

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

1930 Ocean Street Extension Residential Project

SCH NO. 2016102018

PREPARED FOR
City of Santa Cruz

PREPARED BY
DUDEK

August 2018

FINAL

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

1930 OCEAN STREET EXTENSION RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

SCH NO. 2016102018

PREPARED FOR:

CITY OF SANTA CRUZ

Planning and Community Development Department

PREPARED BY:

DUDEK

Santa Cruz, California

August 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	Purpose of the EIR	1-1
1.2	Project Overview	1-2
1.3	Scope of the EIR.....	1-2
1.4	Environmental Review and Approval Process.....	1-3
1.5	Organization of EIR.....	1-7
2	SUMMARY	2-1
2.1	Introduction.....	2-1
2.2	Project Overview	2-1
2.3	Areas of Controversy or Concern	2-1
2.4	Summary of Alternatives.....	2-2
2.5	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	2-2
2.6	Issues to be Resolved	2-8
3	CHANGES TO DEIR AND PRDEIR	3-1
3.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.2	Changes to Draft EIR.....	3-2
3.3	Changes to Partial Recirculated Draft EIR	3-5
4	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES.....	4-1
4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.2	List of Comment Letters Received.....	4-2
4.3	Master Responses and Responses to Comments on DEIR.....	4-5
4.4	Response to Comments on PRDEIR.....	4=141
FIGURES		
4.1.3A	NEW Photo Simulation of Proposed Project.....	3-11
TABLES		
5-16	REVISED: Summary of Alternatives	3-3
4-1	NEW: Index of Commenters	4-2
4-2	NEW: Index of Master Responses	4-6
APPENDICES		
A	Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program	
B.	Public Comments on DEIR and PRDEIR	

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

This EIR has been prepared for the City of Santa Cruz (City), which is the lead agency for the project. This document, together with the Draft EIR dated May 2017 and Partial Recirculated Draft EIR dated April 2018, constitutes the Final EIR for the proposed 1930 Ocean Street Extension Residential Project. This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which is found in the California Public Resources Code, Division 13, and with the State CEQA Guidelines, which are found in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, commencing with section 15000.

As stated in the CEQA Guidelines section 15002, the basic purposes of CEQA are to:

- Inform governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
- Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced.
- Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible.
- Disclose to the public the reasons a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15121, an EIR is an informational document which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information which may be presented to the agency. While the information in the EIR does not control the ultimate decision about the project, the agency must consider the information in the EIR and respond to each significant effect identified in the EIR by making findings pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.

Pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21002), public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects. Pursuant to section 15021 of the State CEQA Guidelines, CEQA establishes a duty for public agencies to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. In deciding whether changes in a project are feasible, an agency may consider specific economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. According to the State CEQA Guidelines, “feasible” 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. This section further indicates that CEQA recognizes that in determining whether and how a project should be approved, a public agency has

an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors, and an agency shall prepare a “statement of overriding considerations” as to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives when the agency decides to approve a project that will cause one or more significant effects on the environment. The environmental review process is further explained below in Section 1.4.

1.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addresses the potential environmental effects of construction of the proposed 40-unit apartment/condominium development. The project application consists of a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Tentative Parcel Map for a Condominium Project, Design Permit, and Planned Development (PD). The General Plan Amendment is to change the land use designation from L (Low Density Residential) to LM (Low Medium Density Residential). The Zoning Map amendment is to rezone the site from R-1-10 (Single-Family Residence) to RL (Multiple Residence – Low Density). The PD request is for a variation to allow tandem parking and a variation to slope regulations to permit development within 10 feet of 30 percent slopes. A full description of all project components is provided in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

1.3 SCOPE OF THE EIR

An Initial Study and Notice of Preparation were prepared for the project, which identify potentially significant impacts and discuss issues that were found to result in no impacts or less-than-significant impacts (see Appendix A of the Draft EIR). Based on the analyses in the Initial Study and responses to the Notice of Preparation (as discussed below), this EIR evaluates potentially significant impacts for the topics listed below. The EIR also evaluates topics required by CEQA and CEQA Guidelines, including growth inducement, project alternatives, and cumulative impacts. The environmental analysis for this EIR includes:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Transportation and Traffic
- Water Supply
- Land Use
- Energy Conservation

As indicated above, the focus of the environmental review process is upon significant environmental effects. As defined in section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines, a “significant effect on the environment” is:

... a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether a physical change is significant.

In evaluating the significance of the environmental effect of a project, the State CEQA Guidelines require the lead agency to consider direct physical changes in the environment and reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes in the environment which may be caused by the project (CEQA Guidelines section 15064[d]). A direct physical change in the environment is a physical change in the environment which is caused by and immediately related to the project. An indirect physical change in the environment is a physical change in the environment which is not immediately related to the project, but which is caused indirectly by the project. An indirect physical change is to be considered only if that change is a reasonably foreseeable impact which may be caused by the project.

CEQA Guidelines section 15064(e) further indicates that economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment, although they may be used to determine that a physical change shall be regarded as a significant effect on the environment. In addition, where a reasonably foreseeable physical change is caused by economic or social effects of a project, the physical change may be regarded as a significant effect in the same manner as any other physical change resulting from the project.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS

1.4.1 Scoping

Under CEQA, the lead agency for a project is the public agency with primary responsibility for carrying out or approving the project, and for implementing the requirements of CEQA. CEQA Guidelines section 15083 authorizes and encourages an early consultation or scoping process to help identify the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed and considered in an EIR, and to help resolve the concerns of affected regulatory agencies, organizations, and the public. Scoping is designed to explore issues for environmental evaluation, ensuring that important considerations are not overlooked and uncovering concerns that might otherwise go unrecognized.

An Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR were circulated for a 30-day comment period on October 6, 2016. The NOP, with an Initial Study as an attachment, was circulated to the State Clearinghouse and to local, regional, and federal agencies in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines. The NOP also was sent to organizations and interested citizens that have requested notification in the past for the proposal project or any project. Additionally, the NOP was circulated to owners of property contiguous to the project site in accordance with noticing requirements in the City's CEQA Guidelines. An agency and public scoping meeting also was held on October 26, 2016 to take public comments on the scope of the EIR's analyses. Written comments were received from one public agency (Caltrans), one organization (Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association [OSENSA]), and 12 individuals and families. The written comments and oral comments received at the scoping meeting have been taken into consideration in the preparation of this EIR for comments that address environmental issues. Comments received during the scoping period regarding environmental issues generally include the following concerns, which are further discussed in the EIR chapters that discuss the relevant topic:

- Aesthetics and impacts to the visual character of the surrounding area;
- Air quality and impacts of emissions from the adjacent crematory;
- Biological impacts to sensitive habitat, special status species, and wildlife;
- Geotechnical issues related to soils, slopes, landslides and liquefaction;
- Drainage and water quality impacts;
- Traffic and parking impacts; and
- Land use concerns, including consistency of the General Plan amendment and rezoning with the General Plan 2030, effects of increased density on surrounding areas, and effects of agricultural operations on Ocean Street Extension.

1.4.2 Public Review of Draft EIR

The Draft EIR was published and circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day public review period from May 17, 2017 through June 30, 2017. Copies of the document were distributed to the State Clearinghouse, regional and local agencies, and interested organizations and individuals for their review and comment. Letters of comment on the Draft EIR were received from three public agencies, the project applicant, five organizations, and 132 individuals, 43 of which were the same letter. Upon review by City staff, it was determined that additional analyses were warranted, resulting in preparation of a Partial Recirculated Draft EIR.

1.4.3 Partial Recirculation of Draft EIR

State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is included. As used in this section of the CEQA Guidelines, the term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.
- The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

Section 15088.5 also allows the lead agency to recirculate only the chapters or portions of the Draft EIR that have been revised. The lead agency may request that reviewers limit their comments to the revised sections, and the agency need only respond to comments received during the recirculation period that relate to the revised Draft EIR sections.

The Partial Recirculated Draft EIR (PRDEIR) was prepared in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5. The PRDEIR included a revised Traffic and Transportation section (Section 4.5) and Cumulative Traffic section (part of Section 5.4) due primarily to a new finding of a significant unavoidable impact that was not identified in the DEIR and other minor revisions and clarifications in both sections. The PRDEIR document also included a new Section 4.8, Energy Conservation, which was not previously provided for public review in the DEIR. All other sections of the Draft EIR, dated May 2017, remained unchanged and were not subject to recirculation or additional public comment.

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines, PRDEIR was available for public review for 45 days April 27 through June 11, 2018. The lead agency need only respond to (i) comments received during the initial circulation period that relate to chapters or portions of the document that were not revised and recirculated, and (ii) comments received during the recirculation period that relate to the chapters or portions of the earlier EIR that were revised and recirculated. Therefore, the City of Santa Cruz, as the lead agency, requested that reviewers limit the scope of their comments to the revised and added sections in the PRDEIR. Letters of comment on the PRDEIR were received from one public agency, the project applicant, three organizations, and 17 individuals.

1.4.4 Final EIR/Project Approval

This Final EIR volume includes written responses to significant environmental issues raised in comments received during the public review period for the Draft EIR and PRDEIR sections in accordance with CEQA Guidelines sections 15088 and 15088.5, respectively. The Final EIR also includes Draft EIR and PRDEIR text changes and additions that became necessary after consideration of public comments (see CEQA Guidelines, § 15088, subd. (c)).) The Final EIR, which includes this Final EIR volume, the May 2017 Draft EIR and April 2018 Partial Recirculated Draft EIR, will be presented to the City the City Planning Commission and City Council. Before it can approve the project or any of the alternatives described in the Final EIR, the City Council must first certify that it has reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, that the EIR has been completed in conformity with the requirements of CEQA, and that the document reflects the City's independent judgment (see CEQA Guidelines, § 15090, subd. (a).)

Pursuant to sections 21002, 21002.1 and 21081 of CEQA and sections 15091 and 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects unless both of the following occur:

- (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:
 - (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects on the environment.
 - (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by such other agency.
 - (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.
- (b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

Although these determinations (especially regarding feasibility) are made by the public agency's final decision-making body based on the entirety of the agency's administrative record as it exists after completion of a final EIR, the draft EIR must provide information regarding the significant effects of the proposed project and must identify the potentially feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to be considered by that decision-making body.

1.4.5 Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CEQA requires that a program to monitor and report on mitigation measures be adopted by a lead agency as part of the project approval process. CEQA requires that such a program be adopted at the time the agency approves a project or determines to carry out a project for which an EIR has been prepared to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the EIR are implemented. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is included in Appendix A of this document.

1.5 ORGANIZATION OF EIR

This document, together with the Draft EIR dated May 2017 and Partial Recirculated Draft EIR dated April 2018, constitutes the Final EIR for the project. This document contains responses to comments received on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR is organized with the following sections.

- **Chapter 1, Introduction**, explains the CEQA process; describes the scope and purpose of this EIR; provides information on the environmental review and approval process; and outlines the organization of this Final EIR document.
- **Chapter 2, Summary**, presents an overview of the project; provides a summary of the impacts of the project and mitigation measures; provides a summary of the alternatives being considered; includes a discussion of known areas of controversy; and lists the topics not carried forward for further analysis.
- **Chapter 3, Changes to Draft EIR**, outlines revisions to the Draft EIR text as a result of review of comments and responses as may be needed. Additional clarification provided by City staff also is included.
- **Chapter 4, Public Comments and Responses**, includes responses to comments, including nine Master Responses that address broad issue areas or topics raised in multiple comments.
- **Appendices.** A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is included in Appendix A. Appendix B includes all the written comments on the DEIR and PRDEIR.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 2 SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a brief description of the proposed project, known areas of controversy or concern, project alternatives, all potentially significant impacts identified during the course of this environmental analysis, and issues to be resolved. This summary is intended as an overview and should be used in conjunction with a thorough reading of the EIR. This document, together with the Draft EIR dated May 2017 and Partial Recirculated Draft EIR dated April 2018, constitutes the Final EIR for the proposed 1930 Ocean Street Extension Residential Project, and the text of these volumes, including figures, tables, and appendices, serves as the basis for this summary.

2.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addresses the potential environmental effects of construction of the proposed 40-unit apartment/condominium development. The project application consists of a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Tentative Condominium Plan, Design Permit, and Planned Development (PD). The General Plan Amendment is to change the land use designation from L (Low Density Residential) to LM (Low Medium Density Residential). The Zoning Map amendment is to rezone the site from R-1-10 (Single-Family Residence) to RL (Multiple Residence – Low Density). The PD request is for a variation to allow tandem parking and a variation to slope regulations to permit development within 10 feet of 30 percent slopes. A full description of all project components is provided in Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft EIR.

2.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY OR CONCERN

The City of Santa Cruz, as the Lead Agency, has identified areas of concern based on the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) and public review of the Draft EIR and Partial Recirculated Draft EIR. The following issues and concerns have been raised, some of which may be areas of controversy:

- Aesthetics and impacts to the visual character of the surrounding area;
- Air quality and impacts of emissions from the adjacent crematory;
- Biological impacts to sensitive habitat, special status species, and wildlife;
- Geotechnical issues related to soils, slopes, landslides and liquefaction;
- Drainage and water quality impacts;
- Traffic and parking impacts; and

- Land use concerns, including consistency of the General Plan amendment and rezoning with the General Plan 2030, effects of increased density on surrounding areas, and effects of agricultural operations on Ocean Street Extension.

2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe and evaluate alternatives to the project that could eliminate significant adverse project impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level. The following alternatives are evaluated in the CEQA CONSIDERATIONS section (Chapter 5.0) of this EIR

- No Project Alternative Required by CEQA
- Alternative 1 – Residential Development with Existing Designations
- Alternative 2 – Residential Development with Rezoning Only
- Alternative 3 – Reduced Project Size

Table 5-4 in Section 5 of this EIR presents a comparison of project impacts between the proposed project and the alternatives. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative, would eliminate the identified significant impacts, but would not attain any of the project objectives. Of the other alternatives, Alternative 1 and 2 would potentially eliminate the significant impact related to disturbance to nesting birds as the need to remove trees may be eliminated. None of the other identified significant impacts would be eliminated with any alternative, but would be reduced in severity with all alternatives. Of the alternatives considered, Alternative 3 would best achieve project objectives, while also reducing the severity of identified significant impacts and therefore, is considered the environmentally superior alternative of the alternatives reviewed.

2.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

All impacts identified in the subsequent environmental analyses are summarized in this section. This summary groups impacts of similar ranking together, beginning with significant unavoidable impacts, followed by significant impacts that can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, followed by impacts not found to be significant. The discussions in the Initial Study of impacts that are not being addressed in detail in the text of the Draft EIR are intended to satisfy the requirement of CEQA Guidelines section 15128 that an EIR “shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and therefore were not discussed in detail in the EIR.” The Initial Study is included in Appendix A of this EIR. A summary of less-than-significant and no impacts identified in the Initial study is presented at the end of this section.

2.5.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

The following impacts were found to be potentially significant, and while mitigation measures have been identified, the impact cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Impact Trans-1: Circulation System Impacts. The project will result in an increase in daily and peak hour trips, but would not cause existing or planned intersections to operate at an unacceptable Level of Service (LOS). However, project trips would contribute to the existing unacceptable LOS at the Ocean Street / Highway 1 Southbound Off Ramp intersection.

MITIGATION TRANS-1: Require the project applicant to contribute the project's share of the cost of signalization and widening of the Highway 1 Southbound Off-ramp at Ocean Street.

Cumulative: Cumulative traffic at the Ocean Street / Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp intersection, which is already operating at a deficient LOS, would result in a significant cumulative impact at the off-ramp. The project's contribution towards signalization and the widening of the off-ramp as required by Mitigation Trans-1 would reduce the project's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable. While, implementation of Mitigation Measure Trans-1 would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, due to uncertainty of funding and timing of construction, it is concluded that the cumulative impact will remain significant and unavoidable.

2.5.2 Significant Impacts

The following impacts were found to be potentially significant, but could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of identified mitigation measures should the City's decision-makers impose the measures on the project at the time of final action on the project.

Impact Geo-1: Exposure to Seismic Hazards. The project site will be exposed to strong ground-shaking during a major earthquake on any of the nearby faults, resulting in the exposure of people and/or structures to damage due to strong seismic shaking and potential liquefaction.

MITIGATION GEO-1: Incorporate all recommendations of the project geotechnical investigations and reviews (Haro, Kasunich & Associates, 2007, 2010, 2014 and 2016) in a project design-level geotechnical investigation and incorporate recommendations into final building, grading and drainage plan designs into building plans

with additional soils borings as recommended to finalize designs of foundations and retaining wall.

Impact Bio-1: **Nesting Birds.** Tree removal during the breeding season (generally March 1 to August 1) could result in direct mortality to nesting avian species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act due to destruction if active nest sites are present. Construction activity for a prolonged period could affect nesting adults and result in nest abandonment or failure.

MITIGATION BIO-1: Schedule tree removal to take place between August 15 and February 15 of any given year to avoid the nesting season for birds. If this schedule is not practical, require a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting raptors no more than 15 days prior to tree removal. If nesting raptors are found, construction may need to be delayed until August or after the wildlife biologist has determined the nest is no longer in use or unless a suitable construction buffer zone can be identified by the biologist. The biologist will determine the extent of a construction-free buffer zone to be established around the nest (typically 300 feet for raptors and 100 feet for other species), to ensure that no nests of species protected by the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code will be disturbed during project construction.

Impact Bio-2: **Heritage Tree Damage.** Six onsite coast live oak trees will be retained as part of the proposed development, but could be inadvertently damaged during construction due to grading and disturbance to root zones.

MITIGATION BIO-2: Implement measures to protect oak trees to be retained in order to minimize damage to protected trees and their root zones during construction as outlined in the project arborist reports (Ellen Cooper & Associates, March 15, 2010, August 16, 2010 as updated in January 2016), including, but not limited to, the following: installation of temporary construction fencing around the dripline of the trees, cabling of tree trunks as specified, prohibition of storage or dumping of any kind within the fenced area, protection of the trees and root zones as specified, and pruning as specified in the report. Require that the project arborist be retained throughout the duration of the project to

inspect and monitor tree protection zones and to ensure that all arborist recommendations are implemented. The project arborist shall determine in the field if and how Tree 14 can be retained and protected during grading operations.

Impact Noise-1: Exposure to Noise. Portions of the proposed residential buildings would be exposed to exterior and /or interior noise levels that exceed local and state requirements.

MITIGATION NOISE-1: Require implementation of recommendations set forth in the project noise assessment (Edward L. Pack Associates, Inc., October 28, 2009) as updated at the time of building permit submittal, which includes design standards for windows, including keeping some adjacent to Graham Hill Road closed at all times with proper ventilation if needed.

2.5.3 Less-Than-Significant Impacts

The following impacts were found to be less-than-significant. Mitigation measures are not required.

Impact Aesth-2: Scenic Resources. The proposed project would result in removal of 10 trees that are not visually distinctive or prominent and are not are not located along a designated scenic highway or roadway.

Impact Aesth-3: Visual Character of the Surrounding Area. The proposed project would introduce new multi-family residential development into the area, which would be visible in the immediate vicinity of the site, but overall building siting, height, scale and mass would not substantially degrade the visual character of the surrounding area.

Impact Aesth-4: Introduction of Light and Glare. The proposed project would include exterior lighting typical of residential developments, but would not result in introduction of a major new source of light or glare.

Impact Air-1: Criteria Pollutant Emissions. Project construction and operations will result in emissions of criteria pollutants, but would not exceed adopted thresholds of significance, violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- Impact Air-2: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions.** Project construction and operations will result in GHG emissions, which are not considered significant.
- Impact Geo-2: Slope Stability.** Project development will result in construction on moderate slopes, regrading of the upper slopes, and construction of homes on cut pads, but the project would not cause or result in slope instability. Potential instability of a fill slope below Graham Road will be addressed with the proposed retaining wall along the eastern edge of the site.
- Impact Geo-3: Soils Constraints.** With implementation of recommendations of the geotechnical feasibility report, development of the project is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint.
- Impact Hydro-1: Stormwater Drainage.** The proposed project will result in an increase in runoff, but would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain facilities, cause downstream or offsite drainage problems, or increase the risk or severity of flooding in downstream areas.
- Impact Hydro-2: Water Quality.** Runoff from the project's onsite access road could result in downstream water quality degradation to San Lorenzo River from automobile oils and greases carried in stormwater runoff. Project grading could also result in erosion and potential downstream sedimentation if not properly managed. However, with the proposed stormwater treatment measures and planned project improvements and controls, this is considered a less-than-significant impact.
- Impact Trans-2: Highway Segment Impacts.** The project will result in an increase in daily and peak hour trips, but would not result in a change to an unacceptable LOS along state highway segments.
- Impact Water-1: Water Supply.** The proposed project will result in an increased demand for water supply in a system that, under existing conditions, has adequate supplies during average and normal years, but is subject to potential supply shortfalls during dry and critically dry years. The additional project demand would not result in a substantial increase during dry years and would not be of a magnitude to affect the level of curtailment that might be in effect.
- Impact Water-2: Groundwater Recharge.** The proposed project will result in increased impervious surfaces on the project site, but would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge.

Impact 4.8-1: Energy Use. The proposed project could result in indirect increased energy demands, which would not be wasteful or an inefficient use of resources.

Impacts Evaluated in Initial Study (Draft EIR Appendix A)

- Biological Resources: Special Status Species
- Cultural Resources: Paleontological Resources
- Hazards: Wildland Fire Hazard
- Noise: Permanent and Temporary Increases in Noise Levels
- Population-Housing: Population Growth Inducement
- Public Services: Fire Protection, Police Protection, Schools, Parks
- Recreation: Increase Use of Existing Parks
- Utilities: Wastewater Treatment, Solid Waste Disposal

2.5.4 No Impacts

The State CEQA Guidelines section 15128 require that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. Through the Initial Study, NOP scoping process, and EIR, the City of Santa Cruz determined that the proposed project would have no impact on the environmental issues outlined below, and thus, are not further analyzed in the EIR. See the Initial Study in Appendix A for further discussion.

Impacts Evaluated in EIR

- Aesth-1: Scenic Views
- Trans-3: Project Access / Creation of Hazards
- Trans-4: Emergency Access
- Trans-5: Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Travel
- Water: Groundwater Recharge
- Land-1: Conflicts with Policies and Regulations
- Land-2: Conflicts with Agricultural Operations

Impacts Evaluated in Initial Study (Draft EIR Appendix A)

- Agricultural and Forest Resources
- Biological Resources: Riparian, Wetland and Sensitive Habitats

- Cultural Resources: Historic, Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials, except Wildland Fire Risk
- Mineral Resources
- Noise: Generation of Vibration, Location Within Airport Land Use Plan
- Population-Housing: Displacement of Housing or Residents
- Recreation: Impacts of Construction of Recreational Facilities
- Utilities: Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements, Storm Drain Improvements with Significant Impacts, Conflicts with Solid Waste Regulations

2.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

CEQA Guidelines section 15123 requires the Summary to identify “issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.” This EIR has presented mitigation measures and project alternatives, and the City Planning Commission and City Council will consider the Final EIR when considering the proposed project. In considering whether to approve the project, the Planning Commission and City Council will take into consideration the environmental consequences of the project with mitigation measures and project alternatives, as well as other factors related to feasibility. “Feasible” 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 (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15364). Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or already owns the alternative site). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives. 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. 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.

CHAPTER 3 CHANGES TO DRAFT EIR AND PARTIAL RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Changes to Draft EIR and Partial Recirculated Draft EIR text that are identified below are shown in underlined type for new text and ~~strikeout~~ type for deleted text.

3.2 CHANGES TO DRAFT EIR

Introduction and Summary

Page 1-2 Change the second sentence of Section 1.2 AND
Page 2-1 Change the second sentence of Section 2.2 as follows:

The project application consists of a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Tentative Parcel Map for a Condominium Project Plan, Design Permit, and Planned Development (PD to construct a 40-unit apartment/condominium development.

Page 2-1 Revise Summary as shown in Chapter 2 of this document.

Project Description

Page 3-2 Revise the first sentence of the second paragraph as follows:

A lawsuit was filed by the Applicant against Santa Cruz Memorial Park, and in 2013 a settlement agreement was reached in which the Memorial Park, ~~from whom the parcel was purchased~~, agreed to relocate the crematory to the west side of Ocean Street Extension.

Page 3-4 Revise the fifth sentence of Section 3.4 as follows:

The project application consists of a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Tentative Parcel Map for a Condominium Project Plan, Design Permit, and Planned Development (PD to construct a 40-unit apartment/condominium development.

Aesthetics

Page 4.1-8 Revise the first sentence of the last paragraph as follows:

With regards to overall layout, the proposed buildings are stepped up the gentle slope of the property, which minimizes grading relative to leveling of the project site.

Page 4.1-9 Revise the last sentence of the third full paragraph as follows:

These trellis and patio features help break up the building plane mass along some elevations of the residential structures, which helps break up the appearance of the building mass.

Page 4.1-9 Add the following expanded text to the end of the last paragraph:

A photo simulation of the project along Graham Hill Road was prepared by the applicant's architect and is included as Figure 4.1-A (at the end of this chapter). As seen, only the upper portion of the buildings would be visible, and would not appear massive or imposing. Furthermore, the proposed landscaping with 18 trees along the Graham Hill Road frontage would serve to soften and screen the exterior building appearance.

Page 4.1-10 Revise the first sentence of the third paragraph as follows:

The proposed muted colors, ~~limited windows~~, planned landscaped trellises, and other landscaping would serve to soften the overall building mass.

Page 4.1-11 Add the following before the last sentence of the first paragraph:

While the project would introduce residential structures on a currently vacant site, the project would not substantially change the visual character of the surrounding area as it is not substantially different than other similar developments within the City to the south.

Page 4.1-14 Correct typo of project name on Figure 4.1-2 from 9130 to 1930 Ocean Street Extension.

Page 4.1-14 Add a new Figure 4.1-3A to show photo simulation of project from Graham Hill Road, which is included at the end of this chapter.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Page 4.4-5 Revise the first sentence of the second full paragraph as follows:

Stormwater runoff from the site is conveyed via sheet flow across the site and flows ~~into an 18-inch storm drain that runs northerly along the east side of Ocean~~

Street Extension along the project frontage and discharges on the surface of the street until it flows into a drainage ditch past the project site or continues down the east side of the street to Crossing Street.

Land Use

Page 4.7-3 Revise the third sentence of the second paragraph as follows:

Review by City Planning Department staff indicate that the parcel has a net developable area of 96,268 ~~96,503~~ square feet (2.21 acres), excluding areas with 30-percent or greater slopes. Given the developable area of the project site, development under current designations could result in nine single-family homes on nine 10,000+ square foot lots.

Page 4.7-9 Revise discussion for Policy CD3.2 as follows:

NO CONFLICT: Project does not affect public views or City landmarks as none exist in the vicinity of the project as shown on the Landmarks Map on page 24 of the General Plan, and the project will not affect limited distant views of Holy Cross Church.

Alternatives

Page 5-16 Correct clarify Table 5-3 as shown below:

Table 5-3: Summary of Alternatives

	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 Existing GP & Zoning	Alternative 2 Rezone to R-1-5	Alternative 3 Reduced Size
Project Size	40 MFD	9 SFD	19 SFD	32 MFD
Impacts				
▪ Impervious Surfaces-Bldgs [1]	25,900 sf <u>27,160 sf</u>	28,000 sf <u>19,800 sf</u>	38,500 sf <u>38,000 sf</u>	20,700 sf 22,460 sf
▪ Daily Trips	266	86	181	213
▪ Peak Hour Trips	25	9	18	19
▪ Annual Water Demand	2.0 MGY	0.9 MGY	1.5 MGY	1.6 MGY
<p>[1] Impervious Surfaces only estimated for potential building coverage as follows:</p> <p><u>Proposed Project: Buildings and Carports as shown on site plan</u></p> <p><u>Alternative 1: Assumes building and garage footprint of 2,200 square feet (sf), though could be larger</u></p> <p><u>Alternative 2: Assumes building and garage footprint of 2,000 sf</u></p> <p><u>Alternative 3: Assumes same as Proposed Project minus two buildings of approximately 2,350 sf each</u></p>				

Page 5-17 Revise *Hydrology and Water Quality* subsection as follows:

Under this alternative the less-than-significant impact related to impacts on the visual character of the surrounding area could be similar, but ~~or~~ slightly reduced with nine homes on nine lots.

Page 5-18 Revise the first sentence of the *Aesthetics* subsection as follows:

- ***Hydrology and Water Quality:*** This alternative would result in construction of nine single-family homes. As indicated above, the proposed project includes ten buildings that each have a building footprint of approximately 2,200 square feet. This alternative would have nine buildings with an expected similar building footprint. Thus, impervious surfaces would be similar, but ~~or~~ slightly reduced than the proposed project with regards to building coverage. However, the proposed project would likely have more impervious surfacing associated with the internal road and parking areas. Thus, it is expected that the less-than-significant impacts related to drainage and stormwater quality would be reduced due to an anticipated reduction in impervious surfacing not substantially change, and but a drainage system similar to what is proposed with the project would be required.

Page 5-19 Revise the last two sentences of the second paragraph under Alternative 2 subsection as follows:

With a net developable area of 96,268 ~~96,503~~ square feet (2.21 acres), excluding areas with 30-percent or greater slopes, this alternative assumes development of 19 residential units. It is expected that somewhat smaller residential units would be constructed than what would be constructed on larger lots, but a traditional subdivision lot pattern would be utilized with maximum allowed building coverage. It is expected that somewhat smaller residential units would be constructed than what would be constructed on larger lots, but a traditional subdivision lot pattern would be utilized.

Page 5-21 Revise Alternative 3 Project Description as follows:

This alternative considers a reduced size for the proposed project. It assumes that the General Plan amendment and rezoning continue to be proposed, but it considers elimination of two buildings containing a total of eight units. Existing average building footprint is approximately 2,350 square feet, and approximately 4,700 square feet of building footprint would be eliminated. Thus, the alternative would result in construction of 32 condominium/apartment units instead of 40 units. Under this alternative, size and design could be modified to site the buildings further away from the 30 percent slope areas, although, the geotechnical feasibility investigation did not identify impacts with the siting of

buildings close to these slopes with the proposed regrading and retaining wall; ~~this alternative might better achieve consistency with City slope regulations.~~

Page 5-22 Correct *Ability to Meet Project Objectives* subsection to read:

This project would attain three of the project objectives (#3, 4, 5, ~~6~~), and would partially attain the other three objectives related to the size of the project with eight less units than the proposed project (#1, 2, 6).

Page 5-23 Revise the second paragraph to indicate that none of the alternatives would eliminate the significant unavoidable traffic impact, except the No Project Alternative.

References

Biotic Resources Group. November 10, 2017. Letter to Ryan Bane, Senior Planner, City of Santa Cruz Planning and Community Development Department. Regarding “ “1930 Ocean Street Extension Responses to Comments on DEIR.”

Bowman and Williams. February 22, 2018. Letter to Ryan Bane, City of Santa Cruz Planning and Community Development Department regarding “Revised Draft EIR Comment Responses, 1930 Ocean Street Extension, Santa Cruz, APN 008-044-02, Bowman & Williams file no. 23742.”

Haro Kasunich and Associates, Inc. February 12, 2018. Letter to Ryan Bane, Senior Planner, City of Santa Cruz Planning and Community Development Department regarding: “Responses Letter”.

3.3 CHANGES TO PRDEIR

Page 4.5-3 Revise last sentence as follows:

Of the identified critical intersections, the Ocean street-Highway 17 Ramps/Ocean Street-Plymouth Street intersection is included in the TIS, but the other three critical intersections in proximity to the project site were not included in the study area because the project does not add 25 trips to any of these intersections, thus not triggering further analysis as explained above.

Page 4.5-22 Correct Table 4.5-7 to show LOS E, not F, at the Highway 1 Southbound Off-ramp.

Page 4.5-23 Add the following before Impact Trans-2:

Mitigation Measure Trans-1 requires the applicant to contribute the project’s share of the cost of signalization and widening of the Highway 1 southbound off-

ramp at Ocean Street and include the improvement in the Highway 1 Bridge project that is currently planned by the City and is included in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The cost of the signal and off-ramp widening would be estimated by the project engineer and reviewed by City staff. The project's share would be determined based on the project percentage of total PM peak hour trips at the intersection. The fee would be collected at the time of building permit issuance, the same as other collected fees, and the fee would be deposited in a separate account. According to state law, the City can hold the funds for five years or longer if the project to be funded is planned by the City and included in the CIP. The Highway 1 bridge widening project is in the City's CIP and already includes improvements to the ramp.

Page 4.5-26 Revise the first sentence of the first full paragraph as follows:

The project includes widening Ocean Street Extension to 20 feet along most of the project frontage from the ~~project~~ north side of the cemetery entrance south to

Page 4.5-28 Add 3 to the text after Table 4.5-10 that reads: includes taxi, motorcycles and other modes" to identify footnote 3 to the table.

Page 4.5-28 Revise the second sentence of the first paragraph as follows:

The new sidewalk will start ~~across from the entrance to the project site~~ at the entrance to the cemetery and extend south to join the existing sidewalk south of the Graham Hill Road/Ocean Street Extension intersection.

Page 5-4 Revise second to last sentence as follows:

The project's contribution to these intersections (approximately 6 ~~less than 25~~ PM peak hour trips) would be minor and would not result in discernible changes to delays or operations at these intersections. The CEQA Guidelines indicate that a project's funding its fair share of a mitigation measure designed to alleviate the cumulative impact would render the project's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable. Although two regional intersections would continue to operate at a deficient LOS with improvements, the project's contribution to the congestion at these intersections is not considered cumulatively considerable due to payment of traffic impact fees and minor number of added trips that would not result in noticeable or discernible changes in delay or operations.



Southwest View from Graham Hill Road Existing



Southwest View from Graham Hill Road with Project

CHAPTER 4 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides responses to individual comments that were submitted by agencies, organizations, and individuals as summarized below in Section 4.2. Responses to comments that address environmental issues and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) are included in Section 4.3. Responses to comments on the Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) are included in Section 4.4. All comment letters are included in Appendix B. Appropriate changes that have been made to the DEIR text based on these comments and responses are provided in Chapter 3, Changes to DEIR.

State CEQA Guidelines section 15088(a) requires a lead agency to evaluate comments on environmental issues and provide written responses. Section 15204(a) provides guidance on the focus of review of EIRs as follows:

In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

In reviewing comments and providing responses on the following pages, this section of the CEQA Guidelines will be considered. The focus will be on providing responses to significant environmental issues.

4.2 LIST OF COMMENT LETTERS RECEIVED

The DEIR was published and circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day public review period from May 17, 2017 through June 30, 2017. One hundred forty two letters of comment were received, of which 43 were the

same petition-style letter submitted by separate commenters; agencies, organizations, and individuals that submitted written comments on the DEIR are identified in Table 4-1.

