Salinas to implement. These measures do not apply to the proposed project. Mitigation Measures A4 and A5 are requirements for both the City and for proposed projects or discretionary projects. The proposed project would be subject to Mitigation Measure A4, which requires consistency with the landscaping requirements. All landscaping in the Specific Plan Area would be subject to the City's landscaping requirements. The proposed project would also be

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
in the City was found to increase the amount of light and glare in the community, particularly in areas planned for nonresidential development, such as retail and general commercial. It was also found that future development under the General Plan has the potential to change the visual character of the City. Subsequently, the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) indicated that aesthetic impacts associated with the FGAs, which includes the West Area Specific Plan, would not be different from those discussed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002). Any future development under the approved General Plan, which includes all development under the proposed project, would be required to comply with the above referenced regulations, policies, and standards. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed in the in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) and *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007). (See the Initial Study)	City to implement landscaping requirements for all proposed projects; and Mitigation Measure A5 requires the City to review all discretionary projects for aesthetics impacts.		subject to Mitigation Measure A5, which requires the City of review the proposed project for aesthetics impacts. Impacts to aesthetics are analyzed in the Initial Study for the project. See Appendix A of the Draft EIR for the West Area Specific Plan Initial Study. Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Agriculture and Forest Resources The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) noted that General Plan buildout would result in the conversion of 3,525 acres of agriculture lands to urban uses. The *Final Environmental Impact Report,* also indicates that General Plan buildout would result in agricultural activity in proximity to residential and other urban uses, which may result in conflicts between the uses. It is noted that agricultural activity can cause nuisances related to air quality and noise that may disturb surrounding development. Urban activities may also negatively affect nearby agricultural uses, as increased vandalism often occurs and the introduction of domestic animals may disturb certain agricultural activities. The City of Salinas certified the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002), adopted a statement of overriding considerations relative to this significant and unavoidable impact, and approved the Salinas	The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) concluded that with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AG1 through AG4, the impacts on potential compatibility issues would be reduced to a less than significant level; however, while the impacts on agricultural conversion would be reduced to the extent feasible, a significant and unavoidable impact would remain related to the loss of important farmland. Mitigation AG5 specifically addressed Agricultural Land Conservation Easement Program, which states that the City will work with the County of Monterey and other local jurisdictions to create and implement an agricultural land conservation easement program, including such measures as securing the dedication of easements or by paying a mitigation fee that could be used to purchase easements through a mitigation bank. Additionally, in 2006, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 19422, approving the Agricultural Land Preservation Program. The resolution adopted a $750.00 per acre mitigation fee for agricultural lands currently	LTS	All of the five mitigation measures included in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002), including Mitigation Measures AG1 through AG5, are requirements for the City of Salinas to implement. These measures do not apply to the proposed project. Additionally, in 2006, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 19422, approving the Agricultural Land Preservation Program. The resolution adopted a per acre mitigation fee for agricultural lands currently designated by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping Program as "Prime" or "of Statewide Importance." The project would be subject to this fee. Impacts to agricultural resources are analyzed in the Initial Study for the project. See Appendix A of the Draft EIR for the West Area Specific Plan Initial Study. Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
General Plan. Subsequently, the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) indicated that agricultural impacts associated with the FGAs, which includes the Specific Plan, would not be different from those discussed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002). Any future development under the approved General Plan, which includes all development under the proposed project, would be required to comply with the above-referenced regulations, policies, and standards. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) and *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007). (See the Initial Study)	designated by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping Program as "Prime" or "of Statewide Importance."		
Geology and Soils Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) and Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR (EDAW/AECOM 2007). (See the Initial Study)	No additional mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials While the Draft EIR analyzes Hazards and Hazardous Materials, several topics were determined to not warrant additional analysis within the Chapter. The land uses proposed within the Specific Plan Area would not be expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Additionally, these uses are not expected to 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. Furthermore, the proposed project is not located in the vicinity of an airport or private airstrip; therefore, it would not result in a safety hazard related to air traffic for people residing or working in the Specific Plan Area. These topics do not	No additional mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
warrant additional analysis and will not be addressed further in the EIR. Separately, the City has adopted a Multi-hazard Emergency Plan, which serves as extensions of the California Emergency Plan and the Emergency Resource Management Plan. The purpose of the Multi-hazard Emergency Plan is to respond to emergency situations with a coordinated system of emergency service providers and facilities. The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) in City Hall serves as the center of the City's emergency operations. The Plan also addresses evacuation and movement of people in the event of an emergency. The proposed project does not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the Multi-hazard Emergency Plan. Implementation of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact relative to this environmental topic and will not be further analyzed or addressed further in the EIR. Lastly, the proposed project is not located in an area that is considered a high risk for wildfires. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. (See the Initial Study)			
Land Use and Planning The *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002) concluded that with the impacts would be reduced to a **less than significant** level with mitigation. Subsequently, the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) indicated that impacts associated with the FGAs, which include the Specific Plan Area, would not be different from those discussed in the *Final Environmental Impact Report, Salinas General Plan* (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002). The City certified the Final Supplemental EIR and approved annexation of the North of Boronda FGA, which includes the West Area Specific Plan. The project, as proposed, is consistent with the Greater Salinas Area Memorandum of Understanding (GSA-MOU). All development under the proposed project would be required to comply with the regulations, policies, and standards identifies in the *Final Environmental*	No additional mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION)	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	FINDINGS OF FACT
Impact Report, Salinas General Plan (Cotton Bridges Associates 2002), and *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any new significant adverse impacts beyond those addressed within these supporting documents. (See the Initial Study)			
Mineral Resources It was determined in the *Final Supplemental for the Salinas General Plan Final Program EIR* (EDAW/AECOM 2007) that development of the FGA, including the Specific Plan Area, would not have a significant impact on mineral resources or mining activities. As such, implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on mineral resources. (See the Initial Study)	No mitigation measures are necessary.	LTS	Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.)