The PRDEIR was published and circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day public review period from April 27, 2018 through June 11, 2018. Twenty-two letters of comment were received as outlined in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1. Index of Commenters

Letter Number	Commenter Name
<i>Public Agencies</i>	
A1	Santa Cruz County Public Works Department, Rachel Fatoohi
A2	Monterey Bay Air Resources District
A3	California Native American Heritage Commission
A4	California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse
<i>Applicant</i>	
B1	Rick Moe and Craig Rowell
<i>Organizations</i>	
C1	Bike Santa Cruz County
C2	Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association
C3	Wittwer Parkin, Representing Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association
C4	Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Posse
C5	Villa Granada Homeowners Association, Lorenzo Rota
<i>Individuals</i>	
D1	Ellen Aldridge
D2	Yafah Almog
D3	Yosi Almog
D4	Teresa Aquino
D5	Mark and Lori Arsenault
D6	Mary Kay and Bruce Ashley
D7	Greg Baker and Adrienne Harrell
D8	Sharon Beaty
D9	Jonathon Blanding
D10	John D. Boyle
D11	Erin Bucci
D12	Lisa Burdick
D13	Linda Burman and Timothy H. Shea
D14	Veronica Cameron
D15	Frank and Pat Cavalier
D16	Faith Chaffee
D17	Wendy Chapler

Table 4-1. Index of Commenters

Letter Number	Commenter Name
D18	Penny and David Chesluk
D19	Kate Clark
D20	Don Cohen
D21	Karen Bilgri Cohen
D22	Christopher Connery
D23	Tara Cornelisse
D24	Lauren Crux
D25	Jill Damashek
D26	Becca and Casey Davis
D27	Janey Davis
D28	Margaret and Allan Dow
D29	Mark Drobac
D30	Nick and Beatrice Drobac
D31	Patricia Dunlap-Griffin
D32	Eve Eden
D33	Jeremy Elster
D34	Daniel Facciola
D35	Heidi Fisher
D36	Joseph Fisher
D37	Anthony Fleming
D38	Carla Freccero
D39	Andrew Gaines
D40	Cindy Grall
D41	Mike Grall
D42	Jacquelyn Griffith
D43	Allen Hasty
D44	Tessa Hope Hasty
D45	Deborah Hayes (3 letters)
D46	William Healey
D47	Brant Herrett
D48	Matt Hill
D49	John R. Hodge
D50	Sue Holt
D51	Bonita John
D52	Audrey J. Johnson
D53	Josyane Kelly
D54	Zeka Kuspa
D55	Mitchell Lachman
D56	Laurie Lallemand

Table 4-1. Index of Commenters

Letter Number	Commenter Name
D57	Jeff Larkey
D58	Brij Lunine
D59	Paula Mahoney
D60	Julie Thayer Mascarenhas
D61	Leonardo Mascarenhas
D62	Karen and Frank McKillop
D63	Robert A. Morgan
D64	Myla Morris
D65	Michelle Morton
D66	Karsten Mueller
D67	Joe Netro
D68	Michael Nussbaum
D69	Jessica Parr
D70	Gary A. Patton
D71	Sohrab and Samineh Pirnazar
D72	Kater Pollock
D73	Judy Rose
D74	Jackie Rundell
D75	Ethan Sanford
D76	Jack Schultz
D77	David Shaw
D78	John and Carole Simpson
D79	Cara Sloman
D80	Jonathan Steinberg
D81	Marshall and Karen Sylvan
D82	Mark Tarantino
D83	Sharon Took-Zozaya
D84	Peter Weiss
D85	Canon Western
D86	Sharon L. Wright
D87	Karen Zelin
D88	Brian Zucchi
D89	Michelle Zucchi
D90	Identical Letter Submitted by Multiple Individuals (43 letters): Caleb Barrow, Noelle Baxter, Anastasia Bissonnette, Kelly Bradford, Cassandra Brown, Kelly Brown, Manish Chandra, Anders Cochran, Beth Cochran, Nesh Dhillon, Ronald Donkervoort, Yvonne Falk, Melissa Freebairn, Robert Foote, David Gardner, Cindy Geise, Heather Griffith, Morr��a Grillo, Darryl Gunderson, Maaya Hensman, Huili Hong, Darren Huckle, Prince Lawsha, Paul Bods Langen, Gregory LeBaron, Jason Lindsay, Melinda Lundgren, Suzanne Morrow, Jerry

Table 4-1. Index of Commenters

Letter Number	Commenter Name
	Morales, Juliane Neiderhiser, Claire Palazzo, Amberlynn Pinkerton, Matt Quinn, Andrea Ruiz, Matt Scott, Joel Schirmer, Cale Shelley, Shoshana Spielman, Alanna Stock, McKella Slater, Megan Vanderbeck, Sandra Ward, Ajna Weaver, Dean Woolstenhulme
<i>PRDEIR</i>	
PR-A1	California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse
PR-B1	Rick Moe and Craig Rowell
PR-C1	Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association
PR-C2	Wittwer Parkin, Representing Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association
PR-C3	Santa Cruz Memorial
PR-D1	Yafah and Noam Almog
PR-D2	Yosi and Ayelet Almog
PR-D3	Teresa Aquino
PR-D4	Lauren Crux
PR-D5	Heidi Fisher
PR-D6	Joseph Fisher
PR-D7	Mike Grall
PR-D8	Deborah Hayes
PR-D9	Brant Herrett
PR-D10	Matt Hill
PR-D11	Carey KirkHart
PR-D12	Mitchell Lachman
PR-D13	Julie Mascarenhas
PR-D14	Leonardo Mascarenhas
PR-D15	Karsten Mueller
PR-D16	Michael Nussbaum
PR-D16	David Shaw
PR-D17	Canon Western

4.3 MASTER RESPONSES AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON DEIR

Agencies, organizations, and individuals that submitted written comments on the DEIR are outlined above in Section 4.2. Responses to comments received on the DEIR are provided in this section. PRDEIR are addressed in Section 4.4. Each comment letter is included in Appendix B. As indicated above, CEQA Guidelines section 15088(a) requires a lead agency to evaluate comments on environmental issues and provide a written response to all substantive comments. The emphasis of the responses will be on substantive environmental issues raised by the commenters related to the

DEIR analyses. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15204, subd. (a).) Appropriate changes that have been made to the DEIR and/or PRDEIR text based on these comments and responses are provided in Chapter 3, Changes to DEIR.

4.3.1 Master Responses

Many of the comments received were on the same topic or expressed similar concerns. Rather than repeat the same response to each of these comments, the City has prepared the following “master responses,” each of which addresses broad issue areas or topics raised in multiple comments. If a master response was used to respond to an individual’s comment, the commenter is directed to that master response in the response section corresponding to the individual’s comment letter. Table 4-2 provides an index of master responses.

Table 4-2. Index of Master Responses

Number	Topic
Master Response 1	Recirculation of DEIR
Aesthetics 1	Scenic Views
Aesthetics 2	Effects on Visual Character
Aesthetics 3	Night Lighting
Biological Resources 1	Special Status Species
Geology and Soils 1	Geotechnical Report Update
Geology and Soils 2	Landslides and Slope Stability Issues
Hydrology and Water Quality 1	Stormwater Management
Hydrology and Water Quality 2	Erosion and Water Quality
Land Use 1	Conflicts with Agricultural Operations
Land Use 2	Conflicts with General Plan Policies and Regulations
Land Use 3	General Plan Housing Element Goals
Land Use 4	Land Use Compatibility
Traffic and Transportation 1	Traffic Impact Analysis
Traffic and Transportation 2	Road Improvements and Access
Traffic and Transportation 3	Alternative Transportation Modes

Master Response 1 – Recirculation of DEIR

[Comments C2-2, C3-1, C3-27, D70-11]

Several comments request that the DEIR be revised and recirculated generally without reference to specific issues, except Letter C3 specifically requests recirculation to address biological resources, cultural resources and noise in the DEIR, as well as a general request for recirculation at the end of the letter.

State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is included. As used in this section of the CEQA Guidelines, the term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.
- (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

Section 15088.5 also provides that the lead agency need only recirculate the chapters or portions of the DEIR that have been revised. The lead agency may request that reviewers limit their comments to the revised sections, and the agency need only respond to comments received during the recirculation period that relate to the revised DEIR sections.

Upon review by the City, a PRDEIR was prepared in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 and was recirculated for public review from April 27 through June 11, 2018. The PRDEIR included a revised Traffic and Transportation section (Section 4.5) and Cumulative Traffic section (part of Section 5.4) due primarily to a new finding of a significant unavoidable impact that was not identified in the DEIR and other minor revisions and clarifications in both sections. The PRDEIR document also included a new Section 4.8, Energy Conservation, which was not previously provided for public review in the DEIR. These portions of the DEIR were recirculated for public review in accordance with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5. The City determined that none of the other DEIR sections required recirculation based on the comments received on the DEIR or the standards set forth in section 15088.5. Furthermore, the responses and clarifications provided in this document do not result in any of the conditions that would warrant recirculation. None of the other DEIR text revisions result in or indicate a new significant impact or a substantial increase in the severity of an impact associated with the proposed project that would warrant recirculation.

Aesthetics Master Response 1 – Scenic Views

[Comments C2-4, D6-2, D7-4, D10-5, D11-5, D14-3, D16-3, D25-4, D31-3, D33-3, D35-3, D36-5, D37-3, D40-3, D41-4, D44-4, D48-4, D54-2, D58-4, D65-9, D66-5, D73-4, D75-2, D77-3, D79-0, D82-3, D83-5]

Some commenters stated that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City, providing scenic views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church, and expressed concern that the proposed project would obstruct these views. While the City acknowledges that the community has local appreciation for views into the City from Graham Hill Road near the proposed project site, the City's General Plan and General Plan EIR do not identify Graham Hill Road in the vicinity of the project site as an area that provides significant panoramic or urban views (see Figure 4.3-1 of the General Plan EIR). As indicated in the DEIR, while the tree-lined landscape along Graham Hill Road may be subjectively aesthetically pleasing, there are no panoramic views of the ocean or other prominent landscape features that would be considered a scenic view of exceptional beauty as seen from a wide public area. As indicated on page 4.1-4 of the DEIR, Graham Hill Road is not designated as a scenic road in the Santa Cruz County General Plan in the project vicinity, although it is designated a county scenic road north of the project site from Lockwood Drive north to Highway 9.

The proposed project would not block views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church. As discussed on pages 4.1-6 and 4.1-7 of the DEIR, distant views of the eastern slope of Pogonip are intermittently and briefly visible through existing vegetation and for a short duration along Graham Hill Road. Traveling south on Graham Hill Road toward the City, dense vegetation along the western side of Graham Hill Road largely obstructs long-range views of the City. Views of the project site are partially screened by existing eucalyptus trees along Graham Hill Road adjacent to the project site. There are fleeting glimpses of Holy Cross Church atop Mission Hill and the upper ridge of Pogonip along southbound Graham Hill Road near the project's site southern boundary. There are also brief glimpses of the developed Harvey West area of the City seen near the project site. Mission Hill is not fully visible through the project site. The project would not block views of these features from Ocean Street Extension which are visible from the opposite side of the project site.

An additional photo simulation has been prepared to depict views of the project from Graham Hill Road as explained in Aesthetics Master Response 2 (see Figure 4.1-3A in Chapter 3, Changes to the DEIR). As shown in the photo simulation, removal of the existing eucalyptus trees along the perimeter of the project site adjacent to Graham Hill Road would open the long-range views available from Graham Hill Road. While residential buildings associated with the project would be visible immediately adjacent to the roadway in the foreground of the view, the buildings would not obstruct distant views into the City, the eastern ridge of Pogonip, or of Holy Cross Church, the latter of which would become more visible. Therefore, the project would not block views of these features that some commenters believe are scenic from Graham Hill Road, and in fact, may enhance the long-range views for some observers traveling on Graham Hill Road, although proposed project landscaping along would ultimately partially screen the site.

Aesthetics Master Response 2 – Effects on Visual Character

Building Massing and Site Topography

[Comments C2-6, C2-7, C2-8, C2-78. D3-3, D7-2, D10-3, D11-4, , D13-3, D14-2, D16-2, D18-2, D25-2, D31-2, D32-2, D33-2, D35-2, D36-4, D37-2, D38-2, D40-2, D41-3, D42-2, D44-2, D48-5, D58-2, D61-2, D65-7, D66-3, D72-2, D75-3, D75-5, D77-2, D82-2, D83-3]

Many commenters stated their opinion that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the project site and are out of character with the area. Some commenters expressed concern that topography on the project site would amplify the perceived height of the residential buildings, with many stating that the buildings would appear to be 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension, or would “tower” 60 feet above Ocean Street Extension. Some also believe that views of the project would significantly impact visitors to the Santa Cruz Memorial funeral home and cemetery adjacent to the project site.

Seven of the proposed project buildings would consist of two habitable floors above carport parking, which is not considered a three-story building. (Buildings 1, 2, and 3 along Ocean Street Extension would not be built above the carport, and carports would be sited behind the buildings.) As discussed on page 4.1-9 of the DEIR, building height would range between approximately 26 and a maximum of 30 feet above finished grade, which is within the permitted height limit for both the existing single-family zoning designation and the proposed multi-family zoning designation. The maximum allowable building height under the City’s Municipal Code is determined and allowed independent of site elevation and topography. People with normally functioning binocular vision are able to perceive a three-dimensional image of their surroundings. The perceived size of an object is a function of retinal image size and perceived distance. The visual angle of a viewed object and retinal image size are inversely proportional with distance, i.e., the visual angle and retinal image size decrease as distance increases.

Therefore, buildings toward the rear of the site (i.e., adjacent to Graham Hill Road) would not appear taller than buildings toward the front of the site (i.e., adjacent to Ocean Street Extension) when viewed from Ocean Street Extension, nor would they appear to “tower” 60 feet above the street, due to their greater distance from the viewer. As shown on the grading plan for the project, first-floor elevations of the three buildings toward the front of the site would range from 73.24 feet to 80.42 feet, and first-floor elevations of the four buildings at the rear of the site would range from 95.36 feet to 96 feet, for an elevation difference ranging from 14.94 feet to 22.76 feet. Additionally, a photo simulation of the project along Graham Hill Road was prepared by the applicant’s architect and has been added to the EIR; see Chapter 3, Changes to the EIR, of this document. As evidenced in the simulation, only the upper portion of the buildings would be visible from Graham Hill Road, and would not appear to most objective observers to be massive or imposing.

The project scale and mass are similar to nearby condominium, townhouse, and apartment developments. The Santa Cruz Memorial cemetery is bordered by Ocean Street—an arterial roadway in the City—and existing multi-family development is located along Ocean Street to the southeast. It is also noted that the Tanner Heights neighborhood to the east of Graham Hill Road

has a higher density permitted by zoning (R-1-5) than the existing zoning density for the project site (R-1-10). Therefore, the project would not result in building heights or mass greater than other developments in the vicinity.

Visual Character of the Area

[Comments C2-5, C3-11, D7-3, D10-4, D11-6, D13-4, D18-3, D25-3, D42-3, D44-3, D58-3, D60-17, D61-2, D61-3, D68-2, D64-2, D65-8, D66-4, D68-4, D70-4, D72-3, D73-2, D75-7, D75-9, D79-7, D81-2, D83-4, D85-2, D90-2]

Commenters stated that multi-family development at the project site would be out of character with the project area, expressing opinions that the Santa Cruz Memorial property and/or Graham Hill Road provides a dividing line between urban and rural character. The project site is located within city boundaries, whereas, areas to the north along Ocean Street Extension are located within the County, and the City limits mark the transition between urban and suburban residential lots in the county. While many commenters have expressed their opinion that the Santa Cruz Memorial property and/or Graham Hill Road marks the transition between urban and rural development character, this opinion is not supported by the City's General Plan land use designations and zone districts, as well as existing development in the area. There are several existing multi-family developments approximately 700 feet (0.1 miles) from the project site on Ocean Street in an area designated for medium-density residential uses. The DEIR discusses the proposed project's impacts on visual character of the surrounding area; see pages 4.1-8 through 4.1-11 of the DEIR for a detailed discussion and rationale of the proposed project's impacts on visual character. Furthermore, the proposed landscaping with 18 trees along the Graham Hill Road frontage would serve to soften and screen the exterior building appearance.

While the project would introduce residential structures on a currently vacant site, the project would not substantially change the visual character of the surrounding area as it is not substantially different than other similar developments within the City immediately to the south. Given the project's proximity to existing development of similar scale and character, the DEIR's conclusion that the project would have a less-than-significant impact on visual character of the surrounding area remains valid.

Photo Simulations

[Comments C2-4, C2-11, C3-14, D38-4, D40-6, D42-5, D70-4, D75-11, D79-10]

Some commenters expressed dissatisfaction with the photo simulations presented in the DEIR, stating that the simulations understated the project's visual impacts, or the key vantage points from which the project was depicted did not demonstrate the project's maximum visual impact. Another comment indicated that additional photo simulations are necessary to analyze project impacts.

CEQA does not require any photo simulations for an adequate aesthetics analysis, but as part of the visual impact analysis of the proposed project, the project applicant prepared photo simulations for key public viewpoints along Ocean Street Extension to demonstrate and assess the potential change in visual character and quality that would result from the proposed project. The photo simulations represent views toward the proposed project site looking to the north and to the south on Ocean

Street Extension and provide representative views in each direction. These images are presented in Figure 4.1-3 of the DEIR. A new photo simulation has been provided from Graham Hill Road, which shows, due to the sloping terrain in this location, only the upper floors of the buildings would be visible. The photo simulation and additional text has been added to the EIR; see Chapter 3, Changes to the DEIR. The three photo simulations provide representative vantage points of the site.

The photo simulations were developed by the applicant's architect using field photographs of existing conditions. A three-dimensional (3D) computer model was developed using the project plans to develop computer-generated renderings. The renderings were overlaid onto the existing field photographs. A peer review by the EIR consultant's photo simulation specialist was conducted to verify the accuracy of the photo simulations. The peer review compared camera-matching techniques between the existing photographs and the photo simulations and determined that the camera settings in the 3D program match the existing photographs. Therefore, the peer review concluded that the photo simulations provide accurate representations of the scale of the proposed project.

Aesthetics Master Response 3 – Night Lighting

[Comments C2-14, C3-15, D60-18, D68-3]

Some commenters expressed concern that exterior lighting on buildings and from the headlights of vehicles traveling to and from the project site would constitute major new sources of light and glare, disagreeing with the DEIR's conclusion that the proposed project's potential light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

As described in Section 4.1 of the DEIR, the project would include exterior lighting typical of residential development, which would be installed as needed for security and safety. The proposed project's lighting would be required to comply with the City of Santa Cruz Municipal Code Section 24.14.266, which prohibits direct or sky-reflected glare from floodlights.

According to the International Dark-Sky Association,¹ light fixtures that are fully shielded minimize sky glow, glare, and light trespass. All project lighting would consist of LED fixtures and would be fully shielded and directed downward and away from neighboring structures. This would prevent light spillage both upward and onto adjacent properties. Exterior walkways, stairs, and common entryways would be lit with a combination of low, garden-style down lights and wall-mounted down lights. Building entryways and exterior decks would be lit with wall-mounted down lights. Carports and under-building parking areas would be lit with ceiling-mounted down lights, and uncovered parking areas would be lit with pole-mounted down lights.

Due to the orientation of the buildings, night lighting emanating from proposed Buildings 1, 2, and 3 on the western portion of the project site would be shielded from the Tanner Heights neighborhood to the east of the project site across Graham Hill Road by proposed Buildings 4 through 10, in

¹International Dark-Sky Association. "Outdoor Lighting Basics." Accessed May 22, 2018 at <http://darksky.org/lighting/lighting-basics/>.

addition to intervening vegetation and topography. Exterior lighting on Buildings 4 through 10 would face the cemetery to the west of the project site on Ocean Street Extension and, therefore, would not be emitted toward residences. Exterior lighting would be directed away from the northern boundary of the site to minimize disturbances to nocturnal wildlife using the area. Existing and proposed landscaping surrounding the site, as shown on Figure 2-1 of the DEIR and described in Section 4.1 of the DEIR, would also shield surrounding off-site areas from lighting on the project site. As such, a quantitative lighting analysis is not warranted as suggested in one comment.

As shown on Figure 2-1 of the DEIR, site ingress and egress would be from Graham Hill Road, adjacent to the Santa Cruz Memorial cemetery, chapel, and office. Light and glare emitted from vehicle headlights entering and exiting the project site would be short in duration and, as no residences directly adjoin the site and surrounding vegetation obscures views of the site from residences in the area, vehicle headlights would not be visible to light-sensitive residential receptors.

Biological Resources Master Response 1 – Special Status Species

[Comments C2-39, C2-79, C3-2, D23-1, D25-5, D31-18, D40-19, D42-17, D60-19, D72-5]

Commenters noted that the DEIR did not contain a biological resources section, requested clarification on biological resources impact determinations, and asserted that the analysis of biological resources was inadequate for a number of species, including the Ohlone tiger beetle, Monarch butterfly, Mount Hermon June beetle, kangaroo rat, endangered plants, steelhead and coho salmon, and the tidewater goby. Additional clarification is provided in response to these comments and based on review by the project biologist, Biotic Resources Group.

The topic of biological resources was assessed in the Initial Study for the project, provided in Appendix A of the DEIR, based on biological evaluations conducted for the project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant impacts on nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) resulting from tree removal and potential construction-period impacts to retained trees on the site, and included mitigation measures to address each of these impacts, which would reduce the potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. The DEIR did not contain a further discussion of biological resources as it was adequately addressed in the Initial Study, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, and as explained in Section 1.3 of the DEIR.

Ohlone Tiger Beetle

The Ohlone tiger beetle survey was conducted in March 2007 by Tim Hyland, a biologist deemed qualified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to survey for this species for 15 years. As stated in the Biological Assessment Report, the survey date was selected because it was within the flight season for the species, the weather was suitable for detection (actual temperature during the survey was 64°F with calm winds and mostly sunny skies), and beetles were active at a known site in Wilder Ranch State Park. Mr. Hyland conducted a habitat evaluation and surveyed for adult beetle activity. Although portions of the site support soils of Watsonville loam (as per the soil survey), the

site evaluation found that habitat conditions were not suitable for the species because of the very small area (maximum 300 square feet) of native coastal prairie plants associated with species, the observation that the native plants were overgrown by exotic non-native plants, and the lack of bare areas. No individuals of Ohlone tiger beetles were observed, and Mr. Hyland determined that the site was not suitable for this species. Site conditions were found to be similar in plant surveys conducted in 2007, 2008, 2010, 2014, 2016, and 2017 (as further described below), and do not support suitable habitat for this beetle.

There are five currently recognized geographic areas are: west of the city of Soquel, within the city of Scotts Valley, west of the city of Santa Cruz, north of the city of Santa Cruz, and northwest of the city of Santa Cruz. At the time of listing, the Ohlone tiger beetle was known from 11 properties representing 16 occurrences (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2009). The area north of Santa Cruz is closest to the project site, where the Ohlone tiger beetle was known from one parcel owned by the City of Santa Cruz (Pogonip open space)open space preserve. However, no Ohlone tiger beetles have been observed at this area since 2004, and they are potentially extirpated from this geographic area (ibid.).

Therefore, no further focused surveys for Ohlone tiger beetle were deemed warranted (Biotic Resources Group, November 2017). It is noted that one commenter believed site surveys should have been conducted during the larval burrow stages in May to August, although based on the foregoing explanation, no further surveys were deemed necessary. Additionally, it is noted that in this region, the Ohlone tiger beetle is active from late January to early April (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2009).

Monarch Butterflies

Presence/absence surveys were conducted in December 2007 and January 2008 within the winter roosting period for Monarch butterfly, during weather conditions ideal for detecting the species either flying or clustering on eucalyptus trees. In addition, the site was again surveyed in November 2017. Conditions during each of the surveys are described as follows:

- December 26, 2017: temperature 58°F, wind 0-4 miles per hour [mph], mostly clear; and
- January 14, 2008: temperature 68°F, calm, clear
- November 8, 2017: temperature 71°F, wind 0-2 mph, clear

On all three dates, Monarchs were observed at Natural Bridges State Park, a known overwintering site. No Monarchs were observed on the project site during any of the three surveys.

The recommendations by the Xerces Society for Monarch surveys to be conducted during the three weeks surrounding Thanksgiving refer to coordinating efforts to have volunteers conduct transects to count overwintering Monarchs; it is still valid to conduct presence/absence surveys outside that time period when Monarchs are known to be present at other sites. There are eucalyptus trees scattered along the hillside on the uphill side of Graham Hill Road, but they are located on separate

private property not accessible to the biologist; however, no Monarchs were observed with binoculars in the eucalyptus trees across the road during any of the above-mentioned surveys. The eucalyptus trees on the subject property are in a linear arrangement along the edge of Graham Hill Road; it is possible that these trees do not have sufficient protection from wind (including what is generated by traffic on Graham Hill Road) to provide suitable habitat for Monarchs. The tree grove on the project site was found to not support overwintering Monarchs and likely does not provide suitable wind protection for the species. Site conditions within the grove were found to be similarly unsuitable for the species when the condition of the grove was re-examined in 2017. Given all of the foregoing, no additional surveys for Monarchs are warranted (Biotic Resources Group, November 2017).

Mount Hermon June Beetle

The project site does not support Zayante soils (sandhills) or the vegetative communities, such as silver leaf manzanita, ponderosa pine, sand parkland, or mixed evergreen, which the Mount Hermon June beetle requires. Soils are mapped as Watsonville loam, Watsonville-Tierra complex, and Pfeiffer gravelly sandy loam. None of these soil types are known to support inclusions of Zayante sands. No inclusions of Zayante sands were observed on site during the initial 2007 biotic review. No other field indicators that would suggest potential presence of Zayante sands and/or Mount Hermon June beetle occur on site (i.e., presence of sandhills vegetation). The closest known occurrence of Zayante sand material is approximately 0.75 miles north of the site along Graham Hill Road. Because the site lacks the necessary habitat for Mount Hermon June beetle, no focused surveys for the species are warranted (Biotic Resources Group, November 2017).

Kangaroo Rat

The Santa Cruz kangaroo rat is endemic only to the sandhills chaparral habitat of the Santa Cruz Mountains. The project site does not support soils suitable for this species (i.e., Zayante soils) with silver leaf manzanita chaparral, which is required habitat for the Santa Cruz kangaroo rat.² The only known remaining populations of this species are in Henry Cowell State Park and the County Juvenile Detention Center property in Felton, located approximately 4 miles north of the project site. Because the project site does not support the required habitat for the Santa Cruz kangaroo rat, focused surveys for this species are not warranted (Biotic Resources Group, November 2017).

Endangered Plants

Site surveys were sufficient to ascertain presence/absence of special-status plant species. The surveys were conducted within the blooming/detection period of plant species deemed to have the potential to occur on the site. Surveys were conducted in the months of:

² Bean, C. 2003. *An assessment of the endangerment status of the Santa Cruz kangaroo rat*. Masters Theses. 2392. Environmental Studies Department, San Jose State University, San Jose, California. Accessed May 23, 2018 at http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2392.

- March (2007 and 2016) – within the detection period for San Francisco popcorn flower, Santa Cruz clover, and white-rayed pentachaeta
- September (2014) – within the detection period for Santa Cruz tarplant and robust spineflower

As per standard professional practices, known colonies of rare plants were field checked prior to the March 2007 and March 2016 (i.e., San Francisco popcorn flower and Santa Cruz clover from Pogonip and/or Moore Creek open spaces) and September 2014 survey (i.e., Santa Cruz tarplant and robust spineflower from SC Armory and/or Pogonip open space) to confirm the species were in a growth stage that would enable field detection. No special-status plant species were detected at the subject property during any of these surveys (Biotic Resources Group, November 2017).

Aquatic Habitat

As described in Section 4.4 of the DEIR, increased sedimentation, erosion, or delivery of pollutants into the San Lorenzo River could degrade the aquatic environment and habitats. However, the project would be subject to a grading permit from the City, which requires an erosion control plan, and preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) pursuant to the State's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. Discharge of stormwater from the project site to the San Lorenzo River during operation of the project would include a combination of measures to treat stormwater runoff to meet the City's post-construction stormwater treatment requirements. Implementation of the erosion control plan, SWPPP, and City's stormwater treatment requirements would minimize water quality effects and indirect impacts to aquatic species in the San Lorenzo River, resulting in no or less-than-significant impacts.

Geology and Soils Master Response 1 – Geotechnical Report Update

[Comments C2-22, D18-5, D25-6, D31-16, D36-11, D40-7, D42-16, D43-9, D43-12, D76-7]

Several comments requested information on requirements for updated geotechnical reports. As explained on pages 4.3-9 to 4.3-10 of the DEIR, the project geotechnical engineers prepared a geotechnical feasibility investigation dated April 2007, a geologic assessment and response to Geology and Soil Comments dated November 2014 and more recently, a Supplemental Subsurface Exploration Letter dated November 2016. The three combined geotechnical investigations included 11 exploratory borings across the property which concluded the project site is underlain by Santa Margarita Sandstone with some alluvial and terrace deposits overlying the sandstone. The site is not mapped as an area of potential liquefaction. The standard penetration testing from the exploratory borings, the lack of a phreatic surface (groundwater) and the higher fine content of the near surface underlying soils also indicated that liquefaction potential is low at the project site. Laboratory tests of soil samples indicated that the subsoils at the site have a low potential to cause expansion problems. The geologic assessment found no evidence of recent or past slope instability (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018).

Geologic and seismic conditions at the project site have not changed since the geotechnical feasibility investigation report was prepared in 2007. Site conditions were reassessed and confirmed by the project geotechnical engineers, including in a geologic assessment, in November 2014 and a Supplemental Subsurface Exploration Letter dated November 2016. As indicated on page 4.3-10 of the DEIR, an additional geotechnical report will be prepared that presents site-specific geotechnical design criteria for foundations, retaining walls, grading, drainage, and earthquake surcharge loading as part of the building permit/plan submittal in accordance with City requirements. The California Building Code (Chapter 18) also requires preparation of a geotechnical report for most new structures (City of Santa Cruz, June 2012). However, the investigations prepared to date have adequately identified existing geologic and soils conditions and constraints and foundation and building design criteria and recommendations that will be finalized when building plans are completed. The report and project design will adhere to the most current California Building Code.

Geology and Soils Master Response 2 – Landslides and Slope Stability Issues

Landslides and Slope Stability

[Comments C-18, D18-5, D25-6, D31-16, D43-9, D43-10, D43-11, D73-8, 76-4, 79-3]

Several commenters stated that Graham Hill Road was closed due to landslides approximately 1,000 feet north of the project site during the winter of 2017 and expressed concern that while there may be no historic landslides on the project site, there are stability issues on slopes above the site.

Global stability of the slopes above the project site including Graham Hill Road and Tanner Heights was not in the scope of geotechnical analysis. The Cooper-Clark maps indicate that large landslides have not occurred in the immediate area of the project site and the slopes above it. The project site is underlain by Santa Margarita sandstone, ranging in depth from 8 to 15 feet below grade. Other geotechnical investigations by Haro, Kasunich and Associates within Tanner Heights also indicate the presence of this stable, well drained sandstone formation. Deep seated, global failures do not occur in this formation and there is no evidence on site to suspect it will occur at the proposed development. More shallow landsliding is possible within the near surface soil profile when it is saturated but no evidence exists on site that it has occurred and as stated in the responses above, the proposed cut and fill benched grading plan and retaining wall systems will protect the project improvements from this geotechnical risk (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018).

The proposed grading plan will increase the stability of the base of the onsite slopes by bench cuts and retaining walls flattening the overall slope gradient. All cuts will be retained with retaining walls that will include seismic surcharge loading. A project-specific geotechnical investigation report will be submitted with building plans that presents appropriate design values for foundations, retaining walls, grading and surface and subsurface drainage improvements (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018). As indicated above, this is a standard requirement in the City and The California Building Code (Chapter 18) requires preparation of a geotechnical report for most new structures (City of Santa Cruz, June 2012).

Quantitative Slope Stability Analysis

[Comments C2-26, D36-10, D76-4]

Several comments questioned why a slope analysis has not been conducted as had been recommended in the geotechnical reports. As indicated on page 4.3-11 of the DEIR, the geotechnical feasibility investigation recommended that buildings not be constructed on slopes greater than 25 percent without a quantitative slope stability analysis performed by a qualified geotechnical engineer. However, although portions of the eastern buildings (10B, 9B, 8B, 7B) appear to be situated on slopes at or near 25 percent slopes and a slope analysis was not conducted, the geotechnical reviews indicate that the buildings would be protected with the proposed retaining walls. The proposed grading will construct level benches. The excavated material will be keyed and benched across the slope along contour and compacted as engineered fill. The cuts will be retained with retaining walls. The site sections (see Sheet 4-2 of the Civil Plans) reflect the grading plan building layout. Stability of the slopes would be achieved by the retaining wall and horizontal bench configurations. The retaining walls will be designed with seismic earthquake surcharge loads per Department of Geology and Mining's standards.

Stabilization of Adjacent Gully

[Comments C2-24, C2-30, C2-38, C2-40, D31-6, D40-10, D60-11]

A number of comments note the eroding gully adjacent to the project site, question potential risks to the project, and ask why previous recommendations for stabilization of the gully are not proposed or required of the project to reduce erosion and sedimentation. The eroded gully is on the neighbor's property and is not on the project site. The erosion has been caused by stormwater runoff from Graham Hill Road and lands to the east.

Project plans were originally submitted to the City in March 2010, but the project was delayed. Since the initial submittal, the City adopted new Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater standards. The project drainage plan was re-engineered to meet the new standards, including significantly less work in the existing gully than originally proposed in 2010. The currently proposed stormwater system does not direct drainage to the existing gully or grade a detention area into the gully. Current plans show the existing silt to be removed from the gully, and new energy dissipaters installed at two outlet points to help prevent further erosion of the gully. The proposed project does not plan to alter or otherwise increase runoff conditions within the existing gully, which would continue to convey non-project runoff from Graham Hill Road to Ocean Street Extension north of the subject parcel. Project runoff would not be allowed to flow onto the banks of the gully.

According to the project geotechnical engineer, the only proposed building near the gully is Building #4. The foundation will be embedded 10 to 12 feet below existing grade. Retaining walls on both the upslope and the gully side of the building will be constructed to contain the structure. Due to the deep excavation, the bottom of the supporting foundation elements will be at an elevation lower than the nadir of the adjacent gully in question. The project drainage does not discharge into the gully. The project engineering complies with current LID requirements with respect to detention

and retention of stormwater to meter stormwater within pre- construction volumes prior to discharge to the down gradient public right-of-way (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018).

The project does propose to install an energy dissipater at the Graham Hill Road culvert outlet to reduce the erosion currently occurring in the gully. According to the project engineer, rock energy dissipaters are designed to reduce discharge energy to prevent erosion in the existing gully north of the project site which sends County and City water from Graham Hill Road down to Ocean Street Extension. The project proposes to install energy dissipation improvements at the outfall of the 18-inch storm drain on the neighboring property to the north of the project site. The energy dissipation improvements would be engineered as part of the final drainage plans. Rock energy dissipaters require little or no maintenance. The adjoining property owner will be responsible for any required maintenance.

Impacts of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road

[Comments A1-1, C2-27, D4-3, D31-7, D35-6, D36-9, D40-11, D60-10]

A number of comments questioned the effect of tree removal adjacent to Graham Hill Road on slope stability in that area. Heritage tree removal is discussed in the Initial Study on pages 30-32, which is included as Appendix A in the DEIR. Seven eucalyptus trees and one acacia tree would be removed from the project site adjacent to Graham Hill Road; a heritage tree removal permit, which is not considered a discretionary permit, was approved in 2010. The base of the fill slope above the proposed development would be retained with retaining walls 10 to 12 feet high. The addition of retaining walls along the base and toe of the road fill would increase stability of the fill wedge supporting Graham Hill Road. The grading plan would conform to the latest addition of the California Building Code and incorporate the appropriate civil, geotechnical, structural, and drainage design criteria to be presented in the site-specific geotechnical report. These grading procedures and infilling voids with compacted fill would improve the Graham Hill Road fill slope. Voids created during removal of trees would be backfilled and compacted according to engineering criteria presented in the feasibility soil report and the final site-specific soil report prepared for the design and development of the proposed improvements. Therefore, the removal of trees on the project site would not affect slope stability along Graham Hill Road. Furthermore, new trees and landscaping included in the project landscaping plan (Figure 4.1-4) would also stabilize the area between Graham Hill Road and the project retaining wall.

Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1 – Stormwater Management

Stormwater Management Plan

[Comments C2-35, C2-36, C2-43, C2-45, C2-50, D31-8, D35-7, D36-12, D40-12, D42-9, D43-19, D60-3, D60-6, D60-7, D60-8, D60-13, D76-6, 82-4]

Commenters questioned some of the methods and assumptions in the stormwater plan and whether the proposed drainage detention system is adequate. Some commenters think a 50-year storm event should be used to design the stormwater management system. Concerns were also expressed regarding impacts once the detention volumes are reached and whether runoff will sheet

flow across the street into downstream drainage facilities that are currently under capacity. Several commenters indicated that they have observed uncontrolled runoff and sediments flowing from Graham Hill Road and down Ocean Street Extension.

With regard to existing conditions, several commenters referenced offsite drainage and sediment issues that are mainly a result of the existing conveyance of runoff from Graham Hill Road to Ocean Street Extension north of the project site. The proposed project does not plan to alter or otherwise increase runoff conditions within the existing adjacent gully to the north, which will continue to convey non-project runoff from Graham Hill Road to Ocean Street Extension north of the subject parcel. The project is not permitted to allow erosion and sedimentation to leave the project limits. Long-term stormwater system planning is the responsibility of the City and County. The City has increased maintenance of the open ditches along Ocean Street Extension but does not currently have any capital improvements planned.

Stormwater System Design. The preliminary design of the project stormwater facilities is in accordance with the City of Santa Cruz Storm Water Best Management Practices for Private and Public Development Projects, revised March 2014. City requirements follow the County's method for determining structural stormwater control measure volumes, which requires the use of the Rational Method, a common industry-accepted technique for determining anticipated drainage flow rates. The antecedent moisture factor is a method of increasing volumes based on the assumption that runoff will increase as soil becomes more saturated. The antecedent moisture factor is given in the Santa Cruz County Design Criteria, Figure SWM-1, and for a recurrence interval of 25 years the factor is 1.1. This is derived from the American Public Works Association Publication, "Practices in Detention of Stormwater Runoff" (Bowman & Williams, February 2018).

Onsite detention is required on all new developments. The City's Stormwater Best Management Practices require that post-development peak flows discharged from the site not exceed pre-project peak flows for a 10-year, 24-hour storm event. The City requested that peak flows be maintained for a larger 25-year storm, and the proposed project detention system is designed to contain flows from a 25-year storm. On-site detention facilities hold stormwater in an underground facility on the site and release flows at pre-project levels into the existing 18-inch City storm drain in Ocean Street Extension. The bioretention swale in the road right-of-way is designed only for the right-of-way improvements, and is not designed to accommodate stormwater from the project area, which will be handled by the onsite facility (Bowman & Williams, February 2018).

For projects in areas of low infiltration where technical infeasibility can be demonstrated, utilization of the 10-percent method is allowed. The 10-percent method involves dedicating 10 percent of the project's equivalent impervious area to stormwater control measures, regardless of their infiltration capabilities. The project site is situated in soil types that significantly limits infiltration as identified by existing perched groundwater conditions (Bowman & Williams, February 2018).

Detention systems for this project are based on a smaller storm, specifically the 95th percentile 24-hour storm, as required. Subsurface drains and overflow control boxes are proposed to control

overflows from the stormwater control measures and route them to safe points of release at the existing 18-inch storm drain in the road right-of-way (Bowman & Williams, February 2018). Uncontrolled flows from the project site or the right-of-way improvements are not permitted and is not shown on the project plans.

Some infiltration is expected even in low-permeable soils and overflow should only occur in larger storm events. Subsequent rainfall events are not required to be factored for retention design since the antecedent moisture factor is only applied for detention calculations. The City requires that bioretention facilities drain down within 72 hours after a storm event. Infiltration testing may be performed in the project's later stages, and, per standard practice, the bioretention drain down time will be calculated using either site specific test values or the current values obtained from the USGS Web Soil Survey. If the 72-hour drain down time cannot be achieved, underdrains may be added to the bioretention facilities to ensure the drain down time is achieved. Additionally, the runoff from the porous asphalt areas has been factored into the retention and detention systems, per City requirements, by dedicating additional stormwater control measures with a .55 correction factor to the area's equivalent impervious surface area (Bowman & Williams, February 2018). Detailed design of the bioretention facilities will be completed at the building permit phase.

Analyses of 50-year and 100-year storms is not required by the City, and the project engineer has indicated that factors of safety of a minimum of 25 percent have been included, as required, to detention system calculations (Bowman & Williams, February 2018). However, some comments question the effects of the project drainage on a downstream system that is already over capacity and assert that a potential failure of the project improvements could be catastrophic for downstream homeowners. All overflow from the site and from the right-of-way improvements are shown to be diverted to the existing 18-inch storm drain within the right-of-way on the project plans. Uncontrolled sheet flow is not permitted, nor shown on the project plans. The project does not alter existing drainage patterns at the site, but detains project runoff and releases at pre-project levels into the proposed onsite and existing offsite drainage facilities. The project will not increase runoff up to a 25-year storm. Thus, the project would not result in an increase in post-project runoff for the design occurrence.

The stormwater treatment/retention/detention facilities in the road right-of-way are designed only for the right-of-way improvements, and are not designed to accommodate stormwater from the project area. Onsite stormwater measures will handle runoff from the project site.

Detention System Design. The proposed onsite hydrodynamic separator and the bioretention facilities on site and along the right-of-way improvements are designed to remove pollutants to protect water quality. Overflow structures are designed to allow the accumulation of sediment, which is removed. The hydrodynamic separator unit and the bioretention facilities rely on gravity and do not require electricity. The system would be maintained as part of the required Operations and Maintenance schedule that would be part of a required Operations and Maintenance Plan and Maintenance Agreement that includes proof of inspection and maintenance once a year. Any repairs that are needed to ensure that the facilities function as designed are required to be

reported in the proof of inspection. The Agreement specifies that subsequent owners or lessee also are obligated to the terms of the agreement. Additionally the City is authorized to inspect the stormwater control measures to the extent legally permitted. See also Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 3 for additional discussion of water quality.

Severe Storm Events

[Comments C2-23, C2-36, C2-50, D35-4, D36-7, D43-13, D76-8]

Several commenters asked how the geotechnical and hydrological reports account for unpredictable weather with increased storms due to climate change, such as experienced during the winter of 2016-2017. The preliminary design of the project stormwater facilities are in accordance with the City of Santa Cruz Storm Water Best Management Practices for Private and Public Development Projects, revised March 2014. At this time, climate change is not addressed in the City's stormwater requirements. Although the City's stormwater requirements do not expressly discuss climate change, the City has determined that the requirements in its Storm Water Best Management Practices for Private and Public Development Projects are adequate (Bowman & Williams, February 2018).

Rainfall associated with the winter of 2016/2017 caused no adverse effects to the property in its undeveloped state. After the property is developed with benched cut and fill platforms and significant retaining wall containment, the property will be at less risk from winter storms as intense as during the 2016/2017 winter (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018).

Runoff from Graham Hill Road

[Comments C2-19, C2-37, D42-16, D60-9, D76-6]

OSENA asked about the amount of impervious area that drains onto the site from where the asphalt curb terminates on Graham Hill Road and whether that has been accounted for in the drainage analysis and effects on slope stability, foundation design (including waterproofing), and erosion control. Review by the project engineers indicates that runoff south of the asphalt curb on Graham Hill Road has not been included in the stormwater calculations since an earthen berm on the west side of Graham Hill Road prevents drainage from flowing through the project site and diverts drainage south along Graham Hill Road. This condition was verified on December 1, 2017 by Bowman & Williams staff (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018).

The April 2007 Soils Report and the November 2014 Geologic Assessment indicated that the site has not been degraded by runoff from Graham Hill Road. The soil report indicates that the steeper slopes that comprise the fill wedge supporting Graham Hill Road should not be built on. The preliminary Grading and Layout Plan prepared by Bowman and Williams follows the soils report recommendation to contain the fill with retaining walls. Recommendations were also presented for erosion control. Current California Uniform Building Code requirements and geotechnical design criteria will include recommendations for waterproofing and surface and subsurface drainage control when the actual structures are designed (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018).

Surface water from Graham Hill Road will bypass the complete length of the property. Bowman and Williams, the project Civil Engineers verified that runoff south of the asphalt curve on Graham Hill Road is prevented from draining and flowing onto the project site by an earthen berm on the west side of Graham Hill Road (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018). The storm drain engineering addresses the limits and impacts of the project and does not propose to solve the existing historical off-site drainage issues with respect to the gully or Crossing Street.

Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2 – Erosion and Water Quality

[Comments C2-29, C2-33, C2-39, D35-5, D36-8, D40-10, D68-5, D79-3]

A number of comments indicate that grading is likely to result in substantial erosion and sedimentation of downstream drainage facilities and the San Lorenzo River or that uncontrolled runoff will lead to erosion and sedimentation of the river. Water quality and erosion impacts are discussed on pages 4.4-8 to 4.4-10 of the DEIR. As indicated, the project would be required to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction and erosion control plan, as well as meet the City's stormwater treatment requirements through a stormwater management plan.

The project is not permitted to allow erosion and sedimentation to leave the project limits. Best management practices requirements will be met in an effort to prevent erosion and sedimentation of downstream systems and maintain those practices after construction. The proposed onsite hydrodynamic separator and the bioretention facilities onsite and along the road right-of-way improvements are designed to remove pollutants in an effort to increase water quality. Overflow structures are designed to allow the accumulation of sediment, which is then to be removed and maintained as part of the required Operations and Maintenance schedule. An Operations and Maintenance Plan and Maintenance Agreement are required for that stipulates proof of inspection and maintenance once a year. Any repairs that are needed to ensure that the facilities function as designed are required to be reported in the proof of inspection. The hydrodynamic separator unit and the bioretention facilities rely on gravity and do not require electricity.

The proposed onsite hydrodynamic separator and the bioretention facilities on site and along the right-of-way improvements are designed to remove pollutants to protect water quality. Overflow structures are designed to allow the accumulation of sediment, which is removed. These requirements would minimize erosion and potential sedimentation into San Lorenzo River, as well as potential indirect impacts to aquatic species. In accordance with city and state stormwater management requirements, implementation of Best Management Practices (BMP) requirements will be met in an effort to prevent erosion and sedimentation of downstream drainage systems and water courses. The proposed onsite hydrodynamic separator and the bioretention facilities on site and along the right of way improvements are designed to remove pollutants in an effort to increase water quality. Overflow structures are designed to allow the accumulation of sediment, which is then to be removed and maintained as part of the required Operations and Maintenance schedule. An Operations and Maintenance Plan and Maintenance Agreement is required for this project, and

proof of inspection and maintenance is required once a year. Any repairs that are needed to ensure that the facilities function as designed are required to be reported in the proof of inspection.

The project is being proposed as a condominium development. In this case, maintenance issues would be overseen by a homeowner's association. There is intention to operate the development as a rental community. In this case, maintenance would be overseen by a professional property management company. As a rental property, there would be 24-hour onsite management. In either case, the developed community's maintenance operations would be overseen by a professional management company. The development would be signing an Operations and Maintenance Agreement, with the City of Santa Cruz, for maintenance of the bioswales in Ocean St. Extension. The agreement includes language regarding Best Management Practices and annual proof of inspection and maintenance. This agreement runs with the property.

Land Use Master Response 1 – Conflicts with Agricultural Operations

[Comments C2-74, C2-7, D8-2, D20-2, D35-11, D36-15, D57-3, D69-2, D70-7, D73-6, D75-14]

Some commenters expressed concern that the proposed project would pose difficulties for agricultural operations and put pressure to convert agricultural lands to the north of the project site to housing. Commenters also expressed concern that the proposed roadway improvements and project-generated traffic would adversely affect agricultural land uses; roadway improvements and traffic, including travel lane widths, are discussed in **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.

As discussed on page 4.7-3 of the DEIR, properties on the west side of Ocean Street Extension north of the City limits are designated as Prime Farmland in the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. These properties are designated Agriculture (A) in the Santa Cruz County General Plan and are zoned Commercial Agriculture (CA). Most of these properties are or have been in agricultural production, and many appear to contain a dwelling unit. These properties are located greater than 500 feet north of the project site.

As described in the Initial Study (see Appendix A of the DEIR), the project site does not contain agricultural lands as mapped on the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, but is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land. The site is not designated for agricultural uses in the City's General Plan and is not located adjacent to lands that are in agricultural production. As described above, there are parcels north of the project site that are within the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County that are in agricultural production, but there are no properties in agricultural production adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in direct impacts to farmland through farmland conversion.

Section 4.7.2 of the DEIR describes the potential for indirect impacts on agricultural lands through land use conflicts between agricultural and non-agricultural uses. Such conflicts typically include noise, dust, odors, and potential drift of pesticide application associated with agricultural operations. As development occurs near agricultural areas, farmers also are confronted with issues of theft, vandalism, and urban pest control in landscaped areas associated with urban development.

Establishment of buffers can help minimize conflicts between agricultural and urban land uses. The buffer setback is intended to minimize potential conflicts through the provision of distance as a physical barrier to noise, dust, odor, and other effects of normal commercial agricultural operations such as plowing, discing, harvesting, application of agricultural chemicals, or rearing of animals. The Santa Cruz County Code (section 16.50.095) requires a 200-foot buffer between commercial agricultural lands and habitable spaces within the unincorporated area of the County. The project site is located greater than 500 feet from the nearest property that is designated or used for agricultural production. This distance exceeds the County-required agricultural buffer of 200 feet, which is intended to minimize potential conflicts between uses. As such, the project would not interfere or conflict with agricultural operations on properties along Ocean Street Extension north of the project site, or vice versa. One comment states that the Final EIR must document pesticide use and agricultural practices on adjacent and nearby properties, but this is not required to address potential conflicts with agricultural uses; pesticide application is strictly regulated to prevent off-site dispersal of pesticides.

Some commenters expressed concern that rezoning of the project site would lead to similar rezoning of other properties, including agricultural lands. The majority of properties along Ocean Street Extension north of the project site are within the jurisdiction of Santa Cruz County. Seven parcels located north of the project site are within the City limits, south of Crossing Street, none of which are designated for agricultural uses. The remaining properties to the north of Crossing Street along Ocean Street Extension, which include properties designated for agricultural uses on the west side of Ocean Street Extension, are within the County's jurisdiction. The Santa Cruz County General Plan and Santa Cruz County Code (Chapter 16.50, Agricultural Land Preservation and Protection) include numerous goals, policies, and regulations to protect and preserve lands designated for agricultural uses. Before approving a land division or rezoning out of the CA zone district, the County requires an Agricultural Viability Determination to prove that the parcel is not viable agricultural land. See Objective 5.13, Commercial Agricultural Land, of the County General Plan for the County's goals and policies regarding the CA zone district.

Some commenters expressed concerns about potential annexation of County farmland along Ocean Street Extension to the City for housing development. The City's General Plan does not support annexation of lands in this area; Policy LU2.2 states, "Do not expand the city's Sphere of Influence or annex lands..." except for in the Carbonera Area (LU2.2.1), UCSC north campus area (LU2.2.2), and property adjacent to the City's Landfill and Resource Recovery Center on Dimeo Lane (LU2.2.3).

For all of the reasons outlined above, the proposed project would not result in direct or indirect effects related to conversion of farmland or conflicts with agricultural operations.

Land Use Master Response 2 – Conflicts with General Plan Policies and City Regulations

Conflicts with General Plan Policies

[Comments C2-69, C3-13, C3-18, D6-3, D7-5, D68-8]

A number of comments identified General Plan policies that commenters believe are applicable to the project and with which the project would result in conflicts and/or believe the analysis of the project's compliance with the General Plan with respect to Table 4.7-1 is incorrect. **Land Use Master Response 3** addresses commenters regarding project conflicts with General Plan and Housing Element goals related to locating new housing. Potential conflicts with mobility-transportation related policies are discussed in **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.

The City need only to evaluate “any *inconsistencies*” with plans; no analysis is required if the project is *consistent* with the relevant plans. (*Pfeiffer v. City of Sunnyvale* (2011) 200 Cal.App.4th 1552, 1566; see also *Highway 68 Coalition v. County of Monterey* (2017) 14 Cal.App.5th 883, 893.) Upon review of the cited policies and actions, the City has revised Table 4.7-1 to include the following policies and actions; see Chapter 3, Changes to EIR.

- CD3-2. The review was based on the “Landmarks” map shown on page 24 of the General Plan that does not identify landmarks adjacent to the project site. As explained in **Aesthetics Master Response 1**, the project would not adversely affect distant views of Holy Cross Church, which is a mapped landmark. While the adjacent mausoleum meets the definition of a landmark in the General Plan due to its local historic building listing, the building is not on the General Plan Landmarks map, and the public views of the structure would not be altered.

With regard to policies cited in Table 4.7-1 and allegations that conclusions are incorrect, the City responds to those comments as follows:

- CD1.2-Scenic Views: The project would not adversely affect scenic views of Mission Hill/Holy Cross Church and Pogonip; **see Aesthetics Master Response 1**.
- CD1.3-Development Design: The action seeks to ensure that development is designed to be in harmony with the natural topography and vegetation, and the comment asserts that the project does not terrace up the slopes as indicated in the DEIR. The project creates building pads for the structures, which are stepped up the gentle slope of the site. While this results in grading, the entire site is not proposed to be graded. As indicated in the DEIR, native oaks will be preserved.
- LU1.2-Agricultural Land Conversion: One comment states that the DEIR asserts the project will not result in conversion of agricultural land, yet no analysis. Development of the project site would not result in direct conversion of agricultural lands as none exist on the site as discussed in the Initial Study (DEIR Appendix A, page 23). Potential conflicts with existing agricultural operations are discussed on pages 4.7-7 and 4.7-8 and in **Land Use Master**

Response 1 in this document. As discussed, the project would not indirectly lead to conversion of agricultural lands.

- CC5.1.8-Stormwater Runoff: The project is designed in accordance with City requirements and post-project runoff does not exceed pre-project levels for the required design storm.
- CC5.1.9-Water Quality: One comment asserts that the project will not reduce stormwater pollution because the proposed features (pervious pavement, Kristar separator, and bioswales) have significant design flaws. City staff has determined that the project meets all the City's stormwater management requirements and the proposed designs are adequate. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- HZ3.1.1: One comment suggests that "doubling car traffic: would significantly increase surrounding noise. The project would not result in a doubling of traffic and the estimated 25 peak hour trips are not so substantial to cause a significant increase in ambient noise levels.
- HZ1.2.5-Provision of adequate emergency access). As indicated in the DEIR, Ocean Street Extension will be widened along most of the project frontage and will meet access requirements for emergency vehicles.
- HZ3.1.6-Substantial Noise Increases: One comment suggests that the project's traffic would result in significant noise increases. The project would not result in a doubling of traffic and the estimated 25 peak hour trips are not substantial in relation to existing trips along Graham Hill Road adjacent to the project to cause a significant increase in ambient noise levels.
- HZ3.1.11-Sound Barriers: This action identifies techniques to buffer development from adjacent noise sources. As indicated on Table 4.7-1, Inclusion of structural design features to attenuate exterior noise levels is a required mitigation measure.
- HZ6.2-Development on Unstable Slopes: Several comments assert that the project encroaches into areas of 30 percent slope and cite landslides in the areas, but the EIR analyses and supporting technical studies did not identify significant impacts related to landslides or slope instability. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2.**
- HZ6-3-Exposure to Seismic Hazards: One comment suggests the project conflicts with this policy due to potential liquefaction and a geologic investigation should be provided. Geotechnical studies have been conducted and have determined that the project can be designed to withstand seismic hazards; **see Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2.**
- NRC1.2.1-Water Quality: One comment suggests that the project will result in erosion and sedimentation into San Lorenzo River. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2.**
- NRC2.1.3-Biological Resources: One comment suggests that additional surveys are required to determine whether or not the project will result in impacts to special status species. The City disagrees as explained in **Biological Resources Master Response 1.**

The City reviewed other cited policies and determined that the following are not specifically applicable to project-level development projects.

- HZ3.1.4-Minimize Intermittent Noise: This policy appears to be applicable with uses that generate intermittent noise levels and not residential developments.

- HZ5-1- Lighting: This policy seeks to reduce “light pollution” and the supporting policies are directives for City action and are not directly applicable to individual development projects. Nonetheless, the project would not result in a significant increase in lighting as explained in the DEIR; **see Aesthetics Master Response 3.**

Slope Regulations

[Comments C2-13, C2-25, C2-66, C3-19, D31-16, D40-17, D70-3, D70-5]

The commenter questions how the project meets the purpose of the City’s slope regulations regarding avoidance of excessive height, bulk and mass normally associated with building on slopes. Some comments ask how findings can be made to allow building areas to encroach into 30 percent slopes and that findings to substantiate granting an exception to 10-foot setbacks from 30 percent slopes have not been met.

The proposed project is consistent with the height limits of the proposed zone district, which are the same as existing height limits. The overall size of each of the proposed structures is similar to medium-sized single-family structures. The project meets provisions of section 24.140.030, except for not siting a building within 20 feet of a 30+ percent slope. The City will consider the request to site structures within 10 feet of a 30+ percent slope as part of the Planned Development (PD) request. City staff will make the required determinations and findings. The DEIR reviewed and considered the effects of a lesser distance on pages 4.3-12 and 4.7-6 to 4.7-7. As indicated on page 4.6-7 of the DEIR, the northeastern corner of proposed Building 10B encroaches slightly within a 30 percent or greater slope area. However, this area will be regraded to create 2:1 slopes. No environmental impacts were identified in the preliminary geotechnical investigations with regards to slope stability. It is the professional opinion of the geotechnical engineer that buttressed 2:1 cut slopes into native soils will be stable with drainage and erosion controls (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, August 2010). City staff will review and make findings as part of the Planned Development permit, as part of the PD request is to permit development within 10 feet of 30 percent slopes; the project is not requesting a slope modification or exception pursuant to sections 24.08.800-24.08-20 of the Municipal Code. The EIR is focused on physical adverse impacts on the environment resulting from the project, which have been fully analyzed; City staff will evaluate the project and determine findings.

Land Use Master Response 3 – General Plan Housing Element Goals

[Comments D3-4, D7-5, D10-6, D11-7, D12-2, D13-2, D16-4, D18-4, D20-3, D25-7, D29-12, D29-1, D30-1, D31-19, D31-11, D31-13, D31-14, D31-21, D33-4, D35-11, D36-16, D37-4, D38-5, D40-15, D41-6, D42-12, D42-19, D42-21, D43-2, D43-3, D44-5, D46-3, D48-7, D54-3, D57-6, D58-5, D59-3, D61-9, D65-4, D66-6, D73-5, D77-4, D79-9, D82-7, D83-6, D85-3, D88-1]

Many commenters stated that the proposed project conflicts with goals and policies in the City of Santa Cruz *General Plan 2030* (General Plan) and *2015-2023 Housing Element* (Housing Element). Specifically, commenters stated that the project conflicts with the City’s goals to promote a sustainable, compact city with defined urban boundaries and encourage the production of new housing along major commercial corridors and in the compact Downtown core. Some commenters

stated that the project would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. Commenters also cited Policy H6 of the Housing Element, which states: “Strive to fulfill the city’s housing needs while promoting an environmentally sustainable, compact community with clearly defined urban boundaries.” Some commenters also expressed concern that the project would not provide affordable housing.

The commenters are correct that one of the City’s objectives, as stated in General Plan Policy LU4.1.1, is to “support compact mixed-use development Downtown, along primary transportation corridors, and in employment centers.” To that end, the Housing Element identifies Corridor Opportunity Areas (mapped in Appendix C and listed in Appendix D of the Housing Element), where the City plans to focus on infill development, i.e., development of vacant and underutilized parcels along major corridors. These are the areas where the City plans to focus mixed-use development at higher densities. However, these Corridor Opportunity Areas are not the sole focus for housing development within the City, as suggested by some commenters, and do not preclude appropriate development in other areas of the City.

The project is located within defined City boundaries, and as a result would not result in “urban sprawl.” The project site is within City limits surrounded by development, including a variety of residential uses and the Santa Cruz Memorial Park. The project is infill within City limits regardless that the project site is at the edge of the City. Additionally, the project does not include high-density housing; the project requests a General Plan amendment to change the land use designation to LM – Low Medium Density Residential and a rezoning to RL – Multiple Residence Low Rise.

As stated on page 7-120 of the Housing Element, “providing new housing to accommodate projected employment and population growth and to meet the needs of existing residents is a major objective of the City.” The Housing Element also recognizes that the City has limited vacant land available for housing development. In addition to Corridor Opportunity Areas, page 4-60 of the Housing Element describes the City’s inventory of vacant parcels that are zoned to allow residential uses outside of the Corridor Opportunity Areas. Due to the scarcity of vacant land, the Vacant Land Inventory (listed in Appendix B and mapped in Appendix H of the Housing Element) is one component of the City’s strategy for the provision of adequate sites for housing development. This is in addition to development of vacant and underutilized sites along major corridors. The project site is identified in the Vacant Land Inventory as a site that could support 24 potential housing units (see Appendix B of the Housing Element).

Furthermore, page 4-70 of the Housing Element explains that, due to the limited remaining vacant land available for housing in Santa Cruz, the City must offer regulatory concessions to facilitate the production of housing, specifically citing zone changes and General Plan amendments in addition to other regulatory and financial assistance strategies. As described in Chapter 3 and Section 4.7 of the DEIR, the proposed project would include a General Plan amendment to change the land use designation for the property from L (Low Density Residential) to LM (Low Medium Density Residential) and a Zoning Map amendment to rezone the site from R-1-10 (Single-Family

Residential) to RL (Multiple Residence – Low Density). This proposal is consistent with the general goals of Housing Element.

A number of comments state that the project conflicts with or violates the City’s “Corridor Plan”. The City was in the process of completing an update to the City’s Zoning Ordinance, in part to establish mixed-use zone districts along the existing primary transportation corridors in the City (Mission, Ocean, and Water Streets, and Soquel Avenue), consistent with land use designations in the City’s General Plan 2030. Work on the update was stopped in 2017 at the direction of the City Council. The project area is not located along a corridor; however, neither the General Plan nor the corridor study was intended to preclude development in other locations other than the four main transportation corridors.

Regarding affordable housing comments, as indicated on page 3-4 of the DEIR, the project is subject to the City’s inclusionary housing requirements at the time of first condominium sale.

In summary, the City’s Housing Element includes a combination of strategies designed to facilitate the development of adequate housing: higher-density, mixed-use development in Opportunity Areas along major corridors, as well as development of residential parcels in the City’s Vacant Land Inventory. Therefore, the proposed project is not in conflict with the General Plan or Housing Element.

Land Use Master Response 4 – Land Use Compatibility

[Comments C2-71, C2-75, C3-18, D31-74, D42-15, D43-4, D63-1, D68-7, D70-6, D75-13, D79-7]

A number of commenters believe that the proposed project’s land use intensity would be incompatible with surrounding land uses and the general character of the area, that Graham Hill Road provides a natural divide between single-family zoning on Ocean Street Extension and multi-family zoning on Ocean Street, and the project would leap-frog multi-family zoning over the R-1-10 zone district which conflicts with existing patterns of development, and would put development pressure on agricultural lands located north of the project site within unincorporated Santa Cruz County. Comments also indicate that the project would create an incongruous and illogical mix of land uses, and the project would block scenic views of the City from Graham Hill Road.

The project site is currently zoned for residential use. As described on page 4.7-5 in Section 4.7 of the DEIR, the permitted residential use at the site would not change, but the proposed General Plan amendment and rezoning would change the allowable density that would result in an increased land use intensity on the property. A potential effect on development patterns is not a potential impact under CEQA which is focused on physical impacts on the environment, although it is noted that the project site is in proximity to sites zoned RL along Ocean Street. Changes in land use intensity can result in physical impacts related to aesthetics or noise. There are no residential, commercial, or agricultural uses immediately adjacent to the project site that would be affected by this change in land use intensity. The project would not result in substantial noise levels and would not substantially increase existing noise levels. No significant impacts to scenic views or the visual character of the area were identified as a result of the proposed residential project, which are

addressed in the DEIR and in this document in **Aesthetics Master Response 1** (scenic views from Graham Hill Road) and **Aesthetics Master Response 2** (visual character of the area). Potential indirect impacts to agricultural operations north of the project site would not be adversely affected as discussed in Section 4.7 of the DEIR and in **Land Use Master Response 1** of this document. The project would not result in increased traffic along Ocean Street Extension to the north of the project site. However, these issues will be further addressed in the City staff report/review of the project.

Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1 – Traffic Impact Analysis

Study Intersections

[Comments PR-C1-8, PR-C1-19, PR-C1-20, PR-D9-2, PR-D9-4, PR-D13-3, PR-D13-4]

Several comments questioned how study intersections were selected. As explained on page 4.5-3 of the PRDEIR, a traffic study is required if a project would result in an increase of 50 or more trips during the weekday PM peak hour. As set forth in the City's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines, at a minimum, the TIS must evaluate the access driveways and adjacent intersections. The Guidelines also indicate that any "critical" intersection that receives 25 trips should be included in the traffic impact study. Based on the project trip generation, no intersections received more than 25 weekday PM peak hour trips at defined critical intersections. The project traffic study did include the Ocean Street-Plymouth Street/Highway 17 intersection, which is a critical intersection. Some commenters suggested including the Highway 1/Highway 9 and Ocean Street/Felker Street intersections in the traffic study, but the project would result in 10 or less trips at these intersections and didn't meet the 25+-trip criteria. Furthermore, the Ocean Street/Felker Street intersection is not identified as a critical intersection. The Highway 1/Highway 9 intersection was reviewed in the cumulative impacts discussion.

Some comments expressed experiences with congestion at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 Northbound On-Ramp intersection. This intersection is included in the traffic analysis. This is not a constrained movement, and it is also noted that the project does not contribute trips to the left-turn movement. Additionally, there is insufficient right-of-way to install left turn lane at this location.

Traffic Counts

[Comments PR-C1-13, P1-C1-14, PR-C1-16, PR-D13-7]

The traffic impact study was based on intersection traffic counts taken in October 2014, and many comments asserted that the counts are outdated. A supplemental count was taken on March 22, 2018 to consider changes in traffic volume. Although it was near the end of the UCSC quarter and taken after a period of rainfall, the actual PM peak hour count was taken during a period of sunshine and no rain. The traffic counts were 7-9 percent lower than the 2014 counts as discussed on page 4.5-17 of the PRDEIR, and the City determined that use of the higher 2014 counts in the traffic analysis provides a worst-case impact analysis. The March 2018 count was not used to quantify LOS or traffic impacts.

A couple of commenters questioned why counts were not taken on weekend or summer peak periods, and one comment referenced the Caltrans traffic impact study guidelines that indicated “Seasonal and weekend variations in traffic should also be considered where appropriate (i.e., recreational routes, tourist attractions, harvest season, etc.)”. The proposed project does not meet the criteria for a full traffic impact study under the Caltrans guidelines. However analysis of the nearby Caltrans intersections was considered appropriate even if they also did not meet the City standard of 25 additional PM peak hour trips.

In the City of Santa Cruz, the peak hour for weekdays occurs in the evening for most locations as discussed on page 4.5-17 of the PRDEIR. Traffic counts done hourly on Graham Hill Road indicate that AM peak hour volumes are 40 percent of the PM peak hour volumes.

Project Trip Generation

[Comments PR-C1-21, PR-C1-23, PR-D4-2, PR-D13-3]

Several comments questioned the use of the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) trip generation rate and claimed that the project will generate more traffic given the type of units proposed and that the project trip generation did not consider the project floor plans, absence of alternative transportation and likely demographics of future residents of the project. The ITE trip generation rate is the professional standard used for most projects. The ITE rate is based on a broad spectrum of locations including others cities along the California coast. The rates used compare very similarly to rates identified in trip generation studies for the San Diego Area Governments. A case can be made that the trip generation rates used are conservatively high. Based on surveys of travel modes, residents in Santa Cruz are 20 percent less likely to use automobiles to commute than the national average. Additionally the trip calculations assume 100-percent occupancy. Additionally, the CalEEMod emissions model default weekday trip rate for apartments is 6.59 trips per dwelling unit, which was adjusted to a higher 6.65 trip per dwelling unit rate to match the traffic report.

Related to trip generation, some comments questioned the modal split identified in the PRDEIR as some considered the estimates too high. The estimate was based on current modal split averaged within the City, and was provided for informational purposes. The estimate of bicycle trips is based on .5 bicycle excursions per unit per day. The definition of a trip is either a beginning or an end of a trip. Thus, every excursion away from the site generates two trips. This is consistent with travel mode survey prepared for the City Master Transportation Study 2003. The overall trip generation used for the traffic analysis assumed all new trips as vehicle trips.

Project Trip Distribution

[Comments PR-C1-15, PR-D13-3]

Some comments ask how trip distribution was determined and rationale for the determination. Page 4.5-19 of the PRDEIR explains how trip distribution is considered. The traffic report identified the trip distribution based on known demographics, destinations and travel patterns, which were

reviewed and accepted by the City. The trip distribution was forwarded to the City for review and concurrence prior to further analysis in accordance with the City's Traffic Impact Study Guidelines.

Traffic Impacts

[Comments PR-D1-2, PR-D2-2, PR-D3-2, PR-D10-3, PR-D14-3, PR-D15-3, PR-D16-3, PR-D17-3]

Regarding methodologies, both Caltrans and the City require the use of Highway Capacity Manual Methodology to evaluate traffic impacts. This is the best practice available and provides a consistent analysis of whatever circulation component is studied. The City of Santa Cruz experiences peak congestion periods during summer and spring holiday periods but has accepted as a matter of policy not to design for these seasonal peaks.

Some comments stated that the project will significantly impair travel on Graham Hill Road between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley. However, the traffic analysis shows minimal increases in delay (2+ seconds) as result of the project at all intersections, except the Ocean Street/Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp. The project would result in an increase of approximately 3 trips to the San Lorenzo Valley.

Traffic Mitigation

[Comments PR-C1-5, PR-C2-2, PR-D4-3, PR-D9-1, PR-D9-3, PR-D11-2, PR-D17-4]

The comment states that signalization/widening mitigation should be constructed prior to the project being occupied, and asks how the project's share of the cost will be obtained. Several comments questioned the mitigation that requires project contribution to the cost of signalization and widening of the Highway 1 off-ramp. One comment asserts that the mitigation to contribute to the cost of signalizing the intersection and widening the off-ramp does not meet the standard for adequate mitigation and that the EIR fails to disclose a plan for mitigation. The PRDEIR explains on pages 4.5-10, 4.5-11, and 4.5-22 that the City is currently evaluating widening the Highway 1 bridge over the San Lorenzo River. The project is in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and a Project Study Report has been prepared by Caltrans. The signal could be considered in the upcoming environmental and engineering phases, and widening is already part of the project.

Mitigation Measure Trans-1 requires the applicant to contribute the project's share of the cost of signalization and widening of the Highway 1 southbound off-ramp at Ocean Street and include the improvement in the Highway 1 Bridge project that is currently planned by the City and is included in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The cost of the signal and off-ramp widening would be estimated by the project engineer and reviewed by City staff. The project's share would be determined based on the project percentage of total PM peak hour trips at the intersection. The fee would be collected at the time of building permit issuance, the same as other collected fees, and the fee would be deposited in a separate account. According to state law, the City can hold the funds for five years or longer if the project to be funded is planned by the City and included in the CIP. The Highway 1 bridge widening project is in the City's CIP and already includes improvements to the ramp. .

Cumulative Impacts

[Comments PR-D1-4, PR-D2-4, PR-D3-3, PR-D5-3, PR-D6-3, PR-D10-4, PR-D13-6, PR-D14-4, PR-D15-4, PR-D16-4]

A number of comments stated that the traffic reports for this project and the EIR do not adequately account for the cumulative impacts of additional traffic created by the two new projects on Jewell Street, which are currently under construction and will further impair traffic on Graham Hill Road. The PRDEIR identifies cumulative projects in the vicinity of the proposed project on page 5-1. As discussed on page 5-2 of the PRDEIR, the General Plan buildout assumptions were used and updated to include the proposed project, and the General Plan cumulative traffic analysis included 185 residential units in the Ocean Street/Ocean Street Extension area, which accounts for the two new projects on Ocean Street and Jewell Street. No cumulative projects were identified in the vicinity according to County of Santa Cruz Planning Department staff as indicated on page 5-1 of the PRDEIR.

As described in Section 4.5.1 of the PRDEIR, the project would be subject to the City's traffic impact fee. Traffic impact fees are assessed by the City of Santa Cruz Public Works Department based on new net traffic generated by a project. The traffic impact fees are used to address needed traffic improvements at key intersections for circulation and alternative transportation improvements. Funding is divided between specific projects identified on a priority list (85 percent), alternative transportation (15 percent), and intersection and neighborhood traffic (5 percent).

Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2 – Road Improvements and Access

[Comments PR-C1-27, PR-C1-33, PR-C1-35, PR-D1-6, PR-D3-7, PR-D15-6, PR-D17-6]

Road Improvements

A number of comments indicate that Ocean Street Extension is a narrow road with potential conflicts with larger vehicles that use the street, including agricultural equipment, garbage trucks. Residents have indicated that under current conditions, vehicles are able to pull onto the shoulder to allow trucks to pass. With the construction of formal on-street parking and curbs and drainage, there will be no shoulder to pull onto. The EIR acknowledges the use of the road by larger vehicles on page 4.5-26 of the PRDEIR, and notes that the occurrence of larger vehicles, including agricultural vehicles, is irregular and intermittent.

The road improvements proposed by the project are designed to city standards. The project proposes to increase the width of the traveled way and provide needed dedicated parallel parking stalls. The minimum road width standard for a low density residential local street is 18 feet for a two-way street with parking on one side (Neighborhood Street Design Guidelines, a Recommended Practice of the Institute of Transportation Engineers). The City's Subdivision Ordinance has some requirements regarding curbs and gutters, but does not specify a minimum road width. The proposed 20-foot road width along Ocean Street Extension is considered an adequate width for vehicular traffic on a local street, including emergency vehicles.

Comments also object to removal of the informal parking with the road improvements as vehicles park on both sides of the street for funeral services, reducing the roadway width. The proposed lanes are generally wider than the existing conditions and are adequate to accommodate trucks and larger vehicles. On-street parking is planned as part of the project's proposed off-site improvements. Additionally, the widening and median modifications as well as the removal of a tree serve to improve sight distance at the Ocean Street/Ocean Street Extension intersection, and the left-turn lane at this location will be lengthened.

The standard for determining whether a potential traffic hazard impact is significant is whether a project would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The project would result in road improvements that improve current access conditions and would not result in new hazards or increase existing hazards.

Emergency Access

Regarding emergency access, some comments state that all emergency vehicles must travel past the project to the end of Paradise Park. As described in Section 4.5-2 of the PRDEIR, Ocean Street Extension has been used as an alternative access to and from the Paradise Park community, north of the project area, during times when Highway 9 is closed. Access to the Paradise Park neighborhood is provided by Highway 9. There is an existing bridge over San Lorenzo River with a locked gate at the end of Ocean Street. In the past during emergency situations, such as closure of segments of Highway 9, the gate has been opened to allow residents of Paradise Park to access to Ocean Street Extension. The proposed project would not affect or interfere with emergency access either to the project site or emergency access for residents to the north as has occurred in the past. The project-proposed improvements at the Graham Hill Road / Ocean Street intersection (including widening of Ocean Street Extension and lengthening of the northbound Ocean Street left turn lane) would improve operations at this location.

Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3 – Alternative Transportation Modes

[Comments PR-C1-22, PR-C1-25, PR-D11-2, PR-D13-10, PR-D13-12, PR-D13-16, PR-D16-7]

Many commenters stated that the General Plan contains several unspecified policies to promote the use of alternative modes of transportation and that the project would not be served by alternative transportation modes. Commenters also stated that bike lanes are not included in the project, which conflicts with General Plan policies requiring bicycle improvements.

Project Facilities

As discussed in the PRDEIR (pages 4.5-274.5-29, the project site would be served by pedestrian (sidewalk) and bicycle lanes on Ocean Street as well as the sidewalk proposed to be installed on Ocean Street Extension by the applicant. As shown on page 59 of the General Plan, a Class 2 on-street bicycle lane begins at the intersection of Graham Hill Road/Ocean Street Extension/Ocean Street, less than 500 feet from the project site. In addition, the project would include installation of

a sidewalk on the west side of Ocean Street Extension from the cemetery entrance to the existing sidewalks on Ocean Street, thereby connecting the project area to the City's existing pedestrian facilities. Transit service is available on Ocean Street less than 0.5 miles from the project site.

Some comments expressed opposition to the proposed elimination of the bike lane and removal of the island to widen the Graham Hill/Ocean Street Extension intersection. The project's proposed roadway and intersection improvements would not entail removal of existing bike lanes. Similarly, the two medians at Ocean Street Extension would not be removed, but rather, would be reduced in size to better accommodate the sidewalk extension. The existing median at the left-turn lane from Ocean Street to Ocean Street Extension would be removed to accommodate lengthening the left-turn lane.

Many comments raised concerns regarding existing hazards to bicyclists and pedestrians due to conflicts with vehicles, lack of adequate bike lanes and traffic in the area and believe the project would create numerous significant new conflicts and hazards for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The commenters' concerns about safety are noted, but the project would not result in increased hazards. The project would extend the existing sidewalk to the project site, and a bike lane exists on Ocean Street. Bike lanes typically are not provided on local streets due to low traffic volumes, and there is no requirement to put a bike lane on Ocean Street Extension. Sharrows can be installed for streets less than 3,000 vehicles per day with 25 mph posted hours, and could be installed on Ocean Street Extension. It is also noted that bicycles can use sidewalks in non-commercial areas.

Some commenters prefer using the existing gravel shoulder as a bike lane and state that removal of the gravel shoulder and addition of bioswales would create a hazard for bicyclists. The project includes widening the roadway, which would be paved, and elimination of the unpaved shoulder would not create a hazard. A City standard curb and gutter would separate vehicles and cyclists from the bioretention area. The edge of the swale is shown at the same elevation as the gutter pan, so there would be no immediate drop-off from the edge of street to the bioplanter. Pedestrians would be separated by a six-inch drop from the walk to the swale, similar to a standard six-inch curb drop-off, which is a recognized method for providing a detectable warning for pedestrians.

Some comments erroneously claim that the project proposes "redesign" of the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection, which will substantially increase hazards to motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. The project does not propose to redesign the intersection, but proposed improvements include road widening, median modification to accommodate sidewalk extension, and lengthening the left-turn lane from Ocean Street to Ocean Street Extension. These improvements would not increase hazards, but rather, would provide more roadway width for vehicles and bicycles, increased storage for left-turn lanes, and an expanded, continuous sidewalk for pedestrians.

In conclusion, as discussed above and on pages 4.5-27 to 4.5-29 of the PRDEIR, the project does not result in improvements that would cause or increase hazards to pedestrians or bicyclists.

Conflicts with General Plan Policies

The comments generally did not cite any specific policy in the General Plan regarding alternative transportation modes or bicycle improvements with which the project conflicts. Nevertheless, the General Plan contains several policies related to alternative transportation modes and bicycle improvements, described as follows. General Plan Goal LU4 includes policies aimed at developing land use patterns that reduce transportation demand and facilitate alternative modes of transportation, including policies to encourage a transition to higher land use densities along the City's transit and commercial corridors (LU4.1) and encourage land use changes that reduce the need for autos (LU4.2). Goal M1 includes policies aimed to support creation of livable streets (M1.2) and pedestrian-oriented streetscapes (M1.3). Goal M4 includes policies to provide and maintain a complete bicycle network (M4.2), require pedestrian and bicycle improvements in major activity centers and activity areas (M4.3), and promote bike lanes on arterial and collector streets (M4.3.1). No policy in the General Plan indicates a requirement for proposed development projects to include bike lanes or other bicycle improvements.

The following policies identified in Letter C-2 are directives for City action and not applicable to project-level developments: M1.3.1 (amend Zoning Ordinance), M2.3.1 (designing and accommodating multiple transportation modes), M4.2.3 (facilitate bicycle connections to all travel modes), M4.3.1 (promote bike lanes on arterial and collector streets). Another comment questions project consistency with M3.3.5 that requires new development to be designed to discourage through traffic in adjacent neighborhoods and to encourage bicycle or pedestrian connections. Ocean Street Extension does not provide a "through" connection to other neighborhoods. Another comment questioned M2.4.12-Street Classification, which requires development along arterial streets to provide adequate and accessible bus shelters, and one comment indicates that the project is located on an arterial street as indicated in the General Plan. The General Plan map incorrectly shows Ocean Street Extension as an arterial street, but the City has indicated it is a local street, which is corrected and explained on page 4.5-4 of the PRDEIR.

4.3.2 Responses to DEIR Comments

Agencies, organizations, and individuals that submitted written comments on the DEIR are outlined above in section 4.2. Each letter of comment is included in section 4.5. As indicated above, the State CEQA Guidelines section 15088(a) requires a lead agency to evaluate comments on environmental issues and provide a written response. A response to each comment is in this subsection; the written comments are included in subsection 4.5. As indicated in subsection 4.1 above, the emphasis of the responses will be on significant environmental issues raised by the commenters. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15204, subd. (a).) Appropriate changes that have been made to the DEIR text based on these comments and responses are provided in Chapter 3, Changes to EIR.

Responses to Comments from Public Agencies

LETTER A1 – Santa Cruz County Public Works Department

- A1-1 Effects of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road. The comment expresses concerns from residents in the County regarding the stability of Graham Hill Road resulting from tree removal. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**

LETTER A2 – Monterey Bay Air Resources District

- A2-1 Construction Dust. The comment suggests that BMPs to reduce offsite fugitive dust be applied as appropriate. The comment indicates that operational emissions can be reduced further by prohibiting wood-burning fireplaces. The comment is acknowledged, but the EIR did not identify significant air quality impacts related to project operations. However, fireplaces are not included in the project plans. The comment is acknowledged, but the EIR did not identify significant air quality impacts that warrant mitigation. However, the comment is referred to City staff for consideration as a project Condition of Approval (COA).
- A2-2 Recommends Prohibition of Wood-Burning Fireplaces. The comment indicates that operational emissions can be reduced further by prohibiting wood-burning fireplaces. The comment is acknowledged, but the EIR did not identify significant air quality impacts related to project operations. However, fireplaces are not included in the project plans.
- A2-3 Recommends Using Cleaner Construction Equipment. The comment states that, given proximity of residential and commercial land uses, the Air District recommends using cleaner construction equipment that conforms to California Air Resources Board's Tier 3 or Tier 4 emission standards and using equipment that use alternative fuels, whenever feasible. The comment is acknowledged, but the EIR did not identify significant air quality impacts that warrant mitigation. However, the comment is referred to City staff for consideration.
- A2-4 Building Demolition - Asbestos. The comment indicates that any buildings to be renovated or demolished may be subject to District rules regarding investigation and reporting on asbestos. The comment is acknowledged, but there are no existing buildings on the project site that would be demolished.

LETTER A3 – California Native American Heritage Commission

- A3-1 State Agency Comment Received After Close of the Public Review Period. The State Clearinghouse indicates transmittal of letter received after the close of the public review

period from the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to which responses are provided as follows.

- A3-2 Review of DEIR. The commenter indicates that the NAHC was unable to review the document because the CD files could not be opened and the agency did not receive a response from the agency request for electronic copies or an online link for the document. The comment is acknowledged and referred to the City staff. It is also noted that the State Clearinghouse distributed the CDs and had additional copies; no other notifications of a bad CDs were reported to the City. Additionally, the NAHC was on the City's distribution list and sent a copy of the Notice of Completion and Availability of the DEIR with a link to the City's web page where the document could be viewed.
- A3-3 CEQA Requirements for Cultural Resources Evaluation. The comment identifies CEQA requirements for evaluation of historical and tribal cultural resources. The comment is acknowledged. No significant impacts to cultural resources were identified based on findings of an archaeological investigation at the site as reported in the Initial Study (DEIR Appendix A, pages 32-34). Inadvertent discoveries during construction would be subject to stopping construction to evaluate the find and/or contacts with the County Coroner's Office as required by the City's Municipal Code section 24.12.430 as indicated on page 34 of the Initial Study. As indicated in the Initial Study, no Native American tribe has contacted the City of Santa Cruz to request notification pursuant to requirements of AB 52.
- A3-4 Consultant with Native American Tribes. The comment recommends consultation with Native American tribes. The comment is acknowledged; consultation was not required nor deemed necessary based on the results of the archaeological investigation.
- A3-5 AB 52 and SB 18 Requirements. The comment indicates that a summary of provisions of AB 52 and SB 18 are attached with NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments. See Response to Comment A3-3 regarding AB 52 requirements. SB 18 applies to consultation requirements for local agencies prior to adoption or amendment of a General Plan. Consultation letters were mailed to tribal contacts identified by NAHC on August 8, 2017. Local governments are required to consult with tribes who request consultation. No responses were received from any of the contacted tribal representatives, and further action is required.

LETTER A4 – California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse

- A4-1 Compliance with State Clearinghouse Review. The letter acknowledges that the City of Santa Cruz complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for review of draft environmental documents pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and that no state agencies submitted comments through the Clearinghouse. The comment is acknowledged; and no response is necessary.

Responses to Comments from Applicant

LETTER B1 – Project Applicants, Rick Moe and Craig Rowell

- B1-1 Project Objectives. The comment requests addition of project objects listed in Section 3.3 and Chapter 5 of the DEIR. The comment indicates the DEIR does not include all of the project objectives provided to the City. The project objectives identified in this comment were not specifically provided to the City as written in the comment. Upon review by the City, it was determined that the objectives were similar to those already included in the EIR and no modifications to the project objectives were deemed necessary.
- B1-2 Figure 4.1.2. The comment identifies a typo on the label of Figure 4.1-2, which has been corrected; see Chapter 3, Changes to EIR.
- B1-3 Stormwater Drainage. The comment asks that text on DEIR page 4.4-5 be revised regarding existing drainage patterns consist of sheet flow across the site to the street where it flows into a drainage ditch instead of an existing 18-inch storm drain. The revision has been made; see Chapter 3, Changes to EIR. With the proposed drainage plan, project site runoff would be conveyed to the existing storm drain.
- B1-4 Traffic Comments. The comment addresses traffic counts, discussion of access and safety hazards, and project improvements along Ocean Street Extension as discussed in DEIR Section 4.5, Traffic and Transportation. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- B1-5 Project Objectives. The comment requests addition of project objects listed in Section 3.3 and Chapter 5 of the DEIR. See Response to Comment B1-1.
- B1-6 Alternative 3. The comment states that the DEIR overstates the ability of Alternative 3 to reduce environmental impacts compared to the project because buildings would still be exposed to noise, all eucalyptus trees along Graham Hill Road would be removed, and tree protection would still be required to protect existing trees. The comment is acknowledged, but as explained on pages 5-21 to 5-22, fewer people would be exposed to roadway noise with a reduction of units and the elimination of two of the ten buildings. As indicated in the DEIR, the elimination of two buildings could allow for redesign of building layout to reduce the need for tree removal and potential indirect impacts to nesting birds if present. The DEIR acknowledges that protection of retained oak trees during construction would continue to be needed depending on site design.

Responses to Comments from Organizations

LETTER C1 – Bike Santa Cruz County

- C1-1 Bike Improvements to Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road. The comment requests a bike lane and bike improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. However, the comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for further consideration.
- C1-2 Site Development. The comment recommends dispersion of project planned bike racks to be closer to residences. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. However, the comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for further consideration.
- C1-3 Bike Lanes. The comment recommends a multi-use path from the project to Graham Hill Road as well as widening Graham Hill Road to provide bike lanes as identified in the City's Active Transportation Plan. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. However, the comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for further consideration. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment.

LETTER C2 – Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association

- C2-1 Opposes Redesignation of Project Site. The comment indicates that the Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association (OSENSA) objects to the proposed General Plan amendment and rezoning and will continue to oppose any redesignation of the project parcel. The comment expresses concerns about effects of the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- C2-2 General Comment and Request for EIR Recirculation. The comment identifies organization of comments and attachments. The comment also indicates that there have been problems getting information from the City Planning Department, including website issues, which has resulted in "deprivation of procedural due process and based on comments attached, the DEIR should be recirculated for public review. The Planning Department has appropriately responded to project inquiries and has provided project information on the City's website. **See Master Response 1 – Recirculation** regarding request that the EIR be recirculated.
- C2-3 Design Permit Findings and Project Design Review. The comment states that Design Permit findings should be included in the DEIR as the aesthetic analysis in the EIR is based

on these findings. The comment also questions whether a peer review of the proposed plans by a qualified architect has been completed and questions the qualifications of the preparers of the EIR. The basis of impact evaluation and thresholds of significance are explained on pages 4.1-5 and 4.1-6 of the DEIR. The focus is on potential significant adverse physical impacts on the environment, and the DEIR evaluation is not based on Design Permit findings. City staff will review the project and make recommendations based in part on the analyses in the DEIR, but the responsibility for making Design Permit findings lies with the City staff and decision makers. The City does not routinely require independent design review for project applications. City and consultant staff have over 40 years of combined experience in the fields of land use and environmental planning, including design review of development projects and aesthetics impact evaluations.

- C2-4 Scenic Views. The comment asserts that Graham Hill Road is a scenic gateway that provides a significant public scenic vista with views of Pogonip, Mission Hill and Holy Cross Church that would be affected or blocked by the proposed project. The comment requests that story poles or photo simulations of the view from Graham Hill Road be prepared. A photo simulation from Graham Hill Road has been added. **See Aesthetics Master Responses 1 and 2.**
- C2-5 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that inadequate analysis has been provided regarding change of development density on the project site with regard to impacts on the surrounding visual character. The comment opines that the project would introduce incompatible development in an area where surrounding properties are rural in character and that while other multi-family developments exist in proximity to the project site, they are separated from the site by Graham Hill Road and predominantly open grounds of the Santa Cruz Memorial Park. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- C2-6 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment opines that the proposed project height and mass of the 10 structures would dwarf and overwhelm the nearest neighboring structure, the Santa Cruz Memorial crematory and that Graham Hill Road provides a transition between the site and other multi-family structures in the area. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- C2-7 Architectural Elements and Building Mass. The comment provides the commenter's opinion on building design features, massing and paint; asks about roof projections; and asks how patios and trellises break up building mass. Commenter's opinion on the project design features is acknowledged, but do not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is required. See Response to Comment C2-8 regarding building height limitations. Trellises and patios help break up the building plane that would otherwise be a flat surface. Text has been clarified; see Chapter 3, Changes to EIR.
- C2-8 Building Height. The comment states that the 30-foot-tall buildings on the eastern edge of the site will tower 60 feet above Ocean Street Extension due to the sloping topography.

The comment also asks what method the City uses to measure height to ensure accuracy and compliance. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2** regarding building heights. The Planning and Community Development Department Code Compliance Division is responsible for enforcement of zoning regulations, including building height limits. Section 24.22.162 of the City's Municipal Code (zoning regulations) defines building height as shown below. Certain building features are exempt from the building height limits.

The vertical distance from average grade, as defined herein, to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof or to the deck line of a mansard roof or to the average midpoint of roof planes of the highest gable of a pitch or hip roof. In calculating the height of a stepped or terraced building, the height of each individual segment of the building shall first be calculated; the height of a stepped or terraced building is the height of the tallest segment of the building. Height limitations shall not apply to uses listed in Section [24.12.150](#), Height limit modifications, of this title.

- C2-9 Project Materials and Design. The comment states that the proposed materials and design represent some of the cheapest possible construction methods. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no response is necessary. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- C2-10 Building Mass. The comment states that the “assertion by the DEIR that limited windows would serve to ‘soften building mass’ is in direct contradiction to commonly-accepted architectural design principles.” While, in some instances, placement and design of window treatments can break a surface, it is agreed that windows do not substantially serve to soften building mass and the EIR text has been revised. See Chapter 3, Changes to EIR.
- C2-11 Project Photo Simulations. The comment states that the photo simulations included in the DEIR are incomplete and misleading because the “North View with Project” is taken from a distant vantage point and the “South View with Project” includes trees and both portray the project as being considerably less imposing than it will actually appear. The comment requests that more accurate photo simulations be provided. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- C2-12 Drainage Gully. The comment states that the concrete in the erosion gully to the north are “blight” and that the developer should remove and stabilize the gully. The comment expresses an opinion about the appearance of the adjacent off-site gully, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no response is necessary. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2** regarding other comments about the adjacent gully.

- C2-13 Slope Regulations. The commenter questions how the project meets the purpose of the City's slope regulations regarding avoidance of excessive height, bulk and mass normally associated with building on slopes. **See Land Use Master Response 2.**
- C2-14 Light and Glare. The comment states that it appears likely that the project would introduce a major new source of light and requests a quantitative light study. **See Aesthetics Master Response 3.**
- C2-15 Mercury Soils Testing. The comment questions the methodology and location of soils sampling and testing regarding mercury in the soil. Kinnetic Laboratories Inc. collected six soil samples in October 2010; the method of collection is described in the letter from Kinnetic Laboratory Inc., dated November 9, 2010. Normal air movements at the crematory location are primarily up the San Lorenzo River valley in a north-northwest direction and down the valley in a south-southeast direction. This meteorological assumption is confirmed in URS' Health Risk Assessment, dated July 2, 2012. The location of the soils samples was based on this primary air movement.

One sample was taken 42 feet south-southeast of the emissions stacks (sample #4) and one was taken 42 feet east-northeast of the stacks (sample #3). Both samples were on the crematory property. On the proposed project site, one sample was taken at the closest proposed structure to the stacks (Building 6, sample #2), one was taken in the middle of the proposed project (Building 9, sample #5) and one was taken at the farthest building from the stacks (Building 3, sample #1), which is shown in the Kinnetic Laboratory report. Sample #6 was taken from across Ocean Street Extension, in the northwest corner of the cemetery property, as a baseline reference. No samples were taken from vegetation. Based on review of weather reports, the samples were not taken on a rainy day as suggested in the comment.

At the time the soil samples were taken, the crematory had been operating on and off in this location for more than 55 years. The concentrations of mercury found ranged from 0.017 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) dry weight to 0.043 mg/kg dry weight vs. California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSL) safe limits of 18.0 mg/kg dry weight. The soil samples tested showed such a low a level of mercury, there is no reasonable logic to suggest that, in seven years since the testing was done, the levels would now exceed CHHSL limits. No other toxic emissions were tested for in the soil samples. According to URS' Health Risk Assessment, dated July 2, 2012, there are no other toxins emitted from the crematory operation, other than vaporized mercury, which are at a level that would be a health risk. In summary, the soil testing was conducted under best practice testing procedures. The testing concluded that the mercury levels, in the soils, are far below the threshold of concern.

- C2-16 Air District Assessment-Mercury Emissions. The comment questions results of previous evaluations and assessment regarding toxic air emissions from the adjacent crematory. As

indicated on pages 4.2-9 to 4.2-11 of the DEIR, in December 2015, the California Supreme Court decision in *California Building Industry Association v Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (S213478, December 17, 2015) ruled that CEQA does not require analysis of the effects of the environment on the project. In addition, the cemetery has agreed to remove the amalgam-filled teeth prior to cremation. The cemetery has also received approval to relocate the crematory to behind the existing mortuary, across Ocean Street Extension. Therefore, no further analysis of this topic is required in the EIR.

- C2-17 Emissions Model. The comment questions the ITE trip generation rates in the traffic report that were used in the air emissions model and asks how emissions from additional traffic will be factored into the model. The ITE trip generation rate used is based on a broad spectrum of locations, and is the standard tool used for trip generation. No further changes were made to the trip generation rate. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- C2-18 Landslides. The comment states that Graham Hill Road was closed due to landslides approximately 1,000 feet north of the project site and that while there may be no historic landslides on the project site, there are stability issues on slopes above the site. Comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is required. However, **see Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- C2-19 Runoff from Graham Hill Road. The comment asks whether impervious surfaces along Graham Hill Road have been taken into account in the drainage analysis. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- C2-20 Seismic Hazards-Foundation Design. The comment alleges that resolution of potential exposure to seismic shaking and liquefaction are deferred, and references the geotechnical report's recommendations regarding foundations in non-liquefiable soils. As discussed on page 4.3-9 of the DEIR, additional soils boring and testing was conducted in November 2016, which found stronger subsurface soil profiles. See Response to Comment C2-34.
- C2-21 Seismic Hazards. The comment asks the scientific/engineering basis for concluding that the earthquake risk is not a significant impact given the soils condition and construction into the 30-percent slope. The DEIR identifies exposure to seismic shaking as a potentially significant impact that can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with final building designs in accordance with recommendations of the project geotechnical report, which includes seismic design criteria, and required adherence to California Building Code requirements. The project's geotechnical engineer has selected to use cut and fill grading operations to construct level pads benched up from Ocean Street Extension, across the 30-percent slopes below Graham Hill Road, rather than constructing buildings on existing slope gradients using pier and grade beam foundations. The cut and fill benching layout will not only stabilize, by flattening the building site, it will also restrain slope instability by

constructing multiple retaining walls 10 to 15 feet in height across the property. The combination of benching the native slope and retaining the cuts that form the benches, reduces the potential for seismic instability significantly. The retaining walls will be designed for seismic surcharges from earthquakes when retaining wall details are engineered and designed.

- C2-22 Geotechnical Report Updates. The comment states that the geotechnical report was prepared in 2007 and asks what the standards the City has for updating reports. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 1.**
- C2-23 Severe Storms. The comment asks how the geotechnical report and drainage report account for increased storm strength and rainfall such as experienced during the winter of 2016-2017. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- C2-24 Adjacent Gully Stability. The comment notes the eroding gully adjacent to the project site and questions risks to the project and asks why previous recommendations for stabilization of the gully are not proposed. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- C2-25 City Slope Regulations. The comment references section 24.14.030(d), Slope Regulations, of the Municipal Code, states that two proposed building areas encroach into 30 percent slopes, including the gully to the north, and states that findings to substantiate granting an exception to 10-foot setbacks from 30-percent slopes have not been met. **See Land Use Master Response 2** regarding the City's slope regulations and **see Geology and Soils Master Response 2** regarding the gully adjacent to the project site.
- C2-26 Quantitative Slope Stability Analysis. The comment questions why a quantitative slope analysis has not been conducted. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- C2-27 Effects of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road. The comment questions the effect of tree removal adjacent to Graham Hill Road on slope stability in that area. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.** The comment also asks whether the County has commented on this potential threat and whether PG&E has evaluated risks to its gas line. See Comment A1-1 from the County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department, and evaluations by PG&E are unknown.
- C2-28 Geology Report. The comment indicates that a full geology report should be provided as supported by General Plan policy HZ6.2.1. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 1.**
- C2-29 Project Grading and Potential Erosion. The comment indicates that grading is likely to result in substantial erosion and sedimentation of downstream drainage facilities and the San Lorenzo River. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2** regarding erosion.

- C2-30 Adjacent Gully Erosion. The comment states that it would be appropriate for the project to address the erosion issues with the adjacent gully and should be required to stabilize the gully as previously recommended. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- C2-31 Off-site Grading. The comment asks whether there will be offsite grading and this is taken into account in the grading totals. As shown on Figure 4.3-3, Proposed Grading Plan, in the DEIR, there will be some minor grading off site within the Ocean Street Extension right-of-way. Offsite grading is only proposed in the areas shown in the project plans. Grading volumes on Sheet C1.0 will be broken out in more detail during the building permit phase. Grading volumes shown have included the rough grading estimates for the portion of work required within the right of way. Authorization will be required from all properties where work is being performed, including the right of way and drainage easement. An easement exists over the gully area to the north. This easement allows for drainage maintenance. The applicants will apply for a street work permit for any work done in the public right of way. The value of the improvements in the public right of way will be secured with a performance bond.
- C2-32 Drainage Improvements for Ocean Street Extension. The comment questions lack of improvements to Ocean Street Extension drainage system. According to the project engineer, the portions of Ocean Street Extension in question are shown outside of Drainage Management Areas 11 and 12 and equate to approximately 2,046 square feet of sidewalk, curb, gutter and pavement conform on Ocean Street Extension near the intersection with Graham Hill Road, where existing roadway drainage runs to the south away from the project site, and to the north of the proposed sidewalk where a conform is proposed between the proposed improvements and the existing roadway. Since these are areas of conforming to the existing conditions and since the project does not significantly alter the drainage courses or surfaces for these areas, it is unnecessary to slope these sections of improvements to the proposed bioretention areas. Regrading these areas to bioswales would necessitate drastic modifications to Graham Hill Road and would involve significant right-of-way acquisition or existing roadway realignment. These minor areas are also insignificant compared with the 23,880 square feet of affected and treated/retained/detained roadway area, especially since these areas are mainly impervious asphalt being overlain with more asphalt and/or concrete.
- C2-33 Erosion. The comment states that additional erosion would cause sedimentation of drainage facilities and water quality issues for San Lorenzo River. See Response to Comment C2-29.
- C2-34 Foundation Options. The comment asks whether additional soil testing being contemplated in light of the anticipated differential settling. According to the project geotechnical engineer, differential settlement is not anticipated after reviewing the additional boring logs prepared in 2016 for the development. Additional borings were conducted in Zone C, the area of concern regarding differential settlement. The additional

borings were presented in the November 2016 Supplemental Subsurface Information document and concluded, based on the competent nature of the subsoils encountered, that the subsurface soils increased in density and strength with depth, that groundwater was not encountered and the standard penetration testing taken during the sample collection indicated that the proposed foundation zone soils were competent and adequate to support buildings with total and differential settlements less than one inch, adhering to Standard of Care (Haro, Kasunich and Associates, February 2018).

- C2-35 Failure of Stormwater Detention System. The comment states that failure of the retention/detention system could isolate residents of Ocean Street Extension behind a deeply eroded channel. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- C2-36 Stormwater Facility Design. The comment asks why the stormwater facilities didn't use a 50-year storm for design and whether climate change and increased intense storms were taken into account. The City's requirement is 10-year storm event, and the project designed for a 25-year storm event. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1** for further discussion on stormwater facility design and severe storms.
- C2-37 Runoff from Graham Hill Road. The comment asks whether the drainage calculations account for "run-on" from Graham Hill Road as the asphalt curb is reported not to extend the length of the project site. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- C2-38 Adjacent Gully Erosion. The comment indicates that the adjacent gully to the north is partially located on the project property, runoff from the gully causes a significant amount of erosion and sediment, and the project should be responsible for stabilizing the gully to prevent further erosion. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- C2-39 Erosion. The comment states that storms in 2016-2017 resulted in sediment on Ocean Street Extension and that uncontrolled runoff will amplify this problem and asks if water quality in San Lorenzo River has been taken into account, including habitat impacts. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2** and **Biological Resources Master Response 1.**
- C2-40 Gully Dissipater. The comment asks whether the proposed rock dissipater in the adjacent gully will be engineered and effective. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- C2-41 Roadway Bioswale and Off-site Flooding. The comment asks about metering of project runoff, liability for off-site flooding exacerbated by improvements constructed in the right-of-way. The stormwater treatment/retention/detention facilities in the road right-of-way are designed only for the right-of-way improvements, and are not designed to accommodate stormwater from the project area. Onsite stormwater measures will handle runoff from the project site.

- C2-42 **Flooding Liability and Detention System Failure.** The comment asks whether the City will be liable for flooding exacerbated by improvements constructed in the right-of-way and potential failure of detention systems. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. However, the comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for further consideration. Regarding, potential failure of the project detention system, the hydrodynamic separator unit and the bioretention facilities rely on gravity and do not require electricity. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1** regarding operations and maintenance requirements for the proposed stormwater system.
- C2-43 **Downstream Drainage Impacts.** The comment questions drainage of 1.2 acres of impervious area to a downstream system that is already over capacity and potential failure of the improvements could be catastrophic for downstream homeowners. All overflow from the site and from the right of way improvements are shown to be diverted to the existing 18-inch storm drain within the right-of-way on the project plans. Uncontrolled sheet flow is not permitted, nor shown on the project plans. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1**
- C2-44 **Stormwater Study Question.** The comment states that the “antecedent moisture” estimate does not include the likelihood of a series of closely spaced storms as was experienced multiple times during the winter of 2016-2017 and whether this is considered in the drainage calculations. According to the applicant’s engineer, the preliminary design of the project stormwater facilities are in accordance with the City of Santa Cruz Storm Water Best Management Practices for Private and Public Development Projects, revised March 2014. The City requirements follow the Count method for determining structural stormwater control measure volumes which requires the use of the Rational Method, a common industry-accepted technique for determining anticipated drainage flow rates. The antecedent moisture factor is a method of increasing volumes based on the assumption that runoff will increase as soil becomes more saturated. The antecedent moisture factor is given in the Santa Cruz County Design Criteria, Figure SWM-1, and for a recurrence interval of 25 years the factor is 1.1. This is derived from the American Public Works Association Publication, “Practices in Detention of Stormwater Runoff.”
- C2-45 **Stormwater Detention.** The comment questions use of a retention system on the project site with low infiltration. The preliminary design of the stormwater facilities for this project are in accordance with the City of Santa Cruz Storm Water Best Management Practices for Private and Public Development Projects, revised March 2014. Retention is required on all new developments; **see Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1** for further explanation of the proposed drainage detention facilities.
- C2-46 **Porous Asphalt.** The comment questions use of pervious asphalt on a site with a low infiltration rate. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1** for infiltration rate

related comments. Porous asphalt is not considered impervious because of the fact that some infiltration is expected into the porous asphalt's subgrade, and only the overflow from larger storm events will enter the porous asphalt underdrains. Additionally, according to the project engineer, the runoff from the porous asphalt areas has been factored into the retention and detention systems per City requirements by dedicating additional stormwater control measures with a .55 correction factor to the area's equivalent impervious surface area.

- C2-47 Street Vacuuming. The comment asks how about street cleaning and effectiveness. Porous asphalt is considered a pervious surface in accordance with the City's requirements. "Permeable Pavements," prepared by a task committee comprised of the American Society of Civil Engineers and the Environmental and Water Resources Institute, recommends thorough vacuuming twice per year with a commercial street cleaning unit. Per the revised drainage plans and calculations, dated July 20, 2016, the owner will sign a stormwater facilities maintenance agreement – "Maintenance of Structural or Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs)" (Appendix G of the stormwater control plan). The agreement calls for bi-annual inspection of all facilities, annual sweeping or vacuuming of the pervious pavement, annual cleaning of the hydrodynamic separator, and annual submission to the City of the inspection logs, maintenance, repairs, and improvements. Failure to comply with the provisions of the Maintenance Agreement can result in enforcement actions including assessment of civil penalties as allowed by the City's Municipal Code, Chapter 16.19.190 Administrative Remedies.
- C2-48 Bioswale Functions. The comment asks whether the bioswale in the road right-of-way is designed to mitigate project development. As indicated in Response C2-41, the stormwater treatment/retention/detention facilities in the road right-of-way are designed only for the right-of-way improvements, and are not designed to accommodate stormwater from the project area.
- C2-49 Bioswale Proximity to Utility Lines. The comment asks how the bioswale in the street with function with subsurface water and gas lines. The proposed roadway bioretention facilities are relatively shallow devices. The existing utilities will be carefully potholed prior to construction to ensure adequate vertical separation.
- C2-50 Downstream Drainage Facilities and Severe Storms. The comment asks whether downstream drainage sizing has been evaluated and provisions for overflow in severe storms. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- C2-51 Groundwater-Building Coverage. The comment asks for calculations to support the DEIR statement that the project meets the 55-percent coverage allowed for parcels in a groundwater recharge area. Based on the numbers provided on the project site plans, the amount of total coverage for the project would be approximately 52 percent. However,

according to the drainage plan, new impervious surfacing would total approximately 43 percent of the site. These areas do not include any of the public right-of-way.

- C2-52 San Lorenzo River Water Quality Degradation. The comment states that the project stormwater runoff discharged into the San Lorenzo River will affect the water quality of the City's drinking water and health of the San Lorenzo River. As discussed on pages 4.4-9 to 4.4-10, the project stormwater system meets the City's stormwater treatment requirements, which would filter stormwater to prevent sediments and materials from entering downstream drainages and the river. Thus, would not result in water quality degradation in San Lorenzo River or threaten the City's water intake.
- C2-53 Phase 2 Environmental Assessment. The comment asks whether a Phase 2 Environmental Assessment has been completed to evaluate contaminants from the crematory that may be in the soil and mobilized during project grading. No elevated levels of mercury were found in the soil testing to warrant further investigation. See Response to Comment C2-15.
- C2-54 Traffic Report. The comment asks whether a peer review of the traffic study was completed. The City Public Works Department staff and their consulting engineer, Ron Marquez reviewed the project traffic report.
- C2-55 Traffic Comments. The comment addresses traffic counts, discussion of access and safety hazards, and project improvements along Ocean Street Extension as discussed in DEIR Section 4.5, Traffic and Transportation. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- C2-56 Hazards to PG&E Facilities. The comment asks whether PG&E has reviewed the improvement plans. The comment poses general question, but does not specifically address analyses in the DEIR and a specific response cannot be provided.
- C2-57 Arborist Report. The comment asks if an arborist report has been provided for two cedar trees adjacent to the proposed improvements at the southern end of Ocean Street Extension, as well as other trees in proximity to the proposed improvements, and asks if the developer has authority to remove the cedar trees without the consent of the property owner. As described in the initial study (see Appendix A of the DEIR), a total of 10 trees are proposed to be removed. Nine of these are on the project site (seven eucalyptus trees and two acacia trees). The only off-site tree proposed for removal was a pine tree in a median at the intersection of Ocean Street Extension and Graham Hill Road, which was removed in 2017 due to storm damage as explained on pages 4.5-24 and 4.5-25 of the PRDEIR. The project would not impact other trees in proximity to the project

site; therefore, the arborist reports prepared for the project do not analyze the trees requested by the commenter and no arborist report for these off-site trees is warranted.

- C2-58 Traffic. The comment questions whether proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, whether a line-of-sight analysis has been prepared, and indicates there concerns regarding Ocean Street Extension road width. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- C2-59 Project Parking. The comment questions the proposed tandem parking. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR, and parking is not a subject required for review under CEQA. Project parking will be addressed as part of the City's review and staff report.
- C2-60 Collision History. The comment presents information on collisions and asks that the traffic report be updated. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- C2-61 City Water Forecasts. The comment quotes DEIR references to the City's adopted 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and questions the basis for the UWMP's forecasts and conservation factors. The UWMP is the City's adopted water planning document that is required to be updated every five years. It provides the most up-to-date water demand and supply forecasts over a 20-year horizon. The comment also indicates that the statement in the EIR that says the UWMP predicts a decrease in water of approximately 100 million gallons per year (MGY) is unclear. This statement is taken from the UWMP, which accounts for continued water conservation efforts that have resulted in overall demand reductions even with new growth. The UWMP is not the subject of this EIR and no further response is required.
- C2-62 City's Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The comment questions water usage information in the City's UWMP since the HCP isn't complete and that it is a "significant impact to a move forward with any growth " until it is completed. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR, and no response is required. The comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- C2-63 Groundwater. The comment cites a reference to the UWMP included in the DEIR regarding potential risk of seawater intrusion in the City's groundwater supplies and asks

how the project would impact “the potential for over-pumping which will have a significant environmental impact.” The City’s groundwater supplies are only utilized for the service area east of the City limits (Live Oak and Capitola areas), and thus, the project would not result in additional demand on the City’s groundwater supplies.

- C2-64 Grading Regulations. The comment asks how the project complies with Santa Cruz Municipal Code Section 24.14.010 of the zoning code regarding grading and asks how grading has been minimized. As described in Section 4.1 of the DEIR, the buildings would be stepped up the slope of the property, thereby minimizing grading relative to leveling of the project site. The project’s grading plan will be reviewed by City staff.
- C2-65 Planned Development Permit. The comment questions the proposed Planned Development Permit requests and whether the project complies with provisions of the zoning ordinance. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR, and parking is not a subject required for review under CEQA. Project parking will be addressed as part of the City’s review and staff report.
- C2-66 Slope Regulations. The comment references Municipal Code Section 24.14.030, Slope Regulations, asks how the DEIR considers exceptions to slope regulations regarding setbacks from 30-percent slopes. **See Land Use Master Response 2.**
- C2-67 Building Height. The comment asks whether the project complies with the height limits of the zone district and how height is measured. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- C2-68 Groundwater. The comment cites EQ Element Policy 2.3.2 and indicates that it states that within undeveloped groundwater recharge areas, new parcel divisions shall be limited to one unit per 10 acres and asks how the proposed project complies with this policy. The policy cited in the comment is from the City’s 1994-2005 General Plan, which was superseded with the adoption of the General Plan 2030 in 2012. The current General Plan does not include this or a similar policy.
- C2-69 Conflicts with General Plan Policies. The comment states that analysis of the project’s “compliance” with the General Plan with respect to Table 4.7-1 is incorrect regarding policies and actions specified in the comment. **See Land Use Master Response 2.**
- C2-70 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City’s General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes and does not incorporate bike lanes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and

transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.

- C2-71 Neighborhood Compatibility. The comment references a statement from the Housing Element regarding health and well-being of residents and states that the “higher density” project will affect the neighborhood due to traffic, emergency access, and adjacent crematory, and suggest that the EIR must evaluate compliance with this Housing element policy. The comment cites a statement on page 7-113, but this is not a policy in the Housing Element. Comment is acknowledged, but no further response is required.
- C2-72 Complete Streets. The comment asks how the project complies with the “Complete Streets” vision, since no bike lane is provided, and City’s General Plan policies supporting “Complete Neighborhoods,” since the project site is not located on a transit or commercial corridor which would reduce vehicle trips. The comment asks what the applicant has done to reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by the project and if the City determined that higher density development should occur on major corridors per the Corridor Plan and questions the effect of the proposed project being outside of the “Corridor Planning Process.” The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR. However, see **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3** regarding alternative transportation modes and **Land Use Master Response 2** regarding location of development.
- C2-73 Project Studies. The comment states that the project grading plan, soils testing for mercury, geotechnical report, greenhouse gas (GHG) analysis, noise assessment, and traffic study (traffic counts) are outdated. The grading plan, as shown on Figure 4.3-3 in the DEIR, was prepared in 2016 and submitted with the current project plans reviewed in the EIR. See Response to Comment C2-15 regarding soils testing for mercury. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 1** regarding geotechnical reports. The GHG emissions analysis was conducted in 2017 as part of the EIR analysis. The noise-acoustical study remains valid, although an updated study may be required at the building permit stage to demonstrate that interior sound levels can be met. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics 1.
- C2-74 Agricultural Lands. The comment indicates that the DEIR does not address how the project would put pressure on agricultural lands to convert. **See Land Use Master Response 1**.
- C2-75 Project Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses. The comment states that the proposed project’s land use intensity would be incompatible with surrounding land uses and the general character of the area, Graham Hill Road provides a natural divide between single-family zoning on Ocean Street Extension and multi-family zoning on Ocean Street, and the project would leap-frog multi-family zoning over the R-1-10 zone district

which conflicts with existing patterns of development, and would put development pressure on agricultural lands located north of the project site within unincorporated Santa Cruz County. The comment also describes the area from the Graham Hill Road/Ocean Street Extension intersection to Ocean Street Extension north of the project site, states that the project would create an incongruous and illogical mix of land uses, and the project would block scenic views of the City from Graham Hill Road. **See Land Use Master Response 4.**

- C2-76 Parking for Santa Cruz Memorial. The comment states that the statement in the DEIR that “there are no residential or commercial uses immediately adjacent to the project site that would be affected by this change in land use intensity” is incorrect. The comment further states that the project would lead to a reduction in on-street parking spaces from 22 informal spaces to 8 parking spaces, which would have a significant impact on Santa Cruz Memorial because the facility regularly exceeds the capacity of its off-street parking lot and relies on on-street parking on Ocean Street Extension, and asks if this issue has been considered. The statement in the DEIR is not incorrect as stated by the commenter; Santa Cruz Memorial is not zoned as a residential or commercial use, but as “PF – Public Facilities.” Other parcels immediately adjacent to the project site to the north are undeveloped. Removal of on-street parking spaces related to private automobile use, in and of itself, is not considered a physical impact on the environment under CEQA. The EIR is focused on physical adverse impacts on the environment which would result from the project, which have been analyzed; City staff will further review other issues outside of the CEQA process. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- C2-77 Effects to Residents. The comment states that the 49 existing residences on Ocean Street Extension will be affected by the project on a daily basis, indicating road improvements are anticipated to heighten the existing intersection hazards and citing concerns on drainage. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, which acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- C2-78 Project Scale and Impacts on Visual Character. The comment states that there is no other project in the vicinity in size and scale of the proposed project and that 10 three-story buildings are out of character with existing development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- C2-79 Biological Resources. The comment states that the biological resources analysis in the DEIR is inadequate. **See Biological Resources Master Response 1.**
- C2-80 Biological Resources and Water Quality. The comment states that sedimentation from the project site and gully in early 2017 may have overlapped with endangered steelhead

and coho salmon adult in-migration up the San Lorenzo River, and asks how this is consistent with the City's Habitat Conservation Plan. This comment is not related to the proposed project or analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. The comment further states that the project may adversely affect the endangered tidewater goby through sedimentation and water quality degradation and asks how the DEIR addresses this impact. See **Biological Resources Master Response 1**.

LETTER C3 – Wittwer Parkin, Representing Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association

C3-1 Represents OSENA and Requests Revision to EIR. The commenter states that the commenter's law firm represents OSENA, which is acknowledged. The comment also states that the DEIR must be revised and released for a "second round of public review." See **Master Response 1 regarding EIR recirculation**.

C3-2 CEQA Guidelines Section 15128. The comment states that relying on CEQA Guidelines section 15128 buries important discussion regarding impacts and mitigations and does not allow the City to rely on the Initial Study for potential significant impacts and mitigations references biological impacts and noise. The comment requests that biological resources, cultural resources, and noise be included in the EIR and recirculated. The section referenced in the comment states that an EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons why possible significant effects of a project were determined not be significant and were not discussed in detail in the EIR and that such a statement may be contained in an attached copy of an Initial Study. With regard to section 15128, the EIR does disclose in Chapter 2, the topics found to result in no or less-than-significant impacts based on the findings in the Initial Study included in Appendix A of the DEIR. No significant impacts were identified for cultural resources.

Regarding biological resources and noise, the Initial Study identified potentially significant construction-related impacts to nesting birds and heritage trees and included mitigation measures typically used to reduce the impact based on the results of the technical biological and arborist studies. The potentially significant noise impact would be mitigated by implementing structural design recommendations presented in a technical acoustical study. For both these issues, the City determined that the analyses in the Initial Study adequately addressed the topics and no further analysis was required in the DEIR. However, the impacts and mitigation measures were included in the DEIR Summary and carried into the Alternatives analysis. The Initial Study was included the DEIR (Appendix A) as is typically presented in an EIR and was circulated to the public along with the rest of the DEIR.

C3-3 Initial Study Revisions. The comment states that the City revised the Initial Study in lieu of including information in the DEIR and there is no authority for the City to revise an Initial Study after the public has commented on the document. The Initial Study included minor revisions and corrections based on comments received during the scoping period

on the biological and cultural resource sections as indicated on page 1-4 of the DEIR. The checklist was corrected for exposure to wildland fires to a less-than-significant impact to match the conclusion in the text, which did not change.

- C3-4 Project Objectives and Objective #1. The comment asserts that the project objectives are a “complete ruse” and that they misstate City policy in an attempt to cast the project as providing affordable housing. Responses to comments regarding specific project objectives are provided below. See also Response to Comment B-1 regarding additional comments submitted by the applicant.

Regarding Objective 1, the comment questions the reference to the City’s Housing Element, questions the definition of “work force” housing, and states that a multi-family housing development is no better than a single-family housing development in meeting the City’s Housing Element goal. The City does not agree with the commenter’s characterization of the Housing Element goal or its interpretation of the proposed objective. The referenced Housing Element goal encourages diversity in housing types and affordability. The Housing Element does not include a definition of work force housing, but does reference the City’s work force as including teachers, public safety workers, and nurses (Housing Element, page 1-1. However, multi-family housing like that which would be provided by the project typically is more affordable than single-family homes, and the proposed units would broaden the supply of housing available to City residents who are locally employed.

- C3-5 Project Objective #2. The comment references the project objective to provide moderate cost housing and that the objective references Housing Element Goal 2, which call for providing and protecting housing supply affordable to extremely low, very low, low and moderate income households. The comment notes that the proposed condominiums are market rate units and asserts that there is no indication that this will be an affordable housing project for moderate income families as indicated in Objective 2. The commenter questions the current income level that defines moderate income in Santa Cruz, and whether the applicant agrees to restrict the project to defined moderate income households. Moderate income is defined by state law 80 to 120 percent of the median family income, City staff indicate that the current income range for moderate income households is \$83,500 for two person household, \$93,950 for three person household, and \$104,400 for a four person household³. The applicant has not indicated that units will be restricted. However, as indicated on page 3-4 of the DEIR, the project would be subject to the City’s inclusionary housing requirements at the time of the first condominium sale.

³ California Department of Housing and Community Development. April 2018. “State Income Levels for 2018.” Available online at: <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/income-limits/state-and-federal-income-limits/docs/inc2k18.pdf>

- C3-6 Project Objective #3. The comment challenges the project's reference to providing opportunities with persons of disabilities as set forth in the City's Housing Element. This objective relates to Housing Element Goal 3 which calls for provision of accessible housing for special needs populations, which include persons with disabilities, elderly people, female-headed households, large families, farmworkers, persons in need of emergency housing, and college students and faculty. Four ground floor units in Buildings 1 and 2 are identified as being ADA-accessible; residential projects are not required to be ADA-compliant. Since much of the City's older housing stock may not meet ADA standards, any new residential development that does meet ADA standards would provide additional housing opportunities for persons with disabilities even if the units would not be limited to that population.
- C3-7 Project Objective #4. Objective 4: The comment questions how the project can be claimed as infill housing as stated in the objective. The project site is within City limits surrounded by development, including a variety of residential uses and the Santa Cruz Memorial Park. Those features meet many of the criteria under CEQA for "infill" development (see, e.g., CEQA Guidelines section 151332), even though the City has not applied these definitions strictly to the project because it has not applied the infill categorical exemption to this project. The project is "infill" within City limits regardless that the project site is at the edge of the City.
- C3-8 Project Objective #5. Objective 5: The comment states that there is no transit service in the area and the project is not in the City's core, which the commenter asserts renders the objective meaningless. The project site will be accessible to pedestrians with a new sidewalk connecting to an existing sidewalk that provides access to transit service on Ocean Street, less than one-half mile from the project site. Bicycle lanes are provided on Ocean Street that connect to the multi-use Santa Cruz Riverwalk trails that provides access to the Downtown area. The project site is approximately 1 mile and 5 minutes driving time to the downtown area that provides a range of services. By any objective interpretation of the term, this location is "close to" the City core and services. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3.**
- C3-9 Project Objective #6. Objective 6: The comment states that this objective is not an objective as the items listed are already required and the objective should be deleted. CEQA Guidelines section 15124(b) requires a statement of the objectives sought by the proposed project, and should include the underlying purpose of the project, which is captured in this objective.
- C3-10 Project Alternatives. The comment alleges that the alternative analysis is flawed because of the purportedly flawed project objectives and reiterates their view that the project does not provide affordable housing. However, the comment does not specifically explain how the alleged impropriety of the objectives renders the alternatives analysis flawed. The City disagrees that the project cannot meet its own objectives and disagrees that the

commenters' opinions about the merits of the objectives compel a conclusion that the alternatives analysis is inadequate under CEQA. See Response to Comments C3-4 and C3-5 regarding affordability and compliance with the City's inclusionary housing requirements. The proposed project with unit sizes of approximately 900-1,100 square feet are modestly sized units.

- C3-11 Visual Compatibility. The comment states that the EIR downplays the character and features in the project vicinity in considering the compatibility of the project with scale of the surrounding area. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- C3-12 Effects on Adjacent Historic Structure. The comment states that the DEIR does not "acknowledge" impacts to the adjacent Santa Cruz Cemetery site and that the mausoleum is listed in the Santa Cruz Historic Building Survey and does not address impacts on surrounding uses zoned "Public Facility."

The land use designation of the Santa Cruz Memorial site is "PF – Public Facilities." The Public Facilities zoning district is described in Chapter 24.10, Part 18B, of the Santa Cruz Municipal Code. Public Facilities zoning districts are located through the City adjacent to a variety of other zoning districts, including single-family and multi-family residential. The City's Municipal Code does not identify residential uses, including the proposed project's rezoning to "RL – Multiple Residence Low Rise," as incompatible with or having an impact upon Public Facilities.

The cemetery and mausoleum properties are listed in Volume I of the City's Historic Building Survey (page 114). The survey identifies "Arnold's Funeral & Cremation Services" at 1902 Ocean Street Extension, constructed in 1928, as an Egyptian Revival mausoleum in exceptional condition, constructed by one of California's foremost mausoleum designers, B.J.S. Cahill, and the "Odd Fellows Cemetery Crematory-Mausoleum" at 1927 Ocean Street Extension, constructed circa 1930, as a Mission Revival mausoleum complex in excellent condition. Both descriptions of these buildings in the City's Historic Building Survey provide further details on the architectural characteristics of the buildings as justification for their inclusion in the building survey.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 states that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment, and defines a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired. The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources or identification in a historical resources survey.

The Historic Building Survey selected structures for inclusion in the survey on the basis of three criteria: 1) historical and cultural significance, 2) architectural significance, and 3) neighborhood setting. As described above, “Arnold’s Funeral & Cremation Services” is notable for its architectural features and its architect or builder, and the “Odd Fellows Cemetery Crematory-Mausoleum” is notable for its architectural features. Neither description includes any mention of surrounding land use as an attribute that contributes to the buildings’ historical significance or a significant factor in their preservation. The proposed project would not physically alter the adjacent building, and proposed landscaping along the project’s southern property line would screen the project from the adjacent building. Therefore, the project would not affect the significance of these historical resources.

- C3-13 Conflicts with General Plan Policies. The comment states that the EIR contains an error regarding “landmarks” and that the DEIR statement that the project does not affect public views of City landmarks does not account for the adjacent mausoleum that is in the City’s Historic Building Survey. The comment is in reference to a conclusion on Table 4.7-1 regarding potential project conflicts with General Plan policy CD3.2. See **Land Use Master Response 2**.
- C3-14 Aesthetic Impacts and Photo Simulations. The comment questions the comparison of the project to developments on Ocean Street given the project site location in an area considered more rural in character and questions why there were only two photo simulations of the site and asserts that more are necessary to analyze the project impacts. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- C3-15 Light and Glare. The comment states that the lighting analysis in the DEIR is inadequate and asks for more detailed regarding exterior nighttime lighting plans. See **Aesthetics Master Response 3**.
- C3-16 Traffic. The comment addresses the DEIR impact analysis and mitigation regarding impacts to the Ocean Street/Highway 1 Off-Ramp intersection in the DEIR traffic analysis. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- C3-17 Net Developable Area. The comment indicates that the net developable area of the project parcel is incorrect. The EIR text has been revised to correct the net developable project area as 96,268 square feet instead of 96,503 square feet reported in the DEIR; see Chapter 3, Changes to EIR. However, this does not change the conclusion that under existing designations, nine single-family homes could be built on the property.

- C3-18 Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses. The comment states that the DEIR attempts to downplay the commenter's assertion that the project's land use intensity would be incompatible with surrounding uses and the general character of the area by stating that a potential effect on development patterns is not a potential impact under CEQA, and states that development of a similar intensity on Ocean Street is completely different than Ocean Street Extension. The comment further states that the DEIR must analyze inconsistencies with General Plan policies related to density at the City's fringe and incompatibility with surrounding land uses, citing restrictions on infrastructure, availability of infrastructure, aesthetics, and community compatibility. The comment regarding restrictions on infrastructure is not clear, and the City is not aware of restrictions on infrastructure. **See Land Use Master Response 4. See Land Use Master Responses 2 and 3** regarding conflicts with General Plan policies.
- C3-19 Slope Regulations. The comment states that the EIR fails to analyze inconsistencies of the project with the slope regulations in the Municipal Code. **See Land Use Master Response 2.**
- C3-20 Alternative 1-Aesthetics. The comment states that the DEIR is incorrect in stating that Alternative 1 would result in similar or slightly reduced aesthetics impacts. As discussed on page 5-17 of the DEIR, development under existing designations would result in creation of 10,000-square-foot lots and likely larger single-family homes. Given development patterns in the City, a building footprint for a larger single-family home could be 2,000+ square feet, including garage. The proposed building footprint is 2,000 square feet. A second story could fully or partially cover the first floor. Thus, this was the reasoning for the conclusion that nine single-family homes would result in similar, but slightly reduced (if full second stories are not constructed) impacts than the ten proposed structures under the project. Text has been clarified; see Chapter 3, Changes to Draft EIR.
- C3-21 Heritage Tree Removal. With regards to statements in the Alternatives section of the DEIR, the commenter alleges that the DEIR did not analyze impacts of tree removal, and a tree permit should not have been issued, which the commenter further alleges is segmenting review of project-related actions. Contrary to commenter's allegations, heritage tree removal is analyzed in the Initial Study and was found to be a less-than-significant impact due to consistency with the City's regulations as explained on pages 30-32 in the Initial Study, which is included as Appendix A in the DEIR. Although issuance of a heritage tree permit is a ministerial action in the City and not part of the permit approvals under consideration, the impacts of tree removal were discussed and disclosed in the EIR, and thus no illegal segmenting of the project occurred.
- C3-22 Alternative 1 Hydrology Impacts. The comment indicates that the proposed project with parking would have far more impervious surfacing than the alternative and that the EIR must be revised to compare total impervious surface area. The DEIR does provide a general comparison of impervious surfacing as shown on Table 5-3 on page 5-16 based on

building square as driveway areas will likely be similar to the proposed project, but difficult to determine without site plans. It is agreed that Alternative 1 would have less parking and paved area and the EIR text has been revised; see Chapter 3, Changes to EIR.

- C3-23 Alternatives - Objectives. The comment states that project objectives are flawed, especially with regard to Objective 4 (infill housing) since all alternatives would represent infill. Objective 4 also seeks to make efficient use of the parcel, and Alternatives 2 and 3 with more units would provide greater (i.e., more efficient) infill potential.
- C3-24 Project Objectives. The comment states that the project objectives were “drawn too narrowly” and to cast alternatives as not meeting objectives violates CEQA as viable alternatives become infeasible and that the objectives must be revised. See Response to Comments C3-4 through C3-10.
- C3-25 Project Consistency with General Plan. The comment states that the “City’s attempt to avoid analysis of the project’s consistency with the General Plan runs counter to the City’s undisputable duty to assess the Project’s consistency with the General Plan.” The EIR does review policies relevant to the project for potential conflicts as discussed on pages 4.7-5 to 4.7-6 and summarized in Table 4.7-1. The comment does not identify specific policies that commenter thinks should be disclosed. However, some changes have been made to Table 4.7-1 based on comments and responses in this document.
- C3-26 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures. The comment states that the cumulative analyses for water and traffic violate CEQA because they minimize the cumulative impact of development. The comment also states that the City uses the incorrect standard of significance for traffic by assuming that only three percent increase in trips is significant, and that the EIR fails to identify mitigation measures. The standard for analysis for cumulative impacts is whether the project’s contribution to a significant cumulative impact is cumulatively considerable. The CEQA Guidelines indicate that a project’s funding its fair share of a mitigation measure designed to alleviate the cumulative impact would render the project’s contribution to less than cumulatively considerable, which is applicable to both the water fee and traffic impact fees. With regard to traffic, as discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation and Cumulative Traffic sections. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- C3-27 Recirculation and Notice. The commenter requests that the DEIR be revised and recirculated and that the commenter requests that the City forward a Notice of Determination (NOD) to the commenter if and when the project is approved. See **Master Response 1** regarding recirculation, and request for future is referred to City staff.

LETTER C4 – Santa Cruz County Sheriff's Posse

- C4-1 Road Width. The comment states that the road width with 8.75-foot lanes are too narrow for vehicles with horse trailers. The project proposes widening Ocean Street Extension to 20 feet. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is required. However, the comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.

LETTER C5 – Villa Granada Homeowners Association, Lorenzo Rota

- C5-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project due to traffic concerns. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- C5-2 Traffic. The comment states that the traffic studies are outdated and residents have noted significant traffic deterioration at certain peak times. These comments are related to the traffic analysis in the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

Responses to Comments from Individuals**Letter D1 – Ellen Aldridge**

- D1-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about effects of the project, which are addressed in subsequent specific comments and responses. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments are provided in this document; the request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff. The comment also states support of all comments raised by the Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- D1-2 Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road Intersection Safety. The comment identifies concerns regarding safety at the intersection, road configurations, and pedestrian and bicycle safety as discussed in DEIR Section 4.5, Traffic and Transportation. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments

received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.

LETTER D2 – Yafah Almog

- D2-1 Project Concerns. The comment expresses concerns about the proposed development; specific comments are addressed in subsequent specific comments and responses.
- D2-2 Traffic. The comment identifies concerns regarding traffic and safety without specific references to the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D2-3 Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project would diminish natural beauty and contribute to urban sprawl. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D2-4 Project Opposition about High-Density Housing. The comment expresses opposition to high-density housing at the proposed project location. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no response is necessary. The comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- D2-5 Questions Unrelated to DEIR. The comment poses general questions regarding whether the study will be updated and state of neighborhoods considered. The comment does not specifically address analyses in the DEIR and a specific response cannot be made. However, the comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.

LETTER D3 – Yosi Almog

- D3-1 Project Concerns about High-Density Housing. The comment expresses concern about allowing high-density housing at the proposed project location. See Response to Comment D2-4.
- D3-2 Public Transportation. The comment states that there is no public transportation in area and it is dangerous for bicycle and pedestrian use. The does comment does not specifically address analyses in the DEIR and a specific response cannot be made. However, the comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.

- D3-3 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area. See Aesthetics Master Response 2.
- D3-4 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl. See **Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D3-5 Comment Unrelated to DEIR. The comment states that the project will cause unreasonable load on the egress from Ocean Street Extension to Graham Hill Road. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D3-6 Bike Lanes. The comment states that a bike lane has not been provided contrary to General Plan policies requiring bike improvements. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**. The comment is acknowledged, and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- D3-7 Cumulative Traffic Impacts. The comment states that the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts created by two new projects on Jewell Street. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Cumulative Traffic section, which addressed cumulative projects. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D4 – Teresa Aquino

- D4-1 EIR Concerns. The comment alleges that concerns raised in the scoping letters have been “met with gross omissions, obfuscations and copious ‘alternate facts’.” The subsequent comments focus on traffic as addressed below. Each DEIR section summarized issues and concerns raised in the scoping process and if not addressed in the DEIR, an explanation was provided.
- D4-2 Traffic. The comment includes questions on local streets, traffic conditions, alternative transportation modes, collision history, and emergency access. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the

Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

- D4-3 Effects of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road. The comment questions the effect of tree removal adjacent to Graham Hill Road on slope stability in that area. See **Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- D4-4 Thresholds of Significance. The comment states that it appears that every “Threshold of Significance” has been met or exceeded in the traffic section of the DEIR. See Response to Comment D4-2.

LETTER D5 – Mark and Lori Arsenault

- D5-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project due to concerns about traffic, aesthetics, and urban sprawl. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D6 – Mary Kay and Bruce Ashley

- D6-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter’s requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D6-2 Aesthetics-Views of Project and Building Mass. The comment states that the project size is out of character with the location, and the project would be visible from Graham Hill Road, Pogonip, and Mission Hill. As described in Section 4.1 of the DEIR, views of the project site may be available from various locations, along with other existing development within the City. Pogonip offers long-range, distant views over developed portions of the City of Santa Cruz, including large-scale commercial development in the Harvey West area west of the project site. Similarly, Mission Hill offers views of development within the City. As views overlooking the City from Pogonip and Mission Hill consist of extensive development, views of the project, if available, would not be visually prominent amid other existing development and would not represent a significant change in the City view as discussed on page 4.1-7 of the DEIR. Likewise, existing development is currently visible along both sides of Graham Hill Road. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D6-3 Conflicts with General Plan Policies-Traffic. The commenters believe the project is in direct conflict with the City General Plan and will have numerous unmitigated negative

effects on traffic flow and emergency access. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**. Only one significant unavoidable impact was identified in the PRDEIR; see Chapter 2.

- D6-4 Project Concerns. The comment states that the project conflicts with the City’s “Corridor Zoning” plan and that the project site is an unlikely location for the proposed project type. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, which is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D7 – Greg Baker and Adrienne Harrell

- D7-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter’s requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D7-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- D7-3 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- D7-4 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. See **Aesthetics Master Response 1**.
- D7-5 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. See **Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D7-6 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. This comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was

released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3.**

- D7-7 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D7-8 Traffic. The comment states that the project would exacerbate existing traffic conditions which at times hinder access to the commenter's residence. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D8 – Sharon Beaty

- D8-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D8-2 Effects on Organic Farming Operations. The comment states concern "with aspects of the project that put pressure on farming operations" and states that the travel lanes will be narrowed and would not allow truck and tractor passage and increased traffic will cause back-ups when large farm vehicles are behind other cars in the left-turn lane onto Ocean Street Extension. See **Land Use Master Response 1** regarding potential conflicts with agricultural operations. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including the topic addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

LETTER D9 – Johnathan Blanding

- D9-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project, citing concerns about aesthetics, traffic, and public safety. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D10 – John D. Boyle

- D10-1 Winter 2016-2017 Storms. The comment states that storms during winter 2016-2017 blocked access to the commenter's residence due to traffic and road conditions. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D10-2 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D10-3 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D10-4 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D10-5 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D10-6 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D10-7 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, which included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic

and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3.**

- D10-8 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

LETTER D11 – Erin Bucci

- D11-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D11-2 UCSC. The comment states that UCSC must use its open space to house its students. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D11-3 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D11-4 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D11-5 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D11-6 Impacts on Visual Character of Area and Building Height. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. The comment further states that the buildings will

appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**

- D11-7 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D11-8 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D11-9 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

LETTER D12 – Lisa Burdick

- D12-1 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D12-2 Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project will increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**

- D12-3 Pogonip and San Lorenzo River. The commenter indicates spending time around Ocean Street Extension and wildlife in the area. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the DEIR, and no further response is necessary.
- D12-4 Project Opinion. The comment expresses concerns about effects of the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- D12-5 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

LETTER D13 – Linda Burman-Hall and Timothy H. Shea

- D13-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project or any other proposed project on Ocean Street Extension. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D13-2 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3..**
- D13-3 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. See Aesthetics Master Response 2.
- D13-4 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D13-5 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was

released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

- D13-6 Heritage Trees. The comment states that the commenters have studied the arborist report and concludes that the arborist report does not include adequate protections for six coast live oak trees on site. The comment further states that the commenters assume that the death of any of the coast live oak trees on site might be actionable in court. The comment states that the project arborist must be on site for all grading, excavation, and soil disturbance, and cites specific concerns and opinions regarding the protections for Trees #12, #13, #14, and #15. The commenters' concerns are noted and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. However, the arborist report was prepared by a certified arborist registered with the Western Chapter of the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA); as such, the arborist report's conclusions and recommendations represent a qualified expert opinion.
- D13-7 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel from Santa Cruz to the San Lorenzo River, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D14 – Veronica Cameron

- D14-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project or any other proposed project on Ocean Street Extension. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D14-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- D14-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1**.

- D14-4 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel and that the description of traffic in the area is outdated. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D15 – Frank and Pat Cavalier

- D15-1 Traffic Improvements and Impact Fees. The comment provides recommendations for improvements at the Highway 1/River Street, and Ocean Street/Highway 17 and Highway 1 NB Ramp/Ocean Street Extension intersections and addition of a left-turn lane onto Highway 1. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D16 – Faith Chaffee

- D16-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D16-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D16-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D16-4 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D16-5 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was

released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

- D16-6 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, project trips are underestimated, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are inadequate for public safety. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D17 – Wendy Chapler

- D17-1 Project Concerns. The comment expresses concerns about the impacts of the project, citing concerns about effects on the community including traffic, lack of bike lanes, compatibility with the character of the area, and housing affordability. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D17-2 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

LETTER D18 – Penny and David Chesluk

- D18-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D18-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**

- D18-3 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D18-4 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D18-5 Slope Stability and Drainage Issues. The comment states that the project site has a history of hillside instability and drainage issues and there are no updated geotechnical studies. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2.**
- D18-6 Traffic. The comment states that the travel lanes to turn on to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D18-7 Bike Lanes. The comment states that there have been no bike lanes provided. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D19 – Kate Clark

- D19-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project for reasons cited in the comment; see Response to Comment 19-2 below. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D19-2 Traffic. The comment states that increased traffic will have a significant impact, that the traffic analysis does not account for vicinity cumulative projects and emergency access is a problem. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculate d DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response XX

LETTER D20 – Don Cohen

- D20-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project due to stated inconsistent with the density and character of the neighborhood. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D20-2 Conflicts with Agriculture. The comment states that the project represents a threat to agriculture. See **Land Use Master Response 1**.
- D20-3 Land Use. The comment states that the project violates the City’s Corridor Plan. For a discussion of the project’s consistency with General Plan and Housing Element goals, see **Land Use Master Response 2**.
- D20-4 Traffic. The comment states that the project is removed from public transportation, is dangerously accessible by foot or bicycle, and eliminates cemetery parking, and states that traffic studies are flawed. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D20-5 Community Issues. The comment expresses dissatisfaction with resolution of community issues. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. The comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- D20-6 Traffic. The comment expresses observations of delays at left-turn lanes along Ocean Street and traffic in general. The comment is not related to analyses in the PRDEIR (see Response to Comment D20-4 above).
- D20-7 Request for Response. The comment requests consideration of the comment letter. The commenter’s requests are noted and referred to City staff and decision makers for further consideration.

LETTER D21 – Karen Bilgri Cohen

- D21-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter’s requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

- D21-2 Land Use. The comment states that Ocean Street Extension is distinct from Ocean Street and the project does not meet definitions in the General Plan of new compact housing along urban corridors, and states that the proposed high-density housing is out of character and requires a zoning variance. The comment states that the project is not suited for the site. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, which acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. See **also Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D21-3 Traffic. The comment states that the intersection of Graham Hill Road and Ocean Street Extension lacks sidewalk, bike lane, or normal urban features and is too narrow for existing traffic, the opening of the street to Graham Hill Road is frequently the site of automobile collisions due to vehicle speed, and the project would normally require space for 80 vehicles and the street cannot accommodate parking or traffic generated by the project. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D22 – Christopher Connery

- D22-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project, citing concerns about aesthetics, bicycle access, traffic, and land use; commenter supports high density development in the core of the city. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D23 – Tara Cornelisse

- D23-1 Ohlone Tiger Beetle Monitoring. The comment expresses concerns about the level of monitoring conducted for the Ohlone tiger beetle, stating that the original survey is outdated and further surveys should be conducted as follows: surveys for adult beetles on three sunny and warm days in March and surveys for larval burrows on three to five occasions from June to August, before concluding that the beetles are not present on the project site. See Biological Resources Master Response 1.

LETTER D24 – Lauren Crux

- D24-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices

regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

- D24-2 Traffic. The comment states that the description of traffic in the area is outdated and questions the analysis of cumulative traffic impacts. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D24-3 Affordable Housing. The comment states that Santa Cruz needs more affordable housing, and this project would not provide that. As indicated on page 3-4 of the DEIR, the project is subject to the City's inclusionary housing requirements at the time of first condominium sale.
- D24-4 Transportation. The comment states that there is not adequate transportation services and there is no longer bus service. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D24-5 Project Land Use. The comment indicates support for development under current designations without "spot zoning." The comment expresses an opinion about the project, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no response is necessary. The comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.

LETTER D25 – Jill Damashek

- D25-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D25-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.

- D25-3 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D25-4 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D25-5 Biological Resources. The comment states that the biological resources analysis in the DEIR is inadequate and questions a “no impact” determination. **See Biological Resources Master Response 1.**
- D25-6 Slope Stability and Updated Geotechnical Reports. The comment states that approval of a variance to grade within ten feet of a 30 percent slope without an updated geotechnical study is poor planning. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2.**
- D25-7 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D25-8 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D25-9 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D26 – Becca and Casey Davis

- D26-1 Request for Written Response. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter. The commenter's request is noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document.
- D26-2 Traffic. The comment states that the project trips are underestimated, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the proposed are inadequate for public safety vehicles, and accident history is not accurately reported. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D27 – Janey Davis

- D27-1 Project Opinion. The comment states that the project is not suited for the site. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, which acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D27-2 Traffic. The comment raises concerns about improvement sat the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection, the proposed sidewalk, maintaining emergency access to Paradise Park and that the reported collisions are understated and asks whether problems on Jewell Street are accounted for in the cumulative traffic impacts. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.
- D27-3 Support for Alternative 1. The comment expresses support for Alternative 1, the existing designations on the site. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D28 – Margaret and Allan Dow

- D28-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project, citing traffic concerns. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D29 – Mark Drobac

- D29-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project and states that the commenter feels that the DEIR was partial to the interests of the developer. The commenter makes general comments regarding trees, recharge, aesthetics, traffic, and parking and states that a condo project conflicts with General Plan policies and is sprawl, but the comment does not specifically address analyses in the DEIR and specific responses cannot be made. The comment, which expresses an opinion, is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for further consideration. **See Land Use Master Responses 2 and 3** regarding conflicts with General Plan policies.

LETTER D30 – Nick and Beatrice Drobac

- D30-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project because it is out of scale and character for the single-family residential neighborhood, is not on a main commercial corridor, lacks effective alternative transportation modes, and is unlikely to be affordable. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3** and **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.
- D30-2 Traffic Study. The comment questions the timing and date of the traffic study. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D30-3 Support for Alternative 1. The comment expresses support for Alternative 1, keeping existing designations. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D31 – Patricia Dunlap-Griffin

- D31-1 Project Opposition and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses opposition to increased density on the project site and requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The comment on project site density and request to receive future public notices are referred to City staff.

- D31-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D31-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D31-4 Toxins in Soil. [The comment states that significant impacts of presence of toxins in soil and air, including mercury, from the adjacent crematory have not been adequately evaluated. See Response to Comments C2-C2-15.
- D31-5 Traffic-Related Emissions. The comment states that impacts from vehicle emissions have been underestimated due to the trips generated and proposed improvements won't encourage alternative transportation. See Response to Comment C2-17.
- D31-6 Gully Adjacent to Project Site. The comment states that an adjacent gully that is partially located on the project site should be stabilized due to concerns about erosion from the project site and its effects on water quality of the San Lorenzo River, citing sedimentation from storms during winter 2016-2017. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- D31-7 Effects of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road. The comment expresses concerns from residents in the County regarding the stability of Graham Hill resulting from tree removal. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- D31-8 Stormwater Drainage Impacts. The comment states that the creation of over one acre of impervious surface without sufficient on-site "remediation" creates a significant impact on existing drainage systems and the San Lorenzo River. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D31-9 Bioretention Facilities. The comment states that the project establishes bioretention facilities in a public right-of-way and all remediation should occur on site. As indicated in Response to Comment C2-41, the road bioswale is only for road runoff.
- D31-10 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and San Lorenzo Valley, that additional trips are underestimated, that the description of traffic in the area is outdated, that proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, that the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a

PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Responses 1 and 2**.

- D31-11 General Plan Policies Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 3..**
- D31-12 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes and does not provide a bike lane. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D31-13 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals regarding the City's urban boundaries and placement of new housing and that the General Plan amendment and rezoning would be contrary to goals in the General Plan and would not create affordable housing. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D31-14 Land Use Compatibility and General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project's proposed land use intensity is incompatible with the area and that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 4** regarding land use compatibility and **Land Use Master Response 3** regarding General Plan policies.
- D31-15 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. See Response to Comment D31-12.
- D31-16 Slope Stability and Updated Geotechnical Report. The comment states that approval of a variance to grade within ten feet of a 30 percent slope without an updated geotechnical study is poor planning. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2.**
- D31-17 Land Use. The comment states that the City's previously approved land use for the project site was a cemetery expansion in 1969 and notes that the proposed project would be very different from a cemetery use. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

D31-18 Biological Resources. The comment states that the biological resources analysis in the DEIR is inadequate and questions a “no impact” determination. See **Biological Resources Master Response 1**.

LETTER D32 – Eve Eden

D32-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter’s requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

D32-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.

D32-3 Traffic. The comment states that the project will negatively affect travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the traffic reports are outdated, the proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D33 – Jeremy Elster

D33-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter’s requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

D33-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.

- D33-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D33-4 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and production of new housing along major commercial corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D33-5 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes and does not incorporate bike lanes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D33-6 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D34 – Daniel Facciola

- D34-1 Project Opposition. The comment requests that the City Council reconsider the proposed project. As described in Chapter 1, this Final EIR document, which includes the DEIR document, will be presented to the City Planning Commission for consideration of the proposed actions and recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make the final decision on the proposed General Plan amendment, rezoning, and permit applications. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D34-2 Traffic. The comment states that existing traffic congestion in the project area is substantial and has diminished quality of life, and the project is not a good idea. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

- D34-3 Fire Risk. The comment states that there is extreme fire danger in the project area. The comment is correct that project site is located within a high fire hazard area, as shown on maps developed for the City's General Plan. See page 39 of the Initial Study (Appendix A of the DEIR) for a discussion of exposure to wildland fire hazards, which was determined to be less than significant.

LETTER D35 – Heidi Fisher

- D35-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D35-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D35-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D35-4 Severe Storms. The comment asks whether the drainage and geotechnical reports account for unpredictable weather and that project does not appear designed for the 50-year storm. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D35-5 Erosion. The comment states that erosion from the site and that sediment was washed down the gully during storms in 2016-2017. Comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2** regarding erosion and water quality issues.
- D35-6 Effects of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road. The comment questions the effect of tree removal adjacent to Graham Hill Road on slope stability in that area. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- D35-7 Stormwater Drainage Impacts. The comment states that the creation of over one acre of impervious surface without sufficient on-site "remediation" creates a significant impact on existing drainage systems and the San Lorenzo River. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**

- D35-8 Bioretention Facilities. The comment states that the project establishes bioretention facilities in a public right-of-way and all remediation should occur on site. As indicated in Response to Comment C2-41, the road bioswale is only for road runoff.
- D35-9 Bike Priorities. The commenter states that his family bikes from Ocean Street Extension to the river trail and asks what steps are being taken to make biking a priority for Ocean Street Extension to Santa Cruz. The comment poses general questions regarding City bike priorities, but does not specifically address analyses in the DEIR and a specific response cannot be made. However, the comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- D35-10 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel between Santa Cruz and San Lorenzo Valley, trips are underestimated, the proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, and the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D35-11 Impacts to Agricultural Operations. The commenter supports local farming and questions the DEIR's conclusion regarding no significant impact to agriculture would occur given the difficulty of large trucks/farm equipment on a narrower drive. See **Land Use Master Response 1** and **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.
- D35-12 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. See **Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D35-13 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D35-14 Incompatible Land Uses and Rejection of Project. The comment cites a threshold of significance from the DEIR which states, "Introduce new land uses or alter the intensity of land uses, which could be considered incompatible with the surrounding land uses or with the general character of the area," and state this should guide rejection of the proposed project. As described in Section 4.7 of the DEIR, potential impacts under CEQA are limited

to physical impacts on the environment; however, land use issues will be further addressed in the City staff report/review of the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D36 – Joseph Fisher

- D36-1 Project Opposition. The comment states that the community should not squander the opportunity to do something meaningful and special at the project site. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D36-2 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D36-3 Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the existing neighborhood should be protected from high-density urban sprawl. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D36-4 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D36-5 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D36-6 Project Suggestions. The comment provides suggestions for a project design that the commenter would prefer to make it "green". The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- D36-7 Severe Storms. The comment asks whether the drainage and geotechnical reports account for unpredictable weather and that project does not appear designed for the 50-year storm. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D36-8 Erosion. The comment states that erosion from the site and that sediment was washed down the gully during storms in 2016-2017. Comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2** regarding erosion and water quality issues.

- D36-9 Effects of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road. The comment questions the effect of tree removal adjacent to Graham Hill Road on slope stability in that area. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2**. The comment also asks whether the County has commented on this potential threat and whether PG&E has evaluated risks to its gas line. See Comment A1-1 from the County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department, and evaluations by PG&E are unknown.
- D36-10 Slope Stability. The comment states that no stability analysis appears to have been completed and project would be safer if steep slopes were avoided. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2**.
- D36-11 Seismic Hazards. The comment references the impact regarding project exposure to seismic hazards and that the project should not proceed without more extensive geotechnical testing. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2**.
- D36-12 Stormwater Drainage Impacts. The comment states that the creation of over one acre of impervious surface without sufficient on-site “remediation” creates a significant impact on existing drainage systems and the San Lorenzo River. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1**.
- D36-13 Bioretention Facilities. The comment states that the project establishes bioretention facilities in a public right-of-way and all remediation should occur on site. As indicated in Response to Comment C2-41, the road bioswale is only for road runoff.
- D36-14 Traffic. The comment states that the project will make biking more dangerous due to increased traffic and inadequate intersection design, the project will result in a significant increase in bike traffic, asks what steps are being taken to make biking a priority from Ocean Street Extension to Santa Cruz, states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, proposed roadway and intersection improvements are inadequate for emergency access and will increase the potential for vehicular accidents, and accident data is inaccurate. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D36-15 Agriculture. The commenter supports local farming and questions the DEIR’s conclusion regarding no significant impact to agriculture would occur given the difficulty of large

trucks/farm equipment on a narrower drive. See **Land Use Master Response 1** and **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.

- D36-16 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. See **Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D36-17 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes and does not incorporate bike lanes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.
- D36-18 Incompatible Land Uses and Rejection of Project. The comment cites a threshold of significance from the DEIR which states, "Introduce new land uses or alter the intensity of land uses, which could be considered incompatible with the surrounding land uses or with the general character of the area," as a basis for rejecting the proposed project. See Response to Comment D35-14.

LETTER D37 – Anthony Fleming

- D37-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project, citing existing damage to the roadway from flooding. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D37-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. See Aesthetics Master Response 2.
- D37-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. See **Aesthetics Master Response 1**.
- D37-4 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. See **Land Use Master Response 3**.

- D37-5 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3.**
- D37-6 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D37-7 Paradise Park. The comment states that the project would exacerbate traffic challenges for Paradise Park residents and that street improvements should occur before new development in the neighborhood. The comment also states that Paradise Park manages its own roads and infrastructure. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. It is also noted that the project access does not utilize roads in the Paradise Park area.

LETTER D38 – Carla Freccero

- D38-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D38-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area. See Aesthetics Master Response 2.
- D38-3 Project Design and Materials. The comment states that the project design is repetitive and uses cheap construction and finishing materials. The project would be subject to a Design Permit from the City, as described in Chapter 3 of the DEIR. The comment is

acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

- D38-4 Photo Simulations. The comment states that the photo simulations prepared for the project are inaccurate and requests additional photo simulations, including vantage points from Graham Hill Road. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D38-5 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D38-6 Traffic. The comment states that the proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic, the project is not served by alternative transportation modes and does not incorporate bike lanes, the proposed intersection improvements are unsafe, the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and the accident data at the intersection of Ocean Street Extension and Graham Hill Road used in the DEIR is inaccurate. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

LETTER D39 – Andrew Gaines

- D39-1 Access. The comment expresses concern that the project would make accessing Ocean Street Extension more perilous and requests a plan to allow for a route that will ensure safe passage into and out of the community. The comment expresses concern regarding Ocean Street Extension, which acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D40 – Cindy Grall

- D40-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D40-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the

buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**

- D40-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D40-4 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D40-5 Project Design and Materials. The comment states that the project design is repetitive and uses cheap construction and finishing materials. The project would be subject to a Design Permit from the City, as described in Chapter 3 of the DEIR. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D40-6 Photo Simulations. The comment states that the photo simulations prepared for the project are inaccurate and requests additional photo simulations, including vantage points from Graham Hill Road. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D40-7 Land Use. The comment states that the proposed rezoning of the project site from single-family to multifamily use is inconsistent with the adjacent public use as a memorial park. As shown on the City of Santa Cruz Zoning Districts Map, multifamily uses (zoned RM – Multiple Residence Medium Rise) are already located adjacent to the memorial park. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D40-8 Mercury and Toxins in Soils and Air. The comment states that the adjacent crematory releases mercury and other toxins, the presence of which in soils and air has not been adequately evaluated. See Response to Comment C2-15 regarding testing of soils for mercury. Mercury as a toxic air contaminant is evaluated and discussed on pages 4.2-9 through 4.2-11.
- D40-9 Vehicle Emissions. The comment states that impacts from vehicle emissions are underestimated and there will be significant impacts, and infrastructure improvements are insufficient to encourage alternative modes of transportation to offset impacts. Emissions from traffic generated by the project are analyzed on pages 4.2-20 through 4.2-22 of the DEIR; impacts were determined to be less than significant. The commenter has not provided evidence to support the assertion that impacts from vehicle emissions would be significant.

- D40-10 Gully Adjacent to Project Site. The comment states that an adjacent gully that is partially located on the project site should be stabilized due to concerns about erosion from the project site and its effects on water quality of the San Lorenzo River, citing sedimentation from storms during winter 2016-2017. See Response to Comment D31-6 and **Geology and Soils Master Response 2** and **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2**.
- D40-11 Effects of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road. The comment asks if tree removal will affect the stability of Graham Hill Road. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2**. The comment also asks whether the County has commented on this potential threat and whether PG&E has evaluated risks to its gas line. See Comment A1-1 from the County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department, and evaluations by PG&E are unknown.
- D40-12 Stormwater Drainage Impacts. The comment states that the creation of over one acre of impervious surface without sufficient on-site “remediation” creates a significant impact on existing drainage systems and the San Lorenzo River. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1**.
- D40-13 Bioretention Facilities. The comment states that the project establishes bioretention facilities in a public right-of-way and all remediation should occur on site. As indicated in Response to Comment C2-41, the road bioswale is only for road runoff.
- D40-14 Traffic. The comment states that the proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic, the project does not incorporate bike lanes, the proposed intersection improvements are unsafe, calculated delays are underestimated, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and the accident data at the intersection of Ocean Street Extension and Graham Hill Road used in the DEIR is inaccurate. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D40-15 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D40-16 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City’s General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated

DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

D40-17 Slope Stability and Updated Geotechnical Report. The comment states that approval of a variance to grade within ten feet of a 30 percent slope without an updated geotechnical study is poor planning. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2.**

D40-18 Land Use. The comment states that the City’s previously approved land use for the project site was a cemetery expansion in 1969 and notes that the proposed project would be very different from a cemetery use. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

D40-19 Biological Resources. The comment states that the biological resources analysis in the DEIR is inadequate and questions a “no impact” determination. **See Master Response 3.**

LETTER D41 – Mike Grall

D41-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter’s requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

D41-2 Alternatives. The comment quotes a statement on page 1-1 of the DEIR that states, “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which would substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts of a project,” and states that retaining the existing site zoning is a feasible alternative which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

D41-3 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**

D41-4 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**

- D41-5 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, proposed roadway improvements are inadequate for emergency access and would further increase the potential for vehicular accidents, and the DEIR does not contain accurate accident data. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D41-6 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. The comment also states that the General Plan includes policies to promote alternative transportation modes and the project would not be served by alternative transportation modes nor would it incorporate bike lanes. **See Land Use Master Response 3** and **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.

LETTER D42 – Jacquelyn Griffith

- D42-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D42-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- D42-3 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- D42-4 Project Design and Materials. The comment states that the project design is repetitive and uses cheap construction and finishing materials. The project would be subject to a Design Permit from the City, as described in Chapter 3 of the DEIR. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

- D42-5 Photo Simulations. The comment states that the photo simulations prepared for the project are inaccurate and requests additional photo simulations, including vantage points from Graham Hill Road. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D42-6 Land Use. The comment states that the proposed rezoning of the project site from single-family to multi-family use is inconsistent with the adjacent public use as a memorial park. As shown on the City of Santa Cruz Zoning Districts Map, multi-family uses (zoned RM – Multiple Residence Medium Rise) are already located adjacent to the memorial park. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D42-7 Mercury and Toxins in Soils and Air. The comment states that the adjacent crematory releases mercury and other toxins, the presence of which in soils and air has not been adequately evaluated. See Response to Comment C2-15 regarding testing of soils for mercury. Mercury as a toxic air contaminant is evaluated and discussed on pages 4.2-9 through 4.2-11.
- D42-8 Vehicle Emissions. The comment states that impacts from vehicle emissions are underestimated and there will be significant impacts, and infrastructure improvements are insufficient to encourage alternative modes of transportation to offset impacts. Emissions from traffic generated by the project are analyzed on pages 4.2-20 through 4.2-22 of the DEIR; impacts were determined to be less than significant. The commenter has not provided evidence to support the assertion that impacts from vehicle emissions would be significant.
- D42-9 Stormwater Drainage Impacts. The comment states that the creation of over one acre of impervious surface without sufficient on-site “remediation” creates a significant impact on existing drainage systems and the San Lorenzo River. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D42-10 Bioretention Facilities. The comment states that the project establishes bioretention facilities in a public right-of-way and all remediation should occur on site. As indicated in Response to Comment C2-41, the road bioswale is only for road runoff.
- D42-11 Traffic. The comment states that the proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic, the project does not incorporate bike lanes, the project site does not receive regular bus service, the proposed intersection improvements are unsafe, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, the accident data at the intersection of Ocean Street Extension and Graham Hill Road used in the DEIR is inaccurate, the intersection redesign creates safety concerns, and the project would exacerbate existing traffic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a

PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

- D42-12 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D42-13 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes and will increase fossil fuel based trips. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.
- D42-14 Land Use and Housing Affordability. The comment states that the proposed General Plan amendment and rezoning would be contrary to goals in the General Plan regarding the location and intensity of future housing development and would not create affordable housing. See **Land Use Master Response 1**. As indicated on page 3-4 of the DEIR, the project is subject to the City's inclusionary housing requirements at the time of first condominium sale..
- D42-15 Land Use Compatibility. The comment states that the project would introduce a new intensity of land uses which is incompatible with the surrounding area. **See Land Use Master Response 4**.
- D42-16 Slope Stability and Updated Geotechnical Report. The comment states that approval of a variance to grade within ten feet of a 30 percent slope without an updated geotechnical study is poor planning and that the vicinity along Graham Hill Road has a history of hillside instability and drainage issues. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2** and **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2**.
- D42-17 Biological Resources. The comment states that the biological resources analysis in the DEIR is inadequate and questions a "no impact" determination. See **Master Response 3**.

LETTER D43 – Allen Hasty

- D43-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D43-2 Development along Corridors. The comment states that the project conflicts with a City of Santa Cruz Planning Department brochure from March 2017 regarding development along the City's main transportation thoroughfares and City of Santa Cruz General Plan goals regarding the City's urban boundaries and placement of new housing. The comment states that the DEIR does not address these inconsistencies. The reference to the development along the corridors is related to a Corridor Study previously undertaken by the City to look at mixed-use rezoning along the City's major transportation corridors to be consistent with the designation of the City's General Plan 2030. See **Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D43-3 Land Use and Housing Affordability. The comment states that the proposed project would be contrary to goals in the General Plan regarding the location and intensity of future housing development and would not create affordable housing. See **Land Use Master Response 3**. As indicated on page 3-4 of the DEIR, the project is subject to the City's inclusionary housing requirements at the time of first condominium sale.
- D43-4 Land Use Compatibility. The comment states that the project would introduce a new intensity of land uses incompatible with the surrounding area and would erode a natural greenbelt area at the City's edge, affecting residential, commercial, and agricultural land uses immediately adjacent to the project site. The project site is currently zoned for residential use, not open space and is not part of the City's greenbelt. See **Land Use Master Response 4**.
- D43-5 Project Size and Scale. The comment states that the project is not of similar size and scale to any existing multi-family developments on Ocean Street south of the project site and that there are no three-story buildings in any of the developments along Ocean Street. As described in Section 4.1 of the DEIR, the proposed project would include development of 10 two-story residential buildings, and the proposed building heights are within the allowable heights for the existing R-1 zone district as well as the proposed RL zone district. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2** for further discussion.
- D43-6 Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project would increase urban sprawl. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

- D43-7 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.
- D43-8 Environmental Constraints. The comment states that the project site has environmental constraints such as impacts from the adjacent crematory and asks why the Planning Department would consider rezoning the site to allow increased development density on the site. As discussed in Section 4.2 of the DEIR, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations due to emissions from the adjacent crematory. See Section 4.2 of the DEIR for further details. The City Council will make the final decision on the proposed General Plan amendment, rezoning, and permit applications.
- D43-9 Slope Stability. The comment states that a variance of the Municipal Code to grade within 10 feet of a 30-percent slope without updated geotechnical studies is "poor planning" and that there is a history of hillside instability and drainage issues. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2**.
- D43-10 Landslides. The comment states that Graham Hill Road was closed due to landslides approximately 1,000 feet north of the project site and that while there may be no historic landslides on the project site, there are stability issues on slopes above the site. The comment asks that an updated soils and geological study be performed to comply with CEQA EIR guidelines. The State CEQA Guidelines do not require preparation of geotechnical or geological studies. However, a final geotechnical investigation will be prepared as required by City Building Code and California Building Code. **See Geology & Soils Master Response 1** regarding updating geotechnical reports and **see Geology and Soils Master Response 2**.
- D43-11 Slope Stability and Retaining Walls. The comment raises concerns about slope stability analyses and retaining walls. **See Geology & Soils Master Response 2**.
- D43-12 Seismic Hazards. The comment references the impact regarding project exposure to seismic hazards and that the project should not proceed without more extensive geotechnical testing. **See Geology and Soils Master Responses 1 and 2**.

- D43-13 Severe Storms. The comment asks whether the drainage and geotechnical reports account for unpredictable weather and that project does not appear designed for the 50-year storm. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D43-14 Affordable Housing. The comment states that the project would be inconsistent with the City's affordable housing goals in the Housing Element and requests elaboration on how the project will meet the City's affordable housing goals. As described in Chapter 3 of the DEIR, one of the project's objectives is "To provide 40 affordable-by-design, moderate cost housing opportunities per the Housing Element, Goal 2." The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D43-15 Neighborhood Vitality. The comment references the City's Housing Element and that the higher density project will affect the vitality and stability of the current neighborhood in regards to traffic, noise, emergency access, and parking. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D43-16 Traffic. The comment states that the project will eliminate bike lanes and off-street parking and that increased traffic could impede emergency access. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D43-17 Land Use. The comment states that the City's last approved land use for the project site was a cemetery expansion in 1969 and asks when the zoning was last changed. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and is referred to City staff and decision makers for further consideration.
- D43-18 Emergency Access. The comment asks how the DEIR reconciles potential impeded emergency access due to increased traffic. See Response to Comment D43-16.
- D43-19 Stormwater Bioretention Swale Details. The comment asks for elevations and sections for the drainage swale adjacent to the road. Construction details will be completed at the building permit stage. Curb cuts are currently shown to allow drainage to enter the bioretention facility, and a City standard curb and gutter will separate vehicles and cyclists from the bioretention area. The edge of the swale is shown at the same elevation as the gutter pan, so there is no immediate drop-off from the edge of street to the biplanter. Pedestrians will be separated by a six-inch drop from the walk to the swale, similar to a standard six-inch curb drop-off, which is a recognized method for providing a detectable warning for pedestrians.

LETTER D44 – Tessa Hope Hasty

- D44-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D44-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. See Aesthetics Master Response 2.
- D44-3 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D44-4 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. See Aesthetics Master Response 1.
- D44-5 Conflicts with General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D44-6 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D44-7 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the

DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D45 – Deborah Hayes

- D45-1 Request for Project Denial. The comment requests that the proposed rezoning be denied. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D45-2 Project Concerns. The comment states that the proposed development is out of character with the neighborhood, is not part of the corridor plan, and is not pedestrian-friendly; concerns regarding drainage are also stated. The commenter believes that General Plan and zoning should not be changed. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D46 – William Healey

- D46-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D46-2 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D46-3 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D46-4 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis in the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and

Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D47 – Brant Herrett

- D47-1 Traffic. The comment states identifies concerns with the DEIR traffic analysis and states that there has been a substantial increase in traffic since the traffic report was prepared, that the EIR does not take cumulative traffic into account or address morning commute times or affect midday traffic congestion (between 12-1 PM), the Graham Hill corridor has congestion problems, the DEIR does not treat discrete intersections as part of the traffic and circulation system, and questions the conclusions in the DEIR. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D47-2 Traffic Congestion. The comment describes the commenter’s personal experience with traffic congestion. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D47-3 Emergency Response Time. The comment states that the EIR excludes analysis of the impact of traffic on emergency response time and asks what the emergency response time to the project site would be. Emergency access was addressed in the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D47-4 Land Use. The comment states that the rezoning goes against the City’s General Plan and suggests that the Westside neighborhood is better suited for higher density housing. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D48 – Matt Hill

- D48-1 Request for Written Response. The comment expresses concerns about the project’s impacts and requests a written response to the comment letter. The commenter’s request is noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document.

- D48-2 Open Space. The comment states that the City should preserve small parcels of open space such as the project site. While the project site is currently undeveloped, it is not designated as open space in the City's General Plan or Zoning Code. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D48-3 Bike Lanes. The comment states that the project would eliminate the bike lane at the intersection of Ocean Street Extension and Graham Hill Road due to widening of the left turn lane. The project would not involve removal of the bike lanes at the intersection of Ocean Street Extension and Graham Hill Road. The bike lanes on Ocean Street immediately south of the intersection with Graham Hill Road and Ocean Street Extension would remain. See DEIR Section 3.4.3 for a description of the project's proposed roadway and transportation improvements.
- D48-4 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D48-5 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D48-6 Traffic. The comment states that proposed intersection improvements are inadequate, existing traffic data in the DEIR is outdated, and the area is insufficient to accommodate project-generated traffic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D48-7 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D48-8 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the proposed high-density housing does not promote alternative transportation modes and there is no provision for a bike lane. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master**

Response 1. It is also noted that the proposed project is not a high density development under City definitions.

LETTER D49 – John R. Hodge

- D49-1 Traffic. The comment describes the commenter’s experience with increased traffic congestion over time on Graham Hill Road, expresses concerns about traffic associated with the 40 dwelling units proposed, and expresses support for single-family housing on the project site. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D50 – Sue Holt

- D50-1 Traffic. The comment states that the DEIR does not address congestion and accidents at the intersection in front of Denny’s, the northbound Highway 1 onramp, and further up Graham Hill Road, and the project will worsen traffic problems. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D51 – Bonita John

- D51-1 Project Concerns. The comment expresses concerns about the proposed development and concerns about traffic, aesthetics, blockage of views of Pogonip and Holy Cross church. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. However, further discussion of aesthetics and traffic is provided in the Master Responses.
- D51-2 Noticing. The comment expresses dissatisfaction with the City’s noticing of and communication regarding the proposed development, stating that she was unable to read the notice posted at the project site due to topography, and asks why a notice has not been posted at eye level if this is required by law. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15087, notice shall be mailed to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who have previously requested such notice, as well as at least one of the following procedures: (1) publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the project area, (2) posting on and off the site in the project area, or (3) direct mailing to owners and occupants of property contiguous to the parcel on which the proposed project is located. A legal notice was published in the Santa Cruz Sentinel on May 17, 2017 to announce

release and availability of the DEIR for public review. Notice was given to all organizations and persons who submitted comments during the scoping period or requested notification. In accordance with City procedures, all property owners within 300 feet of the project site received notice, and a notice was posted at the site.

LETTER D52 – Audrey J. Johnson

- D52-1 Existing Traffic. The comment states that traffic conditions have worsened over the years near Tanner Heights Drive. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D52-2 Fire Hazards. The comment states that fires from adjacent properties and limited access for the fire department have caused hazardous conditions near Tanner Heights Drive. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D52-3 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

LETTER D53 – Josyane Kelly

- D53-1 Concern about Project. The comment expresses general concern about the project's environmental impacts and concerns about traffic and the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection. the comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D54 – Zeka Kuspa

- D54-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D54-2 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. See Aesthetics Master Response 1.

- D54-3 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**

LETTER D55 – Mitchell Lachman

- D55-1 Comments Unrelated to DEIR. The comment describes opinions on planning and suggests that the project reflect the character of Santa Cruz. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D56 – Laurie Lallemand

- D56-1 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

LETTER D57 – Jeff Larkey

- D57-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D57-2 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the proposed General Plan and Zoning Map amendments. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D57-3 Agriculture. The commenter has organically farmed on Ocean Street Extension for 30+ years and questions the DEIR's conclusion regarding no significant impact to agriculture

would occur given the difficulty of large trucks/farm equipment on a narrower drive. See **Land Use Master Response 1** and **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.

- D57-4 Road Standards. The comment states that roadway is too narrow for 8-foot wide farm trucks. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.
- D57-5 City Housing Goals and Traffic Impacts. The comment states that the commenter is concerned that the project is not in keeping with the City of Santa Cruz housing goals and other traffic impacts. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D57-6 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. See **Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D57-7 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes and does not incorporate bike lanes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.
- D57-8 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, that the additional trips are underestimated, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, the proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic, and concerns on emergency access. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D58 – Brij Lunine

- D58-1 Project Opposition and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, support for the development of affordable housing, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D58-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D58-3 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D58-4 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D58-5 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D58-6 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D58-7 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean

Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D59 – Paula Mahoney

- D59-1 Traffic. The comment expresses concern about project-generated traffic and states that the roadways are already stretched beyond capacity and create safety concerns. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- D59-2 General Plan Policies. The comment states that the proposed buildings are too massive for the site, out of character with the area, and conflict with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. See also **Aesthetics Master Response 2** and **Land Use Master Response 1**.
- D59-3 Project Scale. The comment expresses concern about the project on the quality of life of the commenter's family and asks the City to reconsider the scope and scale. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D59-4 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

LETTER D60 – Julie Thayer Mascarenhas

- D60-1 Project Opposition and Project Concerns. The comment expresses opposition to the project and supports the existing General Plan designation and zone district. The comment also expresses concern regarding bicycle safety with additional traffic, alteration of the visual character of the area, stormwater drainage and geology/soil risks. The comment regarding project opposition is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary. The comment also requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed

project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

- D60-2 Hydrology and Geotechnical Reports. The commenter states concerns about the hydrology and geotechnical reports. Responses to specific comments are provided below.
- D60-3 Stormwater Drainage. The comment states that the drainage analysis should include 50-year and 100-year storm events given multiple climate change predictions. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D60-4 Offsite Runoff and Sedimentation. The comment reports observations of runoff and sediments along Ocean Street Extension. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D60-5 Existing Drainage Facilities. The comment cites a statement in the DEIR that the condition of existing storm drain facilities are marginal and states that the existing storm drains and drainage ditches are less than marginal. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is required.
- D60-6 Stormwater Impacts. The commenter disagrees with the DEIR conclusion that stormwater impacts would be less than significant, and claims that the calculations used for the stormwater plan are not in the document and appear to have been underestimated. The comment also claims that the project appears to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site and that downstream drainage facility capacity should be demonstrated with addition of the project. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D60-7 Stormwater Metering. The comment raises concerns with downstream flooding and claims that the road bioswale handles the project drainage. The road bioswale is only for the roadway area. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D60-8 Project Retention/Detention Facilities. The comment states that the drainage plan relies on high-improvements and without maintenance, and failures could be catastrophic for downstream properties. The comment also questions use of retention where infiltration is low, and functioning of the bioswale in the street with existing utility lines. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1** regarding drainage comments and Response to Comment C2-49 regarding bioswale location.
- D60-9 Runoff from Graham Hill Road. The comment states that the asphalt curb along Graham Hill Road extends about halfway along the upper edge of the project property and that there have been numerous slides along Graham Hill Road. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1** regarding drainage and **Geology and Soils Master Response 1** regarding landslides.

- D60-10 Effects of Tree Removal on Slope Stability Adjacent to Graham Hill Road. The comment asks if tree removal will affect the stability of Graham Hill Road. See **Geology and Soils Master Response 2**.
- D60-11 Sedimentation and Adjacent Gully Erosion. The comment states that sedimentation does not appear to be adequately addressed in the DEIR and states that the project should be responsible for stabilizing the adjacent gully to prevent further erosion. See **Geology and Soils Master Response 2** and **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1**.
- D60-12 Stormwater Drainage. The commenter states that there were multiple times during the winter of 2016-17 that the runoff and sedimentation in the downtown gully at Crossing street caused the gully to reach capacity and flooded the commenter's yard and that additional uncontrolled runoff will amplify sedimentation. See **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Responses 1 and 2** regarding the proposed project stormwater management system and sedimentation.
- D60-13 Gully Drainage. The comment questions effects of sedimentation from runoff on aquatic species in the San Lorenzo River and on the City's water intake in the river. The comment also questions effectiveness of the rock dissipater. See **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2** regarding erosion and sedimentation, **Biological Resources Master Response 1** regarding aquatic species, and **Geology and Soils Master Response 2** regarding gully adjacent to the project site.
- D60-14 Stormwater Drainage. The comment states that model data does not approach the "real conditions observed" at the site and downslope in the winter of 2016-17 and should be improved to reflect real conditions. The project is designed to meet the requirements of the City of Santa Cruz Storm Water Best Management Practices for Private and Public Development Projects, revised March 2014, with additional detention requirements placed to account for the known downstream drainage facility issues. See **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1** regarding existing downstream drainage facility related comments.
- D60-15 Traffic. The comment disagrees that the project would not cause existing or planned intersections to operate an unacceptable LOS and DEIR conclusions regarding transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Responses 1 and 3**.

- D60-16 Tree Removal. The comment states that the eucalyptus trees proposed for removal are indeed prominent, contrary to what was stated in the DEIR, and located on the gateway from the upper San Lorenzo Valley down to Santa Cruz. See **Aesthetics Master Response 1** regarding scenic views from Graham Hill Road. As described in Section 4.1.2 of the DEIR, Graham Hill Road is heavily vegetated adjacent to the project site and to the north; given this, the eucalyptus trees on the project site, which are not unusual specimens of eucalyptus trees, are not visually prominent as stated in the DEIR.
- D60-17 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that the proposed project is siting, height, scale and mass are substantially out of character with the surrounding area and will significantly alter and degrade the area, particularly views from the Memorial Park. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- D60-18 Light and Glare. The comment disagrees with the conclusion in the DEIR regarding light and glare. See **Aesthetics Master Response 3**.
- D60-19 Biological Resources. The comment states that the biological resources analysis in the DEIR is inadequate. See **Biological Resources Master Response 1**.

LETTER D61 – Leonardo Mascarenhas

- D61-1 Project Concerns. The comment generally expresses concerns about the impacts of the proposed project, including drainage and flooding, and disagrees that there would be no significant traffic impact regarding bicycle safety, alteration of the visual character of the area, stormwater drainage and geology/soil risks. The comment also requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D61-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area. See Aesthetics Master Response 2.
- D61-3 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- D61-4 Crematory Air Quality and Soil Impacts. The comment states that the DEIR ignores potential health impacts to workers and future residents due to emissions from the adjacent crematory. See Response to Comment C2-16.

- D61-5 Traffic-Related Emissions. The comment states that impacts from vehicle emissions have been underestimated due to the trips generated, and increased vehicle emissions would have a significant impact since traffic mitigations are not planned to be implemented. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2** regarding trip generation rates.
- D61-6 Drainage Impacts. The comment states that the creation of over one acre of impervious surface without sufficient on-site “remediation” creates a significant impact on existing drainage systems and the San Lorenzo River. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1**.
- D61-7 Bioretention Facilities. The comment states that the project establishes bioretention facilities in a public right-of-way and all remediation should occur on site. As indicated in Response to Comment C2-41, the road bioswale is only for road runoff.
- D61-8 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D61-9 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D61-10 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City’s General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes and does not incorporate bike lanes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

LETTER D62 – Karen and Frank McKillop

- D62-1 Traffic. The comment states that the commenters have observed traffic increases over the last 30 years, Ocean Street Extension is narrow and it would be difficult and dangerous to stop at the intersection of Ocean Street Extension and Graham Hill Road if a stoplight were to be installed, and expresses concerns about project-generated traffic. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D63 – Robert A. Morgan

- D63-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D63-2 Land Use Compatibility. The comment cites a threshold of significance from the DEIR which states, “Introduce new land uses or alter the intensity of land uses, which could be considered incompatible with the surrounding land uses or with the general character of the area,” as a basis for rejecting the proposed project. **See Land Use Master Response 4.**
- D63-3 Project Opposition. The comment states that the project “is unacceptable” and asks that the City reject the proposal or limit the density to something compatible with the neighborhood. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D64 – Myla Morris

- D64-1 Opposition to Project. The comment expresses opposition to the project due to increases in traffic. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- D64-2 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that the project would destroy the rustic character of the area adjacent to the Santa Cruz Memorial Park. The comment expresses an opinion about the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- D64-3 Opposition to Rezoning. The comment states that the project would not provide affordable housing and expresses opposition to rezoning the proposed project site. The

comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D65 – Michelle Morton

- D65-1 Project Opposition and Support for Affordable Housing. The comment expresses opposition to the project and support for affordable housing. As described in the City's Housing Element, AMBAG's RHNA for the City of Santa Cruz is 747 total units for the period from 2015-2023. The RHNA is broken out by income category as follows: 180 units for very low (0-50 percent of area median income [AMI]), 118 low (51-80 percent of AMI), 136 moderate (81-120 percent of AMI), and 313 above moderate (over 120 percent of AMI). The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D65-2 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D65-3 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. The comment also states that there is only one point of ingress and egress for Ocean Street Extension residents and doubling the traffic on the street will make basic travel difficult. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- D65-4 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3**.
- D65-5 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the

project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

- D65-6 Groundwater and Drainage Impacts. The comment states that impact on groundwater and drainage in an area that frequently experiences flooding has not been sufficiently addressed. The comment does not provide specific comments on alleged deficiencies, and a specific response cannot be provided. However, impacts related to drainage and groundwater were evaluated in the DEIR. See also **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1**.
- D65-7 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the hillside setting will amplify the height of the structures. See Aesthetics Master Response 2.
- D65-8 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. See **Aesthetics Master Response 2**.
- D65-9 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. See **Aesthetics Master Response 1**.

LETTER D66 – Karsten Mueller

- D66-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D66-2 Land Use Designation. The commenter states that a cemetery would be a more appropriate use of the site. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D66-3 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the

buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**

- D66-4 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D66-5 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D66-6 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D66-7 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

LETTER D67 – Joe Netro

- D67-1 Water Supply. The comment states that water supply should be the chief concern regarding the proposed project and that Loch Lomond Reservoir provides the City's finite water supply. Water supply is analyzed and discussed in detail in Section 4.6 of the DEIR. As described in Section 4.6 of the DEIR, the City's water system is comprised of four main sources of supply: San Lorenzo River diversions (including the Tait wells); North Coast spring and creeks; Loch Lomond Reservoir; and the Beltz wells. The San Lorenzo River is the City's largest source of water supply. The analysis in Section 4.6 did not identify significant impacts of the proposed project on water supply. See Section 4.6 of the DEIR for further details on water supply, including existing sources and the proposed project's potential impacts.

LETTER D68 – Michael Nussbaum

- D68-1 General Concerns. The comment expresses general concerns about the land use redesignation and rezoning of the project site, as well as concerns about the project's

impacts related to visual character of the neighborhood, bicycle safety and traffic and stormwater drainage. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address specific analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

- D68-2 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that the commenter disagrees with the conclusion in the DEIR regarding visual character of the surrounding area. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D68-3 Light and Glare. The comment states that the commenter disagrees with the conclusion in the DEIR regarding light and glare. **See Aesthetics Master Response 3.**
- D68-4 Stormwater Drainage. The commenter believes that mitigation strategies need to be investigated to mitigate project stormwater runoff increases given runoff conditions observed over the winter of 2016-17. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D68-5 Water Quality. The commenter believes that mitigation strategies need to be investigated to mitigate water quality impacts due to increased turbidity and sedimentation from project stormwater runoff. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 2.**
- D68-6 Traffic. The comment states that the commenter disagrees with the conclusions in the Traffic and Transportation section of the DEIR regarding transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel and policies, and expresses concerns about project-generated traffic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D68-7 Land Use Compatibility. The comment states that the proposed project's land use intensity would be incompatible with the general character of the area. **See Land Use Master Response 4.**
- D68-8 Conflicts with General Plan Policies. The comment raises comments regarding specific General Plan policies. **See Land Use Master Plan Response 2.**

D68-9 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D69 – Jessica Parr

D69-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

D69-2 Agricultural Issues. The commenter questions the DEIR's conclusion regarding no significant impact to agriculture would occur given the difficulty of large trucks/farm equipment on a narrower drive. See **Land Use Master Response 1** and **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.

D69-3 Topic. [Response Text]

LETTER D70 – Gary A. Patton

D70-1 Overview and Procedure. The comment lists the approvals required for the proposed project and states that the applicants have no legal rights to the General Plan and zoning amendments they seek, the City Council must decide whether to approve the project after certification of the Final EIR, and that the DEIR must be substantially revised to meet CEQA standards. The comment does not indicate why the DEIR must be substantially revised. Responses to specific comments on the DEIR are provided below.

D70-2 Extension of Utilities. The comment states that the Final EIR should provide more detail on the extension of water and sanitary sewer lines from Ocean Street, including how many feet would be extended and how many additional parcels could receive services from this extension, because extension of urban level utilities into now unserved areas may have significant environmental impacts. An existing 12-inch water line is located in Ocean Street Extension along the project site, and an existing 6-inch sewer line is located on the property to the south with an easement that extends to the project site. Therefore, utilities already are present in proximity to the project site and extension onto the project site would not result in extension of utilities to unserved areas, which could be considered growth inducing.

D70-3 Slope Variance. The comment asks for more detail on the extent to which the proposed variance to allow development within 10 feet of 30-percent slopes would be required and how much of the development would be within this area, and states that the Final EIR

must disclose potential adverse impacts of the variance. **See Land Use Master Response 2.**

- D70-4 Impacts on Visual Character of Area and Photo Simulations. The comment states that the DEIR has not provided substantial evidence to support a conclusion of a less-than-significant impact on visual character of the surrounding area. The comment also states that the photo simulations contain inaccurate depictions of existing conditions and that no photo simulations were provided from Graham Hill Road. The comment states that the commenter believes the project would have a significant adverse visual impact. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D70-5 Slope Setbacks. The comment states that page 4.3-10 of the DEIR does not mention the City's policy regarding setback requirements from steep slopes, violating this policy would be a significant environmental impact, and this conflict with City policy must be addressed in the Final EIR. This is discussed on pages 4.7-6 and 4-7.7 in the DEIR. **See Land Use Master Response 2.**
- D70-6 Land Use Compatibility. The comment cites a threshold of significance from the DEIR which states, "Introduce new land uses or alter the intensity of land uses, which could be considered incompatible with the surrounding land uses or with the general character of the area," as a basis for rejecting the proposed project. **See Land Use Master Response 4.**
- D70-7 Conflicts with Agricultural Lands. The comment expresses concern that the project would lead to conversion of farmland on Ocean Street Extension and/or annexation of farmland to the City for development. The comment further states that the Final EIR must document pesticide use and agricultural practices on adjacent and nearby properties and evaluate whether agricultural practices would interfere with multifamily residential uses. The comment also states that the project may lead to difficulties for agricultural operators that they do not currently face and thereby adversely impact agricultural operations. **See Land Use Master Response 1.**
- D70-8 Growth Inducement. The comment states that the analysis of growth inducement in the DEIR is strange, and states that the discussion must consider the proposed project's impact on direct or indirect growth inducement in adjacent and/or surrounding areas. The comment further states that adjacent areas are low-density residential or agricultural, and allowing a multi-family development in this neighborhood would likely induce additional population growth as the project would provide an incentive for nearby property owners to similarly request increases in density for their properties to increase their property values. **See Land Use Master Response 1** regarding potential conversion of agricultural lands.

As described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d), an EIR must discuss ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of

additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Direct growth potential occurs on a project site and within the facilities to be constructed, such as the project's proposed housing development that would accommodate an increase in population. Indirect growth potential occurs outside of the project site, but is stimulated by the direct growth attributable to a project, such as if a project established substantial new employment opportunities requiring additional housing, or if a project removed obstacles to population growth, such as establishment of an essential public service or removing a constraint on a required public service.

As described in Section 5.3 of the DEIR, the project would directly foster population growth through the construction of housing. The current City of Santa Cruz population is 64,632, and there are an estimated 23,635 housing units in the City with an average household size of 2.42 persons. The proposed project will house approximately 97 people based on the average household size. The current forecast for the City of Santa Cruz in 2020 is 66,860 people and 26,890 housing units. With the added housing units and population from the proposed project, the City of Santa Cruz would still be below these forecasts. Therefore, the direct increase in population that would be associated with the project is within the planned population growth for the area and would be less than significant.

The project's potential indirect growth-inducing impacts are also analyzed in Section 5.3 of the DEIR. The project would not generate substantial employment opportunities. The project includes roadway and intersection improvements and extension of existing utilities onto the project site from existing utilities already present adjacent to the project site. These improvements would not remove obstacles to population growth.

To state that there would be effects of rezoning of the project site on rezoning of other properties to increase density would be speculative and unsupported by substantial evidence. The majority of properties along Ocean Street Extension north of the project site are within the jurisdiction of Santa Cruz County. Other property owners can submit discretionary permit applications, such as for rezoning or subdivisions, to the County or City at any time regardless of whether or not the proposed project is constructed, and would face the same obstacles to development with or without the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project itself would not remove existing obstacles to development at higher densities on neighboring properties.

LETTER D71 – Sohrab and Samineh Pirnazar

- D71-1 Construction-Period Noise and Dust. The comment states that the commenters' residence is subject to fumes, soot, and dust from existing land uses near the project site, and expresses opposition to construction-period noise and dust. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

- D71-2 Traffic. The comment describes existing traffic congestion issues, expresses concern about project-generated traffic, and inquires about traffic specialists in the City. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D71-3 Graham Hill Road/Ocean Street Extension Intersection Configuration. The comment states that the intersection of Graham Hill Road and Ocean Street Extension is narrow and awkward and many existing structures near the intersection would need to be removed to expand the intersection. Improvements to this intersection are part of the proposed project and described in Chapter 3 of the DEIR. As described in Chapter 3, these improvements would entail removal of an existing raised island, reductions in the size of two existing medians, removal of one tree, and trimming of one tree.
- D71-4 Tourism. The comment states that Santa Cruz is the last great beach town in Northern California and is essentially the only option for beachgoers from the Central Valley and Bay Area, while people living in Southern California have plentiful options with weather superior to that of Santa Cruz to choose from. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D71-7 Roadway Configuration. The comment states that Highway 1, Highway 17, Highway 9, Graham Hill Road, and Ocean Street converge in the project location and states that the only solutions would be a constructing a new, multi-billion-dollar highway from Scotts Valley to Freedom Boulevard, reducing human population, or, at the very least, not approving the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- D71-8 Project Opposition. The comment states that the project is ill-conceived and irresponsible. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D72 – Kater Pollock

- D72-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

- D72-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D72-3 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D72-4 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. See Aesthetics Master Response 1.
- D72-5 Biological Resources. The comment states that the biological resources analysis in the DEIR is inadequate and questions a “no impact” determination. **See Master Response 3.**
- D72-6 Environmental Concerns and Transportation Issues. The comment states that there are numerous unresolved environmental concerns and transportation issues associated with the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- D72-7 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D73 – Judy Rose

- D73-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project’s impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter’s requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D73-2 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that the project would degrade visual character of the site by introducing an incompatible development at the City/County boundary where density and intensity of development typically decreases and that the project would be out character with lower intensity development on Ocean Street Extension north of the site. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2 and Land Use Master Response 4.**

- D73-2 Project Location. The comment indicates that the project is inappropriate for Ocean Street Extension and will have an impact on the street. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D73-4 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D73-5 General Plan Goals and Corridor Plan. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and also conflicts with the City's Corridor Plan. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D73-6 Conflicts with Agriculture. The comment states that properties on the west side of Ocean Street Extension are designated as "Prime Farmland" including Route One Farm, project-generated traffic could impede farm deliveries, and asks why Route One Farm was not acknowledged in the DEIR. **See Land Use Master Response 1.**
- D73-7 Technical Reports. The comment states that the following technical reports are outdated and asks why they were considered adequate for the DEIR: Mercury Soil Testing, Grading Plan, Geotech responses to Wittwer, Greenhouse Gas Analysis, and Noise Assessment Study. See Response to Comment C2-73.
- D73-8 Slope Stability and Landslides. The comment states that storms in the winter of 2017 caused landslides on Graham Hill Road and the area has a history of hillside instability. The comment expresses concern that grading within 10 feet of a 30-percent slope is potentially dangerous and asks why hillside slope stability studies weren't conducted after the winter of 2017. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**
- D73-9 Land Use Patterns. The comment asks how medium-density housing fits into the current development pattern in the area. As described in Section 4.7 of the DEIR, a potential effect on development patterns is not a potential impact under CEQA which is focused on physical impacts on the environment. However, these issues will be further addressed in the City staff report/review of the project.

The comment asks if long-term effects of changing zoning of the project site on other properties on Ocean Street Extension being sold to developers have been considered, and what precedent rezoning will set for future development in the area. Effects of rezoning on sale of other properties to developers in the future would be speculative and unsupported by substantial evidence. The City Council will make the final decision on the

proposed rezoning of the project site. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

The comment states that there are residential and commercial uses immediately adjacent to the project site, contrary to a statement in the DEIR. The statement in the DEIR is not incorrect as stated by the commenter; Santa Cruz Memorial is not zoned as a residential or commercial use, but as “PF – Public Facilities.” Other parcels immediately adjacent to the project site to the north are undeveloped.

- D73-10 Adjacent Land Uses. The comment also states that the crematory adjacent to the site burns up to 600 human bodies per year, while the DEIR stated an average number of 325 and requests that the number in the DEIR be updated. The comment states that funeral guests use street parking across from the proposed project, that there is a known mercury problem with crematory operations, and there should be a monitoring plan for removal of teeth. See Response to Comment C2-16.
- D73-11 Impacts on Adjacent Residential Properties. The comment states that there are 40-50 residences nearby that would be impacted by proximity to the proposed project with regard to traffic, parking, emergency access, noise, air quality, and site drainage, and approval of the project would be in total disregard of the quality of the environment for residents it would supposedly be housing. As described in the DEIR, the project would have less-than-significant impacts on noise levels (permanent and temporary), air quality, and stormwater drainage. As described in the PRDEIR, the project would have no impact on emergency access. Parking, in and of itself, is not an impact under CEQA. The PRDEIR identified significant unavoidable impacts associated with the project’s contribution to the existing unacceptable LOS at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 southbound off-ramp intersection.
- D73-12 Mercury Emissions. The comment questions whether the mercury soil testing report is still valid and whether other studies should be updated. See Response to Comment C2-15 regarding soils test for mercury and see Response to Comment C2-73 regarding other studies.
- D73-13 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City’s General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3.**

- D73-14 Development Capacity. The comment quotes a sentence in Section 4.2 of the City's Housing Element regarding the City's methodology for conducting an inventory of potential housing sites: "Where environmental constraints were identified, the development capacity was reduced accordingly." The comment states that the project would increase development capacity on the site regardless of serious environmental concerns. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- D73-15 Neighborhood Stability and Emergency Access. The comment quotes the City's Housing Element states that the residents of Ocean Street Extension and Paradise Park are the neighborhood that would be affected by the proposed project, which will affect the stability of the neighborhood in particular regarding traffic and emergency access. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**
- D73-16 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D73-17 Project Concerns. The comment states that the project will not solve the City's housing crisis or provide affordable housing and expresses hope that the project will not be approved. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D74 – Jackie Rundell

- D74-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project due to concerns about existing roadway conditions and project-related traffic. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D75 – Ethan Sanford

- D75-1 General Concerns. The comment states that the commenter is primarily concerned with aesthetics, traffic, and land use. Responses to subsequent specific comments are provided below.
- D75-2 Scenic Views. The comment states that the General Plan does not contain scenic mapping to support statements in the DEIR that there are no panoramic views across or from the project site and that views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked or degraded by development, and requests further analysis of this topic. Refer to Figure 4.3-1 of the General Plan for a map of significant views/features in the City, which does not identify panoramic views from Graham Hill Road. **See also Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D75-3 Building Mass and Visual Character. The comment states that it is unclear how 10 three-story buildings are compatible with undeveloped parcels and the Santa Cruz Memorial property. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D75-4 Grading. The comment disagrees with the statement in the DEIR that the proposed buildings would be stepped up the gentle slope of the property, thereby minimizing grading. The comment states that the slope of the site is not gentle to the north. The comment also states that grading is not minimized and the project would require extensive grading and very large retaining walls, and requests that this be corrected in the DEIR. As described in Section 3.5 of the DEIR, grading would result in the excavation of approximately 8,000 cubic yards of material. Section 4.1.2 of the DEIR describes the approximately 8-foot-tall retaining wall required for the project. As described in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR, the statement in Section 4.1 of the DEIR which the commenter references has been revised for clarification as follows: “With regards to overall layout, the proposed buildings are stepped up the gentle slope of the property, which minimizes grading relative to leveling of the project site.”
- D75-5 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that, given the overwhelming size and mass of the building, the varied building orientation described in the DEIR will do nothing to minimize the project’s visual impact. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D75-6 Aesthetics-Building Height. The comment states that the DEIR suggests that, because the height limit is the same for the R-1 and RL zone district, that the proposal is equivalent to what development would look like if the zoning were not changed, and that this is not true. While the commenter is correct that the DEIR states that the height limit of 30 feet applies to both R-1 and RL zoning, the commenter’s assertion that the DEIR suggests the project would appear equivalent to development under R-1 zoning is not substantiated by language in the DEIR. Rather, the DEIR states on page 4.1-9, “The height and footprint of

the buildings also are similar to larger single-family homes built in the area, but would appear more massive than a typical home as the second living floor would have the same floor area as the first, which is not always typical of larger single-family homes that have partial second stories.”

- D75-7 Building Mass and Visual Character. The comment states that comparison of the project scale with development in “other areas of the City” is irrelevant, multi-family developments south of the project site are not part of the visual context of the area, there are no large single-family dwellings within the visual context of the project site, and no dwellings that step up a hill such as proposed on the project site, which would amplify the perceived size of the structures. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D75-8 Project Design and Materials. The comment states that the project design uses cheap construction materials. The comment also disagrees that the project would not have a “rural, farm-like style” as described in the DEIR. The project would be subject to a Design Permit from the City, as described in Chapter 3 of the DEIR. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D75-9 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D75-10 Project Design. The comment states that the project design has no architectural merit and looks awful, and asks if the Design Permit findings were provided. The City Council will ultimately make the final decision on the permit applications, including the Design Permit. As described on the City’s website, access to City Council agendas and staff reports will be available for public review no later than 72 hours prior to a regular meeting, which would include the Design Permit as part of the staff report and recommendations. The comment is acknowledged but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D75-11 Photo Simulations. The comment states that the photo simulations prepared for the project should be redone because they are inaccurate and only show a glimpse of the project site. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D75-12 Traffic. The comment states that traffic counts appear to be underestimated and should be redone during the summer, lane blockages occur frequently near the project site, no bike lane has been provided despite policies in the General Plan requiring bike improvements, the commenter is concerned about parking loss and lane widths, a line-of-sight analysis should be provided, and the accident counts in the DEIR are underestimated. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed

in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

D75-13 Land Use Patterns and Compatibility. The comment states that the project's multi-family development and land use intensity are out of character with the area and existing development patterns, and additional analysis is needed. **See Land Use Master Response 4.**

D75-14 Agriculture. The comment expresses concern that the project would result in the eventual annexation of nearby agricultural lands to the City for housing development, and the analysis in the DEIR is inadequate and warrants closer evaluation. **See Land Use Master Response 1.**

LETTER D76 – Jack Schultz

D76-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

D76-2 Severe Storm Events. The commenter believes that the project drainage design and EIR make insufficient provision for more frequent and more intense rainfall events and design based on likelihood of 10-year, 25-year storms are inadequate. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**

D76-3 Project Opinion. The comment states that the project is not suited for the fourfold density increase. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, which acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

D76-4 Landslides and Slope Stability. The comment states that Graham Hill Road was closed due to landslides approximately 1,000 feet north of the project site and that while there may be no historic landslides on the project site, there are stability issues on slopes above the site and that no "global" stability analysis was prepared. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 2.**

D76-5 Retaining Walls and Slope Stability. The comment raises concern regarding slope stability on 30 percent slopes and retaining wall design and indicates that a detailed analysis be provided. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 1.**

- D76-6 Runoff from Graham Hill Road. The comment states that the asphalt curb along Graham Hill terminates uphill of the project site's southern boundary, allowing runoff onto the project site. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D76-7 Geotechnical Report Updates. The comment references the seismic hazard analyses in the DEIR and indicates that floating foundations would not be less susceptible to failure than conventional footings and the project should not be allowed to proceed without more extensive geotechnical testing. **See Geology and Soils Master Response 1.**
- D76-8 Severe Storms. The commenter asks how the geotechnical and hydrological reports account for unpredictable weather with increased storm form due to climate change. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D76-9 Stormwater Drainage. The commenter believes a 50-year storm event should be used and that runoff exceeding the detention volumes will sheet flow across the street into downstream swales and asks whether an analysis of the capacity of downstream pipes and swales has been conducted. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D76-10 Porous Paving. The comment questions the use of pervious paving on a site with reported low percolation rates. See Response to Comment C2-46.
- D76-11 Drainage Question. The comment states that it appears that the antecedent moisture content should be higher. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D76-12 Project Impervious Area. The comment questions whether the impervious surfacing includes a portion of Ocean Street Extension. See Response to Comment C2-51
- D76-13 Bioswales. The commenter has concerns of the safety and maintenance of the bioswales in Ocean Street Extension. See **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1** regarding maintenance. As indicated in **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**, there is no immediate drop-off from the edge of street to the biplanter. Pedestrians will be separated by a six-inch drop from the walk to the swale, similar to a standard six-inch curb drop-off, which is a recognized method for providing a detectable warning for pedestrians.

LETTER D77 – David Shaw

- D77-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

- D77-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D77-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D77-4 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D77-5 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D77-6 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, proposed roadway improvements and intersection design are inadequate for emergency access, the DEIR's analysis of emergency ingress and egress is inadequate, roadway improvements will increase potential for vehicular accidents, and traffic reports do not accurately account for vehicular accidents. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D78 – John and Carole Simpson

- D78-1 Project Opposition. The comment states that traffic has worsened in the area over the last several decades and that emergency access is a problem for Ocean Street Extension and Paradise Park. The comment asks that the rezoning be denied. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D79 – Cara Sloman

- D79-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, states that the commenter finds the DEIR to be deficient, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D79-2 Traffic. The comment states that the project will worsen conditions for left-turning vehicles from Ocean Street Extension onto Graham Hill Road, the project will worsen traffic safety, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D79-3 Slope Stability and Erosion. The comment expresses concern about slope stability and erosion and state that use of the public right-of-way for stormwater detention is inappropriate. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D79-5 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D79-6 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road offers panoramic views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church which will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D79-7 Land Use Compatibility. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. The comment further states that the proposed project's Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.52 would have a density far greater than any adjacent property. **See Land Use Response 4.**
- D79-8 Aesthetics-Building Height and Mass. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will

appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**

- D79-9 Project Materials and Design. The comment states that the proposed materials and design represent some of the cheapest possible construction methods and disagrees with the statement in the DEIR that limited windows would soften overall building mass. See Response to Comment C2-10 regarding windows. The comment about building materials expresses an opinion about the project, but does not address analyses in the DEIR and no response is necessary. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- D79-10 Project Photo Simulations. The comment states that the photo simulations included in the DEIR are incomplete and misleading because the “North View with Project” is taken from a distant vantage point and the “South View with Project” includes trees and both portray the project as being considerably less imposing than it will actually appear. The comment requests that more accurate photo simulations be provided. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**

LETTER D80 – Jonathan Steinberg

- D80-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project and states that dense housing should be in the city core. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D81 – Marshall and Karen Sylvan

- D81-1 Project Concerns. The comment expresses concern about the effects of the project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D81-2 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D81-3 Development on Neighboring Parcels. The comment expresses concern that the project would lead to similar development on neighboring vacant parcels zoned for residential use. Development on neighboring parcels is not part of the proposed project and analysis of such development would be speculative. Future development proposals received by the City may be subject to project-level CEQA review in which any effects

unique to a particular project would be identified, as well as associated mitigation measures, if applicable. See also Response to Comment D70-8.

- D81-4 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests a written response to the comment letter and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

LETTER D82 – Mark Tarantino

- D82-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D82-2 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D82-3 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**
- D82-4 Stormwater Runoff. The comment states that there are existing drainage issues at the project site and adjacent gully and creation of over an acre of impervious ground without sufficient on-site remediation creates significant impact on existing drainages systems and San Lorenzo River and City's water intake. **See Hydrology and Water Quality Master Response 1.**
- D82-5 Off-Site Bioretention. The comment states that bio-retention in a public right-of-way takes up parking and all remediation should occur on the project site. As indicated in Response to Comment C2-41, the road bioswale is only for road runoff.
- D82-6 Traffic. The comment states that the proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic, the proposed intersection improvements will make the intersection more dangerous, the description of traffic in the area is outdated and does not include heavy summer beach traffic, and accident data is inaccurate. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section,

including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

- D82-7 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D82-12 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation modes. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

LETTER D83 – Sharon Took-Zozaya

- D83-1 Concern about Effects of the Project. The comment expresses general concerns about the project's effects on aesthetics, land use, and transportation. The comment is acknowledged and detailed responses to specific comments are provided below.
- D83-2 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D83-3 Aesthetics-Building Height and Massing. The comment states that 10 three-story buildings are too massive for the site and out of character with the area and that the buildings will appear 60 feet tall when viewed from Ocean Street Extension. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D83-4 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D83-5 Scenic Views. The comment indicates that Graham Hill Road is a gateway to the City and views of Pogonip, Mission Hill, and Holy Cross Church will be blocked by development. **See Aesthetics Master Response 1.**

- D83-6 General Plan Goals and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D83-7 Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment states that the City's General Plan includes policies and actions to promote use of alternative transportation modes and the project is not served by alternative transportation. The comment is related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a Partial Recirculated DEIR (PRDEIR) was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section that included discussion of alternative transportation modes. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- D83-8 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, no bike lane is provided, the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts, and proposed improvements to Ocean Street Extension are problematic. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D84 – Peter Weiss

- D84-1 Air and Soils Testing for Mercury. The comment states that the air modeling and soil testing studies were carried out using best practices and industry standard methods, and represent sound science. The comment is noted and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- D84-2 Further Air and Soils Testing Research Questions. The comment states that, in the commenter's opinion, the studies did not go far enough and many questions still remain, and poses four research questions that the commenter believes need to be addressed regarding accumulation of mercury in surrounding vegetation, whether the results of the original study are replicable, what chemical forms of mercury are emitted from the crematory, and what other air pollutants are present besides mercury—namely particulate matter—which could pose a health risk to local residents. The comment requests additional pollutant testing at the crematory before project approval. See Response to Comments C2-15 and C2-16 regarding mercury testing and emissions from the crematory.

LETTER D85 – Canon Western

- D85-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D85-2 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D85-3 General Plan Goals. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**
- D85-4 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road, and the EIR does not adequately account for cumulative traffic impacts. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.

LETTER D86 – Sharon L. Wright

- D86-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project due to traffic concerns. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D87 – Karen Zelin

- D87-1 Project Opposition. The comment expresses opposition to the project, citing concerns about the scale of the proposed project, and support for low-income housing. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D88 – Brian Zucchi

- D88-1 Project Concerns. The comment states that the project would be out of character due to well-documented issues of aesthetics, conflicts with the General Plan, traffic and the EIR's adequacy, and erosion and stormwater concerns. See **Aesthetics Master Response 1** regarding aesthetics, **Land Use Master Response 2** regarding General Plan land use policy consistency, **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1** regarding the traffic analysis in the DEIR, and **Hydrology and Water Quality Master Responses 1 and 2** regarding stormwater runoff and erosion.
- D88-2 Opposition to Rezoning. The comment states the commenter's opinion that the developer has a right to develop the property at the density permitted under the existing site zoning. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D88-3 Request for Further Studies and Future Public Notice. The comment requests to receive further studies relating to the EIR and future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted.

LETTER D89 – Michelle Zucchi

- D89-1 Project Opinion. The comment states that residents of Ocean Street Extension consider themselves one of the few remaining rural farm areas in Santa Cruz County and would like to remain so. The comment also expresses concern about project-generated traffic. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- D89-2 Noise. The comment expresses concern about project-generated noise due to the increased population. Noise is analyzed in the Initial Study (see Appendix A of the DEIR). As described in the Initial Study, the proposed residential use is not the type of use that would result in significant increases in ambient noise levels and no impact would be anticipated.
- D89-3 Project Opposition. The comment states that most of the commenters' neighbors would support development of 5 to 10 single-family dwellings on the project site, but are opposed to 40 dwelling units. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER D90 – Multiple Submittals of Identical Letter

- D90-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns about the project's impacts, requests a written response to the comment letter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- D90-2 Impacts on Visual Character of Area. The comment states that a multi-family development is out of character with the site and Graham Hill is a natural transition from multi-family development to the south to the single-family development and rural character to the north. **See Aesthetics Master Response 2.**
- D90-3 Crematory Air Quality and Soil Impacts. The comment states that impacts to air quality and soils from the crematory have not been adequately evaluated and the testing is outdated, and requests updated testing and reports. See Response to Comments C2-15 and C2-16.
- D90-4 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impact travel, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road. These comments are related to the traffic analysis the DEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this document, a PRDEIR was released for public comment, which revised the Traffic and Transportation section, including topics addressed in this comment. Comments received on the PRDEIR, including traffic and transportation, are addressed in Section 4.3.4.
- D90-5 Bike Lanes. The comment states that the project would not provide a bike lane, which conflicts with General Plan policies regarding bicycle improvements. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3.**

4.4 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON PRDEIR**LETTER PR-A4 – California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse**

- PR-A4-1 Compliance with State Clearinghouse Review. The letter acknowledges that the City of Santa Cruz complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for review of draft environmental documents pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and that no state agencies submitted comments through the Clearinghouse. The comment is acknowledged; and no response is necessary.

LETTER PR-B1 – Project Applicants, Rick Moe and Craig Rowell

- PR-B1-1 Improvements Correction. The commenter requests revisions that clarify descriptions of proposed project street and sidewalk improvements, which have been made; see Chapter 3, Changes to EIR.

LETTER PR-C1 – Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association (OSENNA)

- PR-C1-1 Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment requests that comments on the DEIR be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. The commenter's requests are noted, and responses to comments in the letter are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff. Regarding comments on the DEIR (see Letter C2), the PRDEIR revised and clarified the traffic section, addressing many of these comments, but all issues related to traffic and transportation raised by commenter are addressed in the following responses and **Traffic and Transportation Master Responses 1, 2 and 3**. Responses to the comment letter on the DEIR submitted by OSENNA on June 30, 2017 are provided in Section 4.3.2 above; see responses to comments in Letter C2.
- PR-C1-2 Ocean Street / Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp Intersection LOS. The comment questions the change in LOS at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 Southbound Off-ramp intersection from F to E with project traffic. In reviewing the Mott MacDonald supplemental traffic review, the City discovered that the LOS rating would be E per Caltrans guidelines based on the amount of delay as explained in the Marquez memo in Appendix A of the PRDEIR. The Caltrans tables in Appendix C indicate that delays between 55 and 80 seconds corresponds to LOS E, and delays above 80 seconds would be LOS F. The delay would be 78.4 seconds with the project, which is within the LOS E classification. Both the traffic study and supplemental traffic count for this intersection use the same methodology to calculate delay. The difference lies in the thresholds used for establishing level of service as explained above.
- PR-C1-3 Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp. The comment states that the previous mitigation has not been "designed, costed or included in the City's CIP" for the significant impact identified at the Highway 1 off-ramp and that the project proposes to "override" this significant impact. Under State CEQA Guidelines, if an identified significant impact cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the City must make findings if the project is approved as explained on page 1-3 of the PRDEIR (and page 1-6 of the DEIR); this is not a project proposal.
- PR-C1-4 Traffic Resulting from Alternatives. The comment states that no quantitative information has been provided for the Alternatives other than the ITE trip generation rate. The Alternatives Analysis was not part of the PRDEIR, and no response is required.

However, it is noted that all alternatives include fewer units than the proposed project, which would result in a reduction of traffic, but as indicated in the DEIR, none of the alternatives would reduce the impacts at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, quantified analyses are not necessary to reach this conclusion.

- PR-C1-5 Mitigation for Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp. The comment states that signalization/widening mitigation should be constructed prior to the project being occupied, and asks how the project's share of the cost will be obtained. The comment regarding completion of the improvement prior to project occupancy is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. It is noted that the intersection currently operates in a deficient condition. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1** regarding additional information on project contribution to the cost of this improvement.
- PR-C1-6 Threshold of Significance. The comment states that three percent measure is not supported by case law or common sense, which should be acknowledged in the FEIR, and asks how the project impacts would change if this were eliminated. The three percent standard accounts for daily variation of traffic volumes and is only applied to project impact analyses at non-Caltrans intersections that operate at an existing unacceptable level as explained on page 4.5-15 of the PRDEIR. The City believes this is a reasonable standard to address project impacts to existing impacted intersections. However, this threshold was not applied in the proposed project traffic analyses as the only intersection operating at an unacceptable LOS was a Caltrans intersection, and this threshold is not used at Caltrans intersections.
- PR-C1-7 Evaluation of Critical Intersections. The comment cites a statement in the PRDEIR regarding how study intersections are selected and asks what authority the City's traffic engineer has to override the directives in the City's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines regarding study intersections and asks for clarification of the last sentence on page 4.5-3. The cited reference explains that a traffic study is required if a project would result in an increase of 50 or more trips during the weekday PM peak hour and the process the City uses to determine study intersections, one of which is if any "critical" intersection that receives more than 25 trips, and the critical intersections are identified. The City Engineer has not overridden any directives contrary to the commenter's claim. It is also noted that a traffic study was prepared even though the project generates 25 peak hour trips, less than the amount triggering the requirement to prepare a traffic study. Based on the project trip generation, no intersections received more than 25 weekday PM peak hour trips at defined critical intersections. The referenced sentence has been clarified; see Chapter 3, Changes to EIR.
- PR-C1-8 Highway 1/Highway 9 Intersection. The comment states that at least one project trip will go through this intersection, and it is puzzling why the intersection was not

included. See Response to Comment PR-C1-7. **See also Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1** for an explanation on how study intersections were selected.

- PR-C1-9 Ocean Street Extension Street Standards. The comment asks what improvements standards are required for a local street and how they reflect the “complete streets” vision. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2** regarding street standards. The commenter’s question regarding complete streets is not related to the DEIR and is referred to City staff for consideration
- PR-C1-10 Active Transportation Plan. The comment asks for clarification of the improvement “planned” for Ocean Street Extension in the City’s Active Transportation Plan. The addition of bike lanes on Graham Hill Road was ranked as a low-priority project as explained on page 4.5-11 of the PRDEIR.
- PR-C1-11 Project Bicycle Trips. The comment states that it doesn’t make sense that 40 bike trips will be added and asks for source of this estimate. As indicated on page 4.5-27 of the PRDEIR, the estimate of bicycle and pedestrian trips is based on the existing mode split in the City. However, as also noted on the same page, this modal split was not assumed in the traffic analysis, which was based on all trips being taken by automobile.
- PR-C1-12 Traffic Counts. The comment states that the March 22, 2018 traffic counts were done on an early spring day with rain and not during peak beach season and when UCSC was in final exams and cites the Caltrans’ Traffic Impact Study Guidelines that call for counts to be conducted in favorable weather conditions. The comment requests new traffic counts during favorable weather and peak season and asks why Caltrans standards were not followed. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-C1-13 Ocean Street/Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp Intersection. The comment states that the March 2018 count was used to recalculate the delay at this intersection and asks what the results would have been with the “new” Caltrans criteria if the October 2014 counts were used. The intersection LOS was not recalculated using the March 2018 comment; **see Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1** for further discussion. The commenter’s reference to new Caltrans criteria is not clear and a specific response cannot be made.
- PR-C1-14 Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp LOS. The comment questions Caltrans criteria for the off-ramp intersection and why the previous traffic study showed F and it is now changing to E. See Response to Comment PR-C1-2.
- PR-C1-15 Trip Distribution. The comment asks how trip distribution was determined and rationale. Page 4.5-19 of the PRDEIR explains how trip distribution is considered. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

- PR-C1-16 Traffic Counts and AM Peak Trips. The comment asks for clarification of traffic counts used and whether AM peak trips were evaluated. The October 2014 traffic counts used in the traffic report was the basis for the intersection impact analysis. The count taken in 2018 showed lower volumes than the 2014 counts, and thus, the higher 2014 provide a worst-case impact. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1** for further discussion. Weekday AM peak hour trips were not evaluated as explained on page 4.5-17 of the PRDEIR.
- PR-C1-17 LOS Table. The comment states that there appears to be an error for the Ocean Street/Highway 1 Northbound On-Ramp intersection on Table 4.5-6 that goes in which delay decreases from 1.8 to 1.7 with the project. The LOS calculations for this intersection were reviewed by the City's consulting traffic engineer. The calculation of delay is based on probability theory. In the case of an off-ramp the likelihood of an opening in the through traffic stream adequate for the desired movement. This calculation was verified to be sure of its accuracy. The result provided is the average delay of two different movements. The delay difference is so close as to be the same.
- PR-C1-18 Delays at Ocean Street/Highway 17 Intersection. The comment states that the actual delays at this intersection far exceed the data provided and questions the HCM 2010 methodology for queue blockages. The comment is in reference to the PRDEIR discussion of the Highway 1 Southbound Off-ramp intersection, where left-turn queues also block right-turn movements. The noted reference was specifically related to this intersection. The HCM method is the standard for LOS calculations, and LOS definitions are based on the HCM theories. There are a number of operational characteristics not evaluated in the methodology, however it is the best practice that is consistent with standard traffic impact analysis methods.
- PR-C1-19 Ocean Street/Felker Intersection. The comment states that this intersection warrants analysis and asks why it was not addressed in the PRDEIR. See Response to Comment PR-C1-7 and **Traffic and Transportation Mater Response 1**.
- PR-C1-20 Ocean Street/Highway 17 Intersection. The comment questions how the project would impact traffic at this intersection on a peak weekend. **See Traffic and Transportation Mater Response 1**.
- PR-C1-21 Trip Generation Rates. The comment questions use of ITE trip rates, which could substantially underestimate the trip generation of a project. **See Traffic and Transportation Mater Response 1**.
- PR-C1-22 Modal Split-Alternative Transportation Modes. The comment questions modal split and states that the DEIR discounts the fact that pedestrian/biking environment is inhospitable and that biking and pedestrian improvements are negligible. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.

- PR-C1-23. Project Trip Generation. The comment states that the DEIR must consider whether or not the traffic report accurately calculates the project trip generation relative to the project floor plans, absence of alternative transportation and likely demographics of future residents of the project. See Response to Comment PR-C1-21.
- PR-C1-24 Modal Split. The comment questions the methodology used to estimate pedestrian and bicycle trips. See Response to Comment PR-C1-11.
- PR-C1-25 Compliance with General Plan Policies. The comment asks how the project complies with the City's General Plan which has multiple policies supporting bike improvements (e.g., M1.3.1, M2.3.1, M2.2.3, M4.2.3 and M4.3.1.). Consistency with policies applicable to the project are addressed pages 4.5-27 and 4.5-30 of the PRDEIR. The policies identified in the comment generally are directives for City action and not applicable to project-level developments. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3.**
- PR-C1-26 Modal Split. The comment states that estimated bicycle trips appear too high. See Response to Comment PR-C1-11.
- PR-C1-27 Project Access Improvements. The comment raises concerns regarding lack of provision of a bike lane, the adequacy of the travel lanes on Ocean Street Extension even with project plans to widen the street and safety of pedestrians that must cross the street from the sidewalks to reach the site. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**
- PR-C1-28 Project Improvements. The comment asks why the project doesn't include improvements along the entire length of the parcel frontage, asks for justification of elimination of parking. The comment requests information on the project, but does not address analyses in the PRDEIR. However, City staff have indicated that due to existing topography and oak trees limited improvements and project provision of an extended sidewalk on the south side of Ocean Street Extension provides a greater public benefit.
- PR-C1-29 Removal of Parking. The comment asks for justification for removal of 14 on-street parking spaces and states that the environmental impacts of moving uses on the Ocean Street Extension shoulder, including PG&E and tree crews, walkers, runners, bikers, campers, and carpoolers, elsewhere. Removal of on-street parking spaces is not considered a physical impact on the environment under CEQA. The EIR is focused on physical adverse impacts on the environment which would result from the project, which have been analyzed; City staff will further review other issues outside of the CEQA process. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

- PR-C1-30 Santa Cruz Memorial Parking. The comment asks how parking demand for Santa Cruz Memorial has been considered, states that Santa Cruz Memorial's basic functionality may rely on on-street parking on Ocean Street Extension as the facility may not conform to City regulations regarding off-street parking, and expresses concern that the project would increase demand for on-street parking spaces. The project's proposed on-site parking (92 spaces) exceeds the number of parking spaces required by the City (78 spaces). Removal of informal on-street parking spaces related to private automobile use, in and of itself, is not considered a physical impact on the environment under CEQA. The EIR is focused on physical adverse impacts on the environment which would result from the project, which have been analyzed. Parking requirements for the Santa Cruz Memorial Park is not part of the proposed project. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.
- PR-C1-31 PG&E. The comment asks whether PG&E has been routed the improvements plans and potential hazards road improvements pose to gas lines. The comment does not address analyses in the EIR and is referred to City staff for further consideration.
- PR-C1-32 Ocean Street Right-of-Way. The comment states that the western side of Ocean Street Extension should be shown on the project plans. Property lines, which include public rights-of-way are shown on the project engineering maps. The right-of-way is shown on the project plans in its record location. According to the applicant's engineer, the western bounds of the right of way near the southernmost sidewalk improvement is currently being analyzed to determine its record location and will either be revised to show the right of way farther west. The plans will be revised at the project later stages to demonstrate our findings. The new sidewalk, at the southern end, will align and connect with the existing sidewalk on Ocean St. If necessary, there is room to move the new sidewalk East by realigning the intersection island.
- PR-C1-33 Road Widths. The comment states that the proposed southern end of Ocean Street Extension has a width of about 19.5 feet with a travelled way of about 17.5 that is inadequate for truck traffic and line-of-sight is blocked at the Ocean Street Extension/Ocean Street intersection. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**
- PR-C1-34 Line of Sight Analysis. The comment asks whether a "formal" line of sight analysis was performed for the left turn from Ocean Street Extension onto northbound Graham Hill Road. See discussion on pages 4.5-25 to 4.5-26 in the DEIR. No formal analysis was conducted, but City staff has indicated that site distance has and will be improved with removal and trimming of existing trees and vegetation.
- PR-C1-35 Road Widths. The comment indicates that the road width is inadequate and cites road standards of the Central Fire Protection District. Comment is noted, but the Central Fire

Protection District standards are not applicable to the proposed project. See Response to Comment PR-C1-33.

PR-C1-36 Project Parking. The comment questions the proposed project use of parking. Parking is not a subject for consideration under the State CEQA Guidelines and is not a topic in the PRDEIR. No response is required, but the comment is referred to City staff for further consideration.

PR-C1-37 Collision Reports. The comment states that the reported collision history at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection remains incomplete and does not include all accident history available for this intersection and that the intersection is dangerous. Reported collisions are identified in the PRDEIR as explained on page 4.5-24 of the PRDEIR. As indicated in the PRDEIR, the proposed project improvements will result in a slightly wider road width and will improve sight distance and safety, and would not result in creation of hazards, which is the threshold of significance reviewed. See PRDEIR page 4.5-24 for further discussion.

LETTER PR-C2 – Wittwer Parkin, Representing Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association

PR-C2-1 Represents OSENA and Requests Revision to EIR. The comment states that the commenter's law firm represents OSENA, the commenter expects written responses to the comments on the DEIR submitted on June 30, 2017, the PRDEIR does not cure any deficiencies in the DEIR previously identified by the commenter, and requests that the DEIR be revised again and released for another round of public review. Regarding comments on the DEIR (see Letter C2), the PRDEIR revised and clarified the traffic section, addressing many of these comments, but all issues related to traffic and transportation raised by commenter are addressed in the following responses and **Traffic and Transportation Master Responses 1, 2 and 3**. Responses to the comments on the DEIR submitted by Wittwer Parkin on June 30, 2017 are provided in Section 4.3.2 above; see responses to comments in Letter C3. See also **Master Response 1** regarding EIR recirculation.

PR-C2-2 Ocean Street/Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp Mitigation. The comment states that the mitigation to contribute to the cost of signalizing the intersection and widening the off-ramp does not meet the standard for adequate mitigation and that the EIR fails to disclose a plan for mitigation. The PRDEIR does identify a mitigation measure that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Since the intersection deficiency exists under current conditions, the mitigation calls for an applicant contribution to the cost of the implementing the mitigation. The PRDEIR identifies a project within the City's Capital Improvement Program that could accommodate the improvement identified in the mitigation measure. However, given uncertainty in funding and scheduling of the improvement and the fact that some portions of the improvement plans are under the

control of Caltrans, not the City, the PRDEIR conservatively concluded that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Further details of collection of the applicant's contribution are provided in **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1** and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in Appendix A.

- PR-C2-3 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures. The commenter states that PRDEIR dismisses impacts to two intersections because the project's contribution would be minor and fails to identify mitigation measures to address cumulative impacts. The comment also alleges that the City uses the incorrect standard of significance for determining traffic impacts by assuming only an increase of three percent in trips regardless of the LOS, and for these reasons the PRDEIR is inadequate.

Cumulative mitigation measures are discussed in the PRDEIR on pages 5-3 to 5-4, which include an applicant contribution to the cost of the improvement at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp intersection and payment of traffic impact fees for other identified intersections. The CEQA Guidelines indicate that a project's funding its fair share of a mitigation measure designed to alleviate the cumulative impact would render the project's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable. Mitigation Trans-1 requires the project's fair share payment to improvements at the Highway 1 Southbound Off-ramp, and required payment of the City's traffic impact fee will be required and applied to other intersections. Although two regional intersections would continue to operate at a deficient level with improvements, the project's contribution to the congestion at these intersections is not considered cumulatively considerable due to payment of traffic impact fees, as well as limited addition of trips.

The PRDEIR cumulative analysis did not use a three percent traffic increase as a significance threshold as explained in Response to Comment PR-C1-6. The standard for analysis for cumulative impacts, as explained on page 5-4 of the DEIR, is whether the project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact is cumulatively considerable. The cumulative analysis does not use referenced three percent threshold. This is a project-level threshold of significance that is applied to intersections that operate at an unacceptable LOS D or E under existing conditions, which is explained on pages 4.5-15 to 4.5-16 of the PRDEIR.

- PR-C2-4 Request for Notice of Determination. The comment requests to receive the Notice of Determination for the project, when available. The request to receive the Notice of Determination is acknowledged and referred to City staff.

LETTER PR-C3 – Santa Cruz Memorial Park

- PR-C3-1 Project Concerns. The comment expresses concerns about the proposed project and references the DEIR Project Description and concerns regarding traffic, building design and height and aesthetics, but that the Board of Trustees is not opposed to some form

of development on the site. The comments do not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no response is required. The Project Description with reference to the commenter has been corrected. The comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for further consideration.

LETTER PR-D1 – Yafah and Noam Almog

- PR-D1-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR and states that traffic impacts were not adequately addressed, including emergency access and bicycle safety. The comment requests that comments be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- PR-D1-2 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel on Graham Hill Road between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and the project improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road and significantly impact the Highway 1 off-ramps. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D1-3 PR-D2-3 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3.**
- PR-D1-4 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D1-5 Traffic. The comment presents commenter’s observations on accidents and traffic. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no response is required.
- PR-D1-6 Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle “No Impact” Conclusions. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the “no impact” conclusions in the PRDEIR regarding transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, and that proposed changes to the intersection including removal of the median and dirt part of the road adjacent to the cemetery will make bike trips more dangerous. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**

LETTER PR-D2 – Yosi and Ayelet Almog

- PR-D2-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR and states that traffic impacts were not adequately addressed, including emergency access and bicycle safety. The comment requests that comments be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- PR-D2-2 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel on Graham Hill Road between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and the project improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road and significantly impact the Highway 1 off-ramps. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D2-3 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3.**
- PR-D2-4 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D2-5 Traffic. The comment presents commenter's observations on accidents and traffic. Comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no response is required.
- PR-D2-6 "No Impact" Conclusions. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the "no impact" conclusions in the PRDEIR regarding transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, and that proposed changes to the intersection including removal of the median and dirt part of the road adjacent to the cemetery will make bike trips more dangerous. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**

LETTER PR-D3 – Teresa Aquino

- PR-D3-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR and "misrepresentations" of traffic, including pedestrian and bicycle safety. The comment requests that comments be

addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

- PR-D3-2 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel on Graham Hill Road between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley and that the March 2018 traffic count was taken on a rainy day when UCSC was mostly done for the semester (sic). **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D3-3 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that traffic from the two new projects on Jewell Street will further impair traffic on Graham Hill Road. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D3-4 Mitigation. The commenter does not think a signal will be approved or installed at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 Southbound Off-ramp intersections and asks what the City's rationale is for approving an EIR with an unmitigated impact. As discussed in Response to Comment PR-C2-2, the EIR discloses the impact and the measure to mitigate the impact, but with uncertainty of implementation since the improvements require Caltrans approval, the EIR concludes the impact is unavoidable. Should the City decision makers approve the project, a statement of overriding consideration would be required explained the reasons for approving the project with a significant impact as explained on page 1-3 of the PRDEIR and pages 1-5 to 1-6 of the DEIR.
- PR-D3-5 Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road Intersection Improvements. The comment indicates that the proposed "redesign" of the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will substantially increase hazards to motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. The project does not propose to redesign the intersection, but proposed improvements include road widening, median modification to accommodate sidewalk extension, and lengthening the left-turn lane from Ocean Street to Ocean Street Extension. These improvements would not increase hazards but provide more roadway width for vehicles and bicycles, increased storage for left-turn lanes, and an expanded, continuous sidewalk for pedestrians.
- PR-D3-6 Bicycle Safety. The comment states that the PRDEIR does not adequately address bicycle safety and asks if there was an analysis of the proposed location of the bioswales and safety. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3.**
- PR-D3-7 Sidewalk Placement. The comment states that the developer's website for the project is inconsistent with the PRDEIR regarding the location of the proposed sidewalk and asks what impact the bioswales have on pedestrian safety. Comment is acknowledged, however, the developer's website is not part of the project subject to review under CEQA. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**

LETTER PR-D4 – Lauren Crux

- PR-D4-1 General Comment. The comment relates commenter’s experience with traffic in the area. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no response is required; the comment is referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.
- PR-D4-2 Trip Generation. The comment states that the project adds 80 cars with a minimum of two trips per day. The comment does not specifically address analyses in the PRDEIR, but project trip generation is discussed on page 4.5-19 of the PRDEIR. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D4-3 Traffic Mitigation and Project Opposition. The comment asks when traffic mitigation and funding would occur, asks why the City does not solve traffic problems before considering this project, expresses a preference for development on the project site at the density permitted by the site’s existing zoning, and states that the project would not provide affordable housing and would be a terrible mistake. See discussion of project mitigation on pages 4.5-21 and 4.5-22, and see also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**. As discussed on page 4.5-11, the City implements road and other improvements as part of the City’s traffic impact fee program and state and federal funding programs. Traffic impact fees are assessed by the City of Santa Cruz Public Works Department based on new net traffic generated by a project and paid at building permit issuance. The traffic impact fees are used to address needed traffic improvements at key intersections for circulation and alternative transportation improvements. Funding is divided between specific projects identified on a priority list (85 percent), alternative transportation (15 percent), and intersection and neighborhood traffic (5 percent). The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- PR-D4-4 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3.**

LETTER PR-D5 – Heidi Fisher

- PR-D5-1 General Comment. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

- PR-D5-2 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3**.
- PR-D5-3 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- PR-D5-4 Traffic Concerns. The comment expresses concern about increasing traffic and describes the commenter's personal observations. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.
- PR-D5-5 Drainage. The comment expresses concern that the EIR does not adequately model drainage issues. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required.

LETTER PR-D6 – Joseph Fisher

- PR-D6-1 General Comment. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- PR-D6-2 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3**.
- PR-D6-3 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.
- PR-D6-4 Traffic Concerns. The comment expresses concern about increasing traffic and describes the commenter's personal observations. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.

- PR-D6-5 Energy. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with PRDEIR Impact 4.8-1: Energy Use, which states, “The proposed project could result in indirect increased energy demands, which would not be wasteful or an inefficient use of resources.” The comment requests additional energy analyses of different building orientations and states that a south orientation would be better for energy usage. Comment is noted and referred to City staff for further consideration. The PRDEIR did not identify significant impacts that would warrant consideration of mitigation measures or alternatives.
- PR-D6-6 Drainage. The comment expresses concern that the EIR does not adequately model drainage issues. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required.

LETTER PR-D7 – Mike Grall

- PR-D6-1 Project Opposition. The comment states that higher traffic developments should be along corridors and asks that the proposed increase in density be denied. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, which acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

LETTER PR-D8 – Deborah Hayes

- PR-D8-1 Project Concerns. The comment states concerns about the PRDEIR and that it doesn’t address the “actual experience” of the area. The commenter cites experience at the Highway 1 on- and off-ramps as being a dangerous intersection and traffic on Graham Hill Road and doesn’t agree with removal of the raised median. Comment is acknowledged
- PR-D8-2 Parking and Traffic. The comment states that eight on-street parking spaces is an insufficient amount and expresses concerns about project-generated traffic due to congestion, safety issues, and emergency access. Removal or addition of parking spaces is not considered a physical impact on the environment under CEQA. As described in Section 4.5-2 of the PRDEIR, the proposed project would not affect or interfere with emergency access either to the project site or emergency access for residents to the north. The project-proposed improvements at the Graham Hill Road / Ocean Street intersection (including widening of Ocean Street Extension and lengthening of the northbound Ocean Street left turn lane) would improve operations at this location.
- PR-D8-3 Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the City of Santa General Plan recommends new housing along major commercial corridors and in the downtown core, and the project site on the outskirts of town will result in negative impacts regarding traffic, safety, parking, congestion and urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from

the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. **See Land Use Master Response 3.**

LETTER PR-D9 – Brant Herrett

- PR-D9-1 Mitigation Measure. The comment states that Mitigation Trans-1 may not be approved by Caltrans, and therefore, does not mitigate project impacts. The PRDEIR does identify a mitigation measure that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Since the intersection deficiency exists under current conditions, the mitigation calls for an applicant contribution to the cost of the mitigation. The PRDEIR identifies a project within the City's Capital Improvement Program that could accommodate the improvement identified in the mitigation measure. However, given uncertainty in funding and scheduling of the improvement, the PRDEIR conservatively concluded that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D9-2 Existing Congestion. The comment identifies existing congestion problems with the Highway 1 northbound on-ramp, two-lane Ocean Street and backups on Ocean Street to Felker and on Jewell Street and indicates that these congested areas are not addressed in the ADEIR. See pages 4.5-3 and 4.5-17 regarding study area and study methods. See also **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1** regarding discussion of selection of study intersections.
- PR-D9-3 Mitigation Measure. The comment states that is not realistic to have any expectation that the approvals and funding for the mitigation measure will come to fruition. The comment expresses an opinion, which acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. See Response to Comment D9-1.
- PR-D9-4 Increased Trips. The comment expresses concerns about project-generated traffic and states that the PRDEIR traffic should include morning and mid-day traffic patterns in addition to the afternoon peak, cumulative traffic from development on Jewell Street, left-turn issues at Ocean Street/Plymouth Street, and the Ocean Street/Felker Street intersection. See Response to Comment D9-2.
- PR-D9-5 Emergency Access. The comment states that the EIR does not address traffic-congestion-related impacts to emergency access and expresses specific concerns about the City Fire Department's response time. The comment further states that it is unclear if the City Fire Chief's statement that there were no public safety access issues on Ocean Street Extension included the commenter's cited concerns. As described in Section 4.5-2 of the PRDEIR, the proposed project has been reviewed by the City of Santa Cruz Fire Department and meets all the City's requirements for emergency access to the project site. See page 44 of the Initial Study (DEIR Appendix A) regarding discussion of public services.

LETTER PR-D10 – Matt Hill

- PR-D10-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR and “misrepresentations” of traffic, including emergency access and bicycle safety. The comment requests that comments be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- PR-D10-2 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3.**
- PR-D10-3 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road during peak hours, and will significant impact the Highway 1 off-ramps and intersection with Ocean Street at Highway 17, which are already operating at unacceptable LOS. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D10-4 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D10-5 Significant Unavoidable Impact. The commenter “takes Issue” with section 2.2.1-Significant Unavoidable Impacts, but does not state why and a specific response cannot be made.
- PR-D10-6 “No Impact” Conclusions. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the “no impact” conclusions in the PRDEIR regarding emergency access and transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.** Regarding bicycle travel, the comment states that the commenter is opposed to the proposed elimination of the bike lane and removal of the island to widen the Graham Hill/Ocean Street Extension intersection. The project’s proposed roadway and intersection improvements would not entail removal of existing bike lanes. Similarly, the medians would not be removed, but rather one would be reduced in size to accommodate an extended sidewalk.

LETTER PR-D11 – Casey KirkHart

PR-D11-1 Project Support. The comment expresses general support for the project and new housing in Santa Cruz. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration; the comment does not address analyses in the Draft EIR and no further response is necessary.

PR-D11-2 Improvements and Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety. The comment states that the developers should provide funds to make improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Highway 1 Southbound Off-Ramp intersection. The commenter further expresses concerns about pedestrian and bicycle conditions, both under existing conditions and for future residents of the project site, and asks the City to address these concerns. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1** regarding intersection mitigation and improvements and see **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3** regarding pedestrian and bicyclist safety.

LETTER PR-D12 – Mitchell Lachman

PR-D12-1 Traffic Congestion. The comment states that there is increasing congestion in the area and Graham Hill Road is unsafe for bicycles, expresses concerns about project-generated traffic, and states that the zoning and new housing should reflect a deteriorating traffic condition in the area. The comment expresses an opinion, which is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

PR-D12-2 Parking Requirements. The comment asks the City to drastically eliminate parking requirements except for commercial and handicapped residents.

LETTER PR-D13 – Julie Mascarenhas

PR-D13-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR and lack of resolution of significant problems and drainage impacts that were not addressed in the PRDEIR. The comment requests that comments be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

PR-D13-2 Drainage. The comment asks why the drainage plan was not addressed in the PRDEIR, states that the current drainage system is at over 100-percent capacity and cannot accommodate any increase in runoff, asks why the DEIR concluded stormwater drainage

- impacts were not significant, asks why real measurements from recent rainy seasons were not considered, asks how runoff from the project would be released at a reasonable rate, and asks how removal of trees along the Santa Cruz Memorial Park cemetery and 1959 Ocean Street Extension in January and March 2018 and associated changes in drainage would be incorporated into the project plans. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, **see Hydrology and Water Master Response 2** and Response to Comments in Letter D60.
- PR-D13-3 Study Intersections Trip Distribution/Generation. The comment states that the PRDEIR traffic section is difficult to understand and asks for clarification on study trips and vehicle trip generation and distribution. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D13-4 Study Intersections. The comment asks why all nearby intersections were not included in the study. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D13-5 Ocean Street/Highway 1 Off-Ramp Intersection LOS. The comment asks why the “With Project” LOS at the southbound Highway 1 off-ramp was changed from F in the DEIR to E in the PRDEIR, describes the commenter’s experience with traffic congestion, asks why these delays experienced by the commenter were not addressed in the DEIR and states that it appears that the traffic engineer’s software does not account for delays experienced by the commenter and the software should be modified or not used. See Response to Comment C1-17.
- PR-D13-6 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D13-7 Traffic Counts. The comment asks why the traffic counts were done during non-peak seasons. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D13-8 Study Intersections. The comment asks why the northbound Highway 1 on-ramp is not addressed in the DEIR. The intersection is included as a study intersection and operates at an acceptable level of service; see PRDEIR page 4.5-19 and 4.5-20.
- PR-D13-9 Intersection Improvements. The comment states that the proposed intersection improvements would create significant new hazards by eliminating the median and splitting the roadway into two lanes, making surface markings less visible, and sharpening the curve; asks why the PRDEIR does not discuss elevation changes, sharpening of the road curve, and poor marking; and states that the intersection improvements would reduce available space for waiting cars. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.** PR-D13-10 Bicycle Safety. The comment states that the PRDEIR is incorrect in stating that bicyclists are able to navigate Ocean Street

Extension without experiencing major vehicle conflicts, describes the commenter's personal observations, states that the project would create numerous significant new conflicts and hazards for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians, and asks why there is no discussion of safety hazards for bicyclists. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.

PR-D13-11 Bike Lanes. The comment states that, with removal of the gravel shoulder, the travel lanes would be undersized, asks what standards were used to size the travel lanes, asks why there is no bike lane, and asks if the project site should be required to dedicate some of its private property to widen the right-of-way to accommodate bike lanes. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.

PR-D13-12 Gravel Shoulder. The comment states that the commenter uses the existing gravel shoulder as a bike lane and that removal of the gravel shoulder and addition of bioswales would preclude on-street parking and create a hazard for bicyclists. The comment further describes the commenter's experiences and asks what analysis was done on the location of the proposed bioswales and safety. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.

PR-D13-13 Right-of-Way to the North. The comment states that there is not enough right-of-way north of the proposed project to accommodate increased vehicle trips in that direction and not all trips will occur to the south, and asks why this was not addressed in the PRDEIR. No project trips were distributed to the north as there are no commercial, public facilities or other uses that would generate trips from the project.

PR-D13-14 Project-Generated Bicycle Trips. The comment states that the number of estimated bicycle trips generated by the project is highly unrealistic, asks if the City has actual statistics regarding bicycle trips per unit, asks how the estimate of bicycle trips was developed, and asks why the gravel shoulder would be removed and no bike lane added if the project-generated bicycle trips are truly accurate. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Responses 1 and 3**.

PR-D13-15 Roadway Improvements. The comment states that the proposed road repaving in front of the project site and to the intersection with Graham Hill Road, which are proposed as a community benefit and mitigation for installing bioswales, would lead to increased ability for vehicles to speed on Ocean Street Extension, thereby threatening families, kids, pets, and wildlife; the local neighborhood opposes this and thus roadway improvements cannot be considered a community benefit; the proposed sidewalk would be of no use to bicyclists; and asks why removing the gravel shoulder and facilitating vehicle speeding through roadway repaving was not addressed in the PRDEIR. Minor road widening is not anticipated to result in increased speeds, and bicycles can use sidewalks in non-commercial areas. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2**.

- PR-D13-16 Sidewalk Placement. The comment states that the developer's website for the project is inconsistent with the PRDEIR regarding the location of the proposed sidewalk and asks what impact the bioswales have on pedestrian safety. The developer's website is not part of the project subject to review under CEQA. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**
- PR-D13-17 Alternatives. The comment requests more quantitative information about the alternatives, including LOS for each alternative at each intersection, and asks why one of the alternatives is not chosen instead of the proposed project. See Response to Comment PR-C1-4.
- PR-D13-18 Question about City Support of Project. The comment asks how the City can support the proposed project given inadequate treatment of runoff and drainage in the PRDEIR, significant traffic impacts, increased hazards for vehicles and bicyclists, and lack of attention from the City in terms of public transportation. The comment states that the project is not suited for the site. The comment expresses an opinion about the project, which is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no further response is necessary.
- PR-D13-19 Public Transportation. The comment states that bus service has been removed from the area, the City completely ignored the neighborhood in its recent bikeshare launch, and asks why the City wants to develop condos but not provide public transportation. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no further response is necessary.
- PR-D13-20 Question about City Support of Project. The comment asks how the City can consider overriding significant negative impacts from EIRs for private developments that do not provide affordable housing, why City residents should be penalized with a project that increases hazards for their alternative modes of transportation, and states that the project encompasses many bad messages to the rest of the residents of Santa Cruz. The comment poses questions to the City, which is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no further response is necessary.

The comment further states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. This comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3.**

LETTER PR-D14 – Leonardo Mascarenhas

- PR-D14-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns on project and the PRDEIR and states that the PRDEIR misrepresents traffic, including emergency access and bike safety. The comment requests that comments be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- PR-D14-2 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3.**
- PR-D14-3 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel on Graham Hill Road between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and the project improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road and significantly impact the Highway 1 off-ramps and intersection with Ocean Street at Highway 17, which are already operating at unacceptable LOS. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D14-4 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D14-5 Traffic. The comment presents the commenter’s observations on accidents and traffic. The comment is acknowledged, but does not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no response is required.
- PR-D14-6 Significant Unavoidable Impact. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the significant unavoidable impact identified in the PRDEIR regarding the proposed project’s contribution to the existing unacceptable LOS at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 southbound off-ramp intersection. The comment further describes the commenter’s experiences with existing traffic congestion. The comment does not state why the commenter takes issue with the impact conclusion and a specific response cannot be made.

PR-D14-7 **“No Impact” Conclusions.** The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the “no impact” conclusions in the PRDEIR regarding emergency access and transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel. Regarding emergency access, the comment further states that the commenter does not want traffic and parking issues on Ocean Street Extension to impact emergency vehicles being able to reach the commenter’s residence. The comment asks how fire trucks will get through in gridlock with no shoulder to drive on, states that the commenter does not want ambulance access to the commenter’s residence to be impeded, and states that on-street parking can already be full along Ocean Street Extension which blocks emergency vehicle access. As indicated in the PRDEIR, the City Fire Department’s review found that the project meets all City requirements for provision of emergency access to the site. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**

Regarding transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities, the comment further states that this is already a dangerous intersection and stretch of road and the project’s proposed roadway and intersection improvements would worsen conditions, objects to removal of the median at the Ocean Street/Graham Hill Road intersection and removal of the gravel shoulder along Ocean Street Extension, and states that repaving the roadway in front of the project site would significantly increase speeding and the residents of the neighborhood are opposed to the roadway repaving, and threats to pets and wildlife were not mentioned in the DEIR. The minor road widening is not anticipated to result in increased speeds,

LETTER PR-D15 – Karsten Mueller

PR-D15-1 **Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice.** The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR and “misrepresentations” of traffic, including emergency access and bicycle safety. The comment requests that comments be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

PR-D15-2 **General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl.** The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3.**

PR-D15-3 **Traffic.** The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road

intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road during peak hours, and will significantly impact the Highway 1 off-ramps and intersection with Ocean Street at Highway 17, which are already operating at unacceptable LOS. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

PR-D15-4 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**

PR-D15-5 Significant Unavoidable Impact. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the significant unavoidable impact identified in the PRDEIR regarding the proposed project's contribution to the existing unacceptable LOS at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 southbound off-ramp intersection. The comment further states that the on-ramp and off-ramp, as well as the intersection of Ocean Street Extension and Ocean Street, are constantly congested and the proposed variance would make these conditions worse. The comment is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR and no further response is necessary.

PR-D15-6 "No Impact" Conclusions. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the "no impact" conclusions in the PRDEIR regarding emergency access and transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel. Regarding emergency access, the comment states that all emergency vehicles must travel past the project to the end of Paradise Park, and that the existing use of on-street parking on Ocean Street Extension by visitors to the cemetery results in gridlock where the variance is proposed. Parking associated with Santa Cruz Memorial is not related to the proposed project and no further response is necessary. **See Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**

LETTER PR-D16 – Michael Nussbaum

PR-D16-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR and "misrepresentations" of traffic, including bicycle safety. The comment requests that comments be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.

PR-D16-2 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high-density housing away from the urban core along major

transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3**.

PR-D16-3 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road during peak hours, and will significant impact the Highway 1 off-ramps and intersection with Ocean Street at Highway 17, which are already operating at unacceptable LOS. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

PR-D16-4 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1**.

PR-D16-5 Traffic. The comment describes traffic congestion on the commenter's afternoon commute, states that the traffic study finding of 10 seconds of delay per vehicle is correct but it certainly does not apply to bicycles, states that the proposed project would not make things and better and the commenter expects it would make things significantly worse, states that the commenter was almost hit by a UPS truck at the Ocean Street/Highway 1 northbound on-ramp, and asks if we have to wait until someone is killed at this intersection before we do something about it. The comment states that the project is not suited for the site. The comment asks questions to the City, which is acknowledged and referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration. The comment does not address analyses in the DEIR and no further response is necessary.

PR-D16-6 Significant Unavoidable Impact. The commenter "takes Issue" with section 2.2.1-Significant Unavoidable Impacts, but does not state why and a specific response cannot be made.

PR-D16-7 No Impact" Conclusions. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the "no impact" conclusions in the PRDEIR regarding transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel. The comment further states that the project includes no provisions for bicycle travel through the Graham Hill Road/Ocean Street intersection and project-generated traffic will worsen bicycle conditions, no bike lane has been provided which conflicts with General Plan policies requiring bicycle improvements, and the sidewalk proposed as part of the project will help pedestrians but will worsen bicycle conditions. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 3**.

LETTER PR-D17 – David Shaw

- PR-D17-1 Project Concerns and Request for Written Response and Future Public Notice. The comment expresses concerns on the PRDEIR and “misrepresentations” of traffic, including emergency access bicycle safety. The comment requests that comments be addressed, that a written response to the comment letter be provided to the commenter, and requests to receive future public notices regarding the proposed project. Responses to comments on the PRDEIR are provided in this document. The request to receive future public notices is referred to City staff.
- PR-D17-2 General Plan Policies and Urban Sprawl. The comment states that the project conflicts with City of Santa Cruz Housing Element and General Plan goals that promote a sustainable compact city within defined urban boundaries and would increase urban sprawl by pushing high density housing away from the urban core along major transportation corridors. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, and no response is required. However, see **Land Use Master Response 3.**
- PR-D17-3 Traffic. The comment states that the project will significantly impair travel between Santa Cruz and the San Lorenzo Valley, the description of traffic in the area is outdated, and proposed improvements at the Ocean Street Extension/Graham Hill Road intersection will block traffic on northbound Graham Hill Road during peak hours, and will significant impact the Highway 1 off-ramps and intersection with Ocean Street at Highway 17, which are already operating at unacceptable LOS. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D17-4 Cumulative Impacts. The comment states that the traffic report and EIR do not adequately account for cumulative impacts of additional traffic by two new projects on Jewell Street. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 1.**
- PR-D17-5 Significant Unavoidable Impact. The commenter “takes Issue” with section 2.2.1-Significant Unavoidable Impacts, but does not state why and a specific response cannot be made.
- PR-D17-6 “No Impact” Conclusions. The comment states that the commenter takes issue with the “no impact” conclusions in the PRDEIR regarding emergency access and transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel. The comment further states that all emergency vehicles must travel past the project site to the end of Paradise Park. Regarding transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel, the comment does not elaborate on why the commenter takes issue with the conclusion and a specific response cannot be made. See **Traffic and Transportation Master Response 2.**

LETTER PR-D18 – Canon Western

PR-D18-1 Project Concerns and Project Opposition. The comment expresses concerns about traffic and that it is not a good area for high-density development and asks that the zoning for nine homes be kept. The comment does not address analyses in the PRDEIR, but is referred to City staff and decision makers for consideration.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK