



COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4TH FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
 (831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123
KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR
<http://www.sccoplanning.com/>

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project: Castle Rock State Park Entrance Relocation

APN(S): 088-081-12

Project Description: The project is a proposal to relocate the entrance to Castle Rock State Park and construct a gateway to the Park in two phases. Phase One to consist of: demolition of existing structures; grading, construction of a new driveway and entrance, including a sign of up to 48 square feet in size; deceleration and acceleration lanes; construction of a parking lot, amphitheater, restrooms, picnic areas and trails; and installation of landscaping. Phase Two to consist of construction of a visitors center complex of about 6,000 square feet and related improvements. Requires the rescission of the existing Williamson Act contract and entrance into an Open Space Easement contract, a Rezoning to change the current CA-P zoning to PR-O (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, with an Open Space Easement Combining District), a General Plan re-designation to O-R (Parks, Recreation and Open Space), a Commercial Development Permit to expand the State Park under a phased Master Site Plan and Parking Plan, an Agricultural Buffer Reduction from the required 200 feet to 100 feet, a Variance for a sign to exceed the 12 square feet allowed by County Code and located closer than five feet from the right-of-way, an overheight fence permit to allow an eight-foot high fence within the front yard setback, an Archaeological Report Review, Soils Report Review, Design Review, Preliminary Grading Review and Environmental Review.

Project Location: The project is located on the southwest side of Skyline Boulevard, which is also State Route (SR) 35, about 2.3 miles from its intersection with Highway 9 (15435 Skyline Blvd., Los Gatos).

Owner: Sempervirens Fund

Applicant: Don Neuwirth

Staff Planner: Annette.Olson, (831) 454-3134

Email: Annette.Olson@santacruzcounty.us

This project will be considered at a public hearing before the Planning Commission. The time, date and location have not been set. When scheduling does occur, these items will be included in all public hearing notices for the project.


California Environmental Quality Act Mitigated Negative Declaration Findings:

Find, that this Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the decision-making body's independent judgment and analysis, and; that the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Mitigated Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review period; and, that revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the project applicant would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; and, on the basis of the whole record before the decision-making body (including this Mitigated Negative Declaration) that there is no substantial evidence that the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment. The expected environmental impacts of the project are documented in the attached Initial Study on file with the County of Santa Cruz Clerk of the Board located at 701 Ocean Street, 5th Floor, Santa Cruz, California.

Review Period Ends: May 27, 2014

Date: _____

Note: This Document is considered Draft until it is Adopted by the Appropriate County of Santa Cruz Decision-Making Body


 TODD SEXAUER, Environmental Coordinator
 (831) 454-3511



County of Santa Cruz

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4TH FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
 (831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123
 KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR
www.sccoplanning.com

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW INITIAL STUDY

Date: February 24, 2014

Application Number: 131055

Staff Planner: Annette Olson

I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

APPLICANT: Don Neuwirth

APN(s): 088-081-12

OWNER: Sempervirens Fund

SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 5

PROJECT LOCATION: The site is located on the southwest side of Skyline Boulevard, which is also State Route (SR) 35, about 2.3 miles from its intersection with Highway 9 (15435 Skyline Blvd., Los Gatos).

SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Proposal to relocate the entrance to Castle Rock State Park and construct a gateway to the Park in two phases. Phase One to consist of: demolition of existing structures; grading; construction of a new driveway and entrance, including a sign of up to 48 square feet in size; deceleration and acceleration lanes; construction of a parking lot, amphitheater, restrooms, picnic areas and trails; and installation of landscaping. Phase Two to consist of: construction of a visitors center complex of about 6,000 square feet and related improvements.

Requires the rescission of the existing Williamson Act contract and entrance into an Open Space Easement contract, a Rezoning to change the current CA-P zoning to PR-O (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, with an Open Space Easement Combining District), a General Plan re-designation to O-R (Parks, Recreation and Open Space), a Commercial Development Permit to expand the State Park under a phased Master Site Plan and Parking Plan, an Agricultural Buffer Reduction from the required 200 feet to 100 feet, a Variance for a sign to exceed the 12 square feet allowed by County Code and located closer than five feet from the right-of-way, an overheight fence permit to allow an eight-foot high fence within the front yard setback, an Archaeological Report Review, Soils Report Review, Design Review, Preliminary Grading Review and Environmental Review.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: All of the following potential environmental impacts are evaluated in this Initial Study. Categories that are marked have been analyzed in greater detail based on project specific information.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Supply/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Resources & Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL(S) BEING CONSIDERED:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Development Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Division | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Permit |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rezoning | <input type="checkbox"/> Riparian Exception |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Development Permit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Rescission of Williamson Act contract and entry into Open Space Easement contract; Agricultural Buffer Reduction; Master Site Plan; Parking Plan; Variance for sign; Overheight Fence Permit, Preliminary Grading Review. |

NON-LOCAL APPROVALS

Other agencies that must issue permits or authorizations: Caltrans (Encroachment Permit)

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the lead agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Todd Sexauer
Environmental Coordinator

4/28/17

Date

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

Parcel Size: 32.7 acres

Existing Land Use: ~9 acres used as a Christmas tree farm

Vegetation: Oaks and shrubs along SR 35, Christmas trees, natural vegetation along the Kings Creek corridor; montane hardwood woodland in southwestern portion of parcel

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

Nearby Watercourse: Headwaters of Kings Creek

Distance To: On subject property

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Water Supply Watershed: Yes

Groundwater Recharge: Not mapped

Timber or Mineral: Not mapped

Agricultural Resource: Type 1A

Biologically Sensitive Habitat: Headwaters of Kings Creek at southwest of property

Fire Hazard: State Response Area - High

Floodplain: Not mapped

Erosion: Highly erodible soils; preliminary erosion control plan submitted and accepted

Landslide: Not mapped

Liquefaction: Low

Fault Zone: Not mapped

Scenic Corridor: SR 35 is a County scenic highway

Historic: No

Archaeology: Yes

Noise Constraint: No

Electric Power Lines: Service comes from SR 35

Solar Access: Potential for visitor center to take advantage of southern solar access

Solar Orientation: Potential for visitor center to take advantage of southern solar access

Hazardous Materials: Underground fuel storage tank previously on-site.

Other:

SERVICES

Fire Protection: CalFire

School District: Los Gatos High/Lakeside

Joint Union Elementary School District

Sewage Disposal: Septic

Drainage District: None

Project Access: Highway 35

Water Supply: Well

PLANNING POLICIES

Zone District: Commercial Agriculture with an Agriculture Preserve and Farmland Security Combining District (CA-P)

General Plan: Agriculture (AG)

Urban Services Line: Inside

Coastal Zone: Inside

Special Designation: None

Outside

Outside

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The subject parcel is located on the Santa Cruz side of SR 35 (Skyline Blvd.), which runs along the crest of the Santa Cruz Mountains, dividing Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties. Sanborn County Park is located across SR 35 from the subject parcel. On the Santa Cruz County-side of SR 35, Castle Rock State Park surrounds the subject parcel on all but one side. The subject parcel is about 32.7 acres in size and is developed with about nine acres of Christmas trees, an abandoned single-family dwelling, and a small accessory structure. The rest of the parcel has montane hardwood woodland and Kings Creek, an ephemeral riparian area, is located in the southwest portion of the parcel. No riparian vegetation is associated with this riparian area.

The Christmas tree farm is planted with young (four- to nine-foot tall) conifer species used for Christmas trees. Unpaved access roads loop around and through the Christmas tree farm providing access for tree customers and farm maintenance operations. Several old apple trees line the access roads. The majority of the Christmas tree farm area is highly disturbed due to the ongoing tree farming and road maintenance. Native vegetation in the tree farm area is sparse, with a narrow strip of shrubs and small trees along the northern fence line near Skyline Boulevard, as well as annual grasses and a small area of yellow star-thistle. The proposed development footprint consists of approximately six acres, with about 1.8 acres of this being new paving and structures, and is primarily contiguous with the Christmas tree farm area.

The southern portion of the site consists of steep slopes that form one of the headwaters of an ephemeral drainage, which flows to Kings Creek, and eventually to the San Lorenzo River. Vegetation in the southern portion of the project site is characterized as montane hardwood woodland with a mixed tree canopy of canyon live oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*), tanoak (*Lithocarpus densiflorus*), madrone, and California bay (*Umbellularia californica*). The shrub layer is open and herbaceous vegetation is sparse. A few Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) and black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*) are also present in the woodland. The woodland community on the project site is continuous with the surrounding woodland in Castle Rock State Park.

The adjacent parcel to the north is privately owned by Robert and Mary Ann Whalen and is developed with their home, a second unit under construction, and a Christmas tree farm. Prior to the approval of Permit 06-0589 for a lot line adjustment, the Christmas trees on the Whalen's parcel and the subject parcel were all located on one parcel and operated together.

After the lot line adjustment, the Christmas tree farm became divided by the new property line. As a part of that lot line adjustment, the Williamson Act contract on the subject parcel, which was originally entered into in 1974, was revised to reflect the new property boundaries. In August 2010, the Whalen family sold the subject parcel to Sempervirens Fund, a local nonprofit, for the development of a new entrance to Castle Rock State Park.

The existing entrance to Castle Rock State Park, which is located about 500 feet southeast of the subject property, lacks basic amenities, including potable water and permanent restroom facilities. California State Parks does not currently have the resources to improve or develop the existing entrance. Sempervirens purchased the subject parcel from the Whalen family in order to develop a new entrance with substantially improved amenities and with the ultimate intent to transfer the property to State Parks.

Although no specific transfer date has been established, California State Parks has been involved in the development of this project and supports it (Attachment 3).

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project would be implemented in two phases. The first phase includes: demolition of the existing single-family dwelling; removal of the Christmas trees; grading; restoration landscaping for the Christmas tree areas not being developed; construction of a new entrance and driveway, including deceleration and acceleration lanes; construction of a parking lot, amphitheater, restrooms, picnic areas and trails; and installation of landscaping. The second phase includes the construction of the visitor center complex (visitor center, restrooms, patio, ranger offices) and related improvements like the fire protection tanks (see Project Plans, Attachment 2).

In Phase 1, most of the Christmas trees within the development footprint would be removed and the development footprint would be graded. Following grading, the majority of this area would be replanted with native plants and endemic tree plantings to create a "hillside and open meadow" setting. The restoration would be phased to reduce the potential for erosion. The trees would be placed where the edge of the existing Christmas tree farm meets the tall trees of the wooded areas. This would provide a more naturally-appearing transition between the meadow areas and the heavily forested areas (as opposed to the existing stark tree line located between the Christmas tree farm and Castle Rock State Park's forest).

In the right-of-way area, Caltrans requires that trees four-inches in diameter or larger within 20 feet of the outside edge of the lane stripe be removed to provide a clear "recovery zone". Caltrans defines this concept as "an area clear of fixed objects adjacent to the roadway to provide a 'recovery zone' for vehicles that have left the traveled way" (Caltrans 2008). Caltrans advises a minimum recovery area of 20 feet on conventional highways. To meet this requirement, ten trees over six-inches in diameter at breast height along the Skyline Boulevard frontage would need to be removed. All trees over 40-inches in diameter would be located outside the recovery zone and would be avoided. The Skyline Boulevard frontage would also be re-landscaped with native bushes and trees that would be of a height and or distance from Skyline Boulevard such that adequate site distance would be maintained.

Grading / Drainage

Grading is required to establish the proposed visitor center building pad in relation to the parking lot, while maintaining adequate ADA accessibility. The overall grading and drainage strategy outside of the building pad and parking lot is to mimic the natural shapes of the surrounding landscapes wherever possible and to promote sheet flow of storm runoff.

Project grading includes approximately 6,242 cubic yards of cut and 7,511 cubic yards of fill divided according to the below values. Note that “strippings” refers to the organic matter that is removed as a part of the Christmas tree removals.

Cut (in cubic yards)
Gross Site Cut: 7,650 CY
Strippings: -1,408 CY
Total: 6,242 CY
Fill (in cubic yards)
Gross Site Fill: 5,925 CY
Strippings: 1,586 CY
Total: 7,511

The strippings would be removed but then compacted and used as fill, resulting in a Net Total of 1,269 cubic yards of import. This estimate may be reduced as utility trenching is expected to offset some of the fill requirement.

The parking lot would consist of pervious strips under the parking spots which would receive runoff from the surrounding asphalt areas and would be subdrained and directed to naturalized treatment and detention facilities (i.e. bioswales, rain gardens). The eventual outfall into the adjacent gullies would be “level spreaders,” which distribute the treated runoff as non-erosive sheet flow.

Entry Feature

The proposed entry feature would include a locking gate located near the intersection of the new driveway with Skyline Boulevard. Sufficient room is provided for a vehicle to pull in out of the travelled in front of the gate. The entry feature would include natural materials and would be designed to be visible, but still blend in with the surrounding environment. A conceptual drawing is included to provide a general idea of the type of feature envisioned (see Attachment 4). Part of the entry feature would be the Park’s sign. Although the entry feature is to be within five feet of the right-of-way, it was designed in such a way as to ensure that adequate sight distance is maintained.

Access/Driveway

The new driveway would be located approximately 85 yards south of the existing access point. New acceleration and deceleration lanes on Skyline Boulevard would be development to allow safe access to the new driveway. The deceleration lane would be 483 feet long and the acceleration would be 150 feet long. New wire fencing with stone

pilasters along the parcel's frontage would also be installed. The new driveway would include a single lane in each direction (separated by a naturally vegetated landscape strip) leading to a locking access gate. The driveway would convey drivers to and from the proposed parking area described below. The new driveway would be shared with the adjacent property owners to the west (the Whalen's) as they have an easement across the subject parcel. To accommodate this easement, a new gated frontage road would split off of the Park driveway to access the Whalen's parcel. A separate driveway was considered to provide the Whalen's direct access from Skyline Boulevard, but Caltrans would only support a single entrance at the proposed location.

Parking and Restroom

The project also includes development of a 90-vehicle parking lot to accommodate the proposed new uses. Shade trees and other landscaping are included in the parking lot design. A prefabricated restroom structure would be located near the parking area. Electronic pay stations would be located around the parking lot. There would be no overnight parking except for those backpackers who park their vehicles in the parking area while camping in the trail camps or hiking the "Skyline to the Sea Trail" (consistent with current operations).

Parking facilities for bicyclists would also be provided as part of this project. The park may be frequented by recreational cyclists to use restroom and picnic facilities as they pass by on Skyline Boulevard, but because of the park's relatively remote location, it is unlikely to attract many visitors who arrive by bicycle.

The specific use of the existing Castle Rock State Park parking lot would be determined by California State Parks, but may include oversize vehicle parking, weekend overflow parking, or overnight parking.

Trails and Trail Connections

The project includes several on-site trails within the development footprint, as well as two trails that connect to other trails off the site. The on-site trails would traverse the site providing connection between the various recreational amenities (i.e. parking areas, picnic areas, visitor center, etc.), as well as to the two off-site trails. The first off-site trail connection would follow Skyline Boulevard approximately 50 feet away from the roadway and would connect to the existing entrance area. The second off-site trail connection would wind south of the site approximately 400 feet to connect to the Ridge Trail and Saratoga Gap Trail, which are popular access trails to the "Skyline to the Sea" Trail (a five-mile hike from the project site).

Amphitheater

The proposed project includes a small, trail-accessible amphitheater at the southeast edge of the development footprint. The amphitheater would be used primarily for educational and recreational presentations (i.e., park ranger wildlife and native plant presentations, bouldering demonstrations, etc.). The proposed amphitheater would not include a public address (PA) system or and no electronic amplification would be allowed.

Picnic Areas

The project includes a group picnic area located near the parking area and four picnic areas located on the loop trail beside the riparian area.

Visitor Center Complex

Phase 2 of the project would include the development of the visitors center complex. The visitors center complex would include a series of small freestanding rooms that provide office space for park rangers, restrooms, a caterer's kitchen for warming and serving food prepared off-site, a room for special events and meetings, flexible gallery/exhibit space, permanent interpretive exhibits, and an area to distribute park information and trail maps. The combined floor area of the structures would total approximately 6,000 square feet (s.f.) with additional outdoor trellis-covered walkways connecting the structures. Bicycle parking facilities would also be provided at the visitor center complex. The design of the complex would incorporate natural materials (i.e. wood and stone) and colors (see Attachment 4 for Design Review materials).

Utilities

For Phase 1, water from the existing well would be used for establishing the new landscaping and restoration areas. A new pump and in-line treatment may be required and would be accommodated in the existing pump house. A new well would be constructed to provide potable water to feed the new restroom adjacent to the picnic area (see Sheet C3.00 and C3.01). The water service of the future visitors center would be stubbed out for future connection during Phase 2.

During Phase 2, potable water and fire water service for the visitors center would extend from the stubbed out connection to new storage tanks and potable treatment system on the hillside then fed separately to the Visitor Center domestic/fire systems and hydrant via gravity.

A new septic system would be installed to serve the small restroom structure and, eventually, the visitor center complex. The proposed project would require a electrical service connection at an existing utility pole on the site, which would be distributed to the site via a new transformer.

Outdoor Lighting

Outdoor lighting would be limited to built-in lighting at the visitors' center building and gathering areas and along the main pathways around the parking lot and building. Limited pedestrian-scale parking lot lighting would be provided (four light standards for the entire parking lot). The amphitheater would only be lighted with bollard-height path lights and/or recessed step lights and lights installed in the amphitheater's seatwalls. All exterior lighting would be fully shielded and directed downward. Exterior lighting would be turned on by a switch during special nighttime events and would be on a clock such that all lights (including parking lot lights) would automatically shut off at 10:00 pm, except for minimal indoor security lighting. Auxiliary lighting for special events would be prohibited.

Visitation

The new entrance would be open to visitors during the same days and hours of operation as Castle Rock State Park, i.e. every day from 6 AM to sunset. Special events are proposed to be allowed until 10 PM. Park quiet hours begin after 10 PM.

The enhanced amenities of the new entrance are anticipated to result in additional visits to the park as members of the public become aware of the educational and recreational opportunities provided by the new entrance and programming. The increased number of park visitors is anticipated to be directly related to the programming schedule and scheduling of special events. The Program Statement (Attachment 5) describes the range of possible programming and events, including classes/workshops, nature walks and talks, school field trips, and weddings and other special events. None of these would exceed 60 attendees and all events would be scheduled to ensure that the parking demand of the events would not exceed the available parking. A Parking Management plan was provided that may be instituted if State Parks personnel find the need to more closely manage parking (Attachment 6).

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

A. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| A. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (A through D): The project site is located outside of the limits of the State Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone (County of Santa Cruz GIS Mapping, California Division of Mines and Geology, 2001). However, the project site is located approximately eight miles northwest of the San Andreas fault zone, and approximately one mile northeast of the Butano fault zone. While the San Andreas fault is larger and considered more active, each fault is capable of generating moderate to severe ground shaking from a major earthquake. Consequently, large earthquakes can be expected in the future. The October 17, 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake (magnitude 7.1) was the second largest earthquake in central California history. During 1990, the U.S. Geological Survey cited a 67 percent probability that an earthquake of Richter magnitude 7, similar to the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake, would occur on one of the active faults in the San Francisco Bay Region in the following 30 years. Recently, The probability that a Richter magnitude 7 earthquake would occur was increased to 70 percent as a result of studies in the vicinity of the Hayward Fault. A 23 percent probability is still attributed specifically to the potential for a magnitude 7 earthquake to occur along the San Andreas Fault by the year 2020 (GeoForensics 2012).

A geotechnical investigation for the proposed project was performed by Daniel F.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Dyckman of GeoForensics Inc., February 14, 2012 (Attachment 7). The report concludes that the potential for ground rupture due to fault offset is low due to the lack of mapped active fault traces through the site (page 5). The project is, however, likely to be subject to very strong to violent ground shaking due the parcel's proximity to major faults. The report recommends that the project's structural engineer use USGS data to determine the appropriate seismic design category, and adherence to the current building code. Together, this would minimize any damage from an earthquake. Liquefaction was determined to be a relatively low risk given that the subject parcel is underlain with bedrock at shallow depths and the absence of saturated sands. The landslide hazard is similarly a low risk given the presence of competent bedrock material at relatively shallow depths. As shown on the County of Santa Cruz GIS Mapping, no portion of the subject parcel is mapped as being within a Cooper Clark landslide.

Implementation of the additional requirements included in the review letter prepared by Environmental Planning staff (Attachment 8) would serve to further reduce the potential risk of seismic shaking.

2. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Discussion: The report cited above concluded that there is a relatively low potential risk from unstable soil given that the site is underlain by bedrock. Any instability would be shallow and is unlikely to result in landsliding, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. As noted above, the proposed improvements would be constructed in conformance with the California building code and with the appropriate seismic design category as determined by the USGS' JAVA Ground Motion Parameter Calculator. The recommendations contained in the geotechnical report, such as foundation and drainage control requirements and standards for fill placement, would be implemented to reduce this potential hazard to a less than significant level.

3. Develop land with a slope exceeding 30%?

Discussion: There are slopes that exceed 30% on the property. No improvements are proposed on slopes in excess of 30%. There would be, however, landscape restoration on slopes greater than 30%. Christmas trees extend up the hillside towards Castle Rock State Park. The project includes the removal of these Christmas trees and the restoration of those areas with native vegetation. Because of concern about the potential erosion of these slopes-- which were determined by GeoForensics to have erodible soils-- and the proximity of Kings Creek, the tree removals and restoration would be done in three phases to avoid "opening" the entire six acre development/restoration area at the same time (see Sheet L10). The geotechnical

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

engineer submitted a plan review letter entitled “Review of Erosion and Relandscaping Plans” which accepts the proposed landscape restoration as being in substantial conformance with the soil report recommendations (Attachment 9).

The first of the three phases would be “A Phase” which includes the 6.72 acre area where the park entrance improvements are proposed, i.e. the driveway, parking area, restrooms, and visitors center complex. This area is relatively flat so the erosion potential is low. Nonetheless, erosion control measures for this phase are included in the project. The project would conform with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required by the State Water Resource Control Board for areas of disturbance of one acre or more. Semi-permanent and permanent erosion control measures would be implemented such as a silt fence to protect the riparian corridor; fiber rolls along grade breaks, around stockpiles, at the downhill perimeter of the site, and at appropriate intervals on slopes equal to or greater than 2:1; compost roll/blanket in rain garden area, hydroseed on all un-irrigated planting areas; and jute netting on slope areas exceeding 20%. In addition, the property owner would plant all irrigated areas, leach field, rain garden, bioswales and all proposed trees which would stabilize those areas.

“B Phase”, which includes 2.9 acres, would be implemented at the end of the two-year plant establishment period for “A Phase” (Sheet L9 shows the area of “B Phase”). An audit of the plantings, erosion control measures, irrigation system and invasive species would be performed at this time by the property owner and the Castle Rock State Park naturalist. Deficits in any of these areas would be remedied at this time. The remaining Christmas trees, except those on slopes greater than 30%, would be removed as recommended by the geotechnical engineer, i.e. the holes resulting from the tree removals and other buried objects would be overexcavated into firm materials and then backfilled and compacted with native materials (GeoForensics 2012, 6).

The “C Phase”, which covers .35 acres, would be for tree removals in areas with greater than 30% slopes. The tree removals in these areas would begin at the completion of “B Phase” and would be done annually over a ten year period to insure that erosion is minimized and slope stability is not compromised. Each year, a portion of the trees would be removed with localized erosion control methods implemented. An annual audit would be performed for up to a period of three years for each phase to evaluate eroding areas, permanent measures requiring repair, plant success, and presence of invasive species.

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

Discussion: Some potential for erosion exists during the construction phase of the project. The potential erosion is, however, minimized due to the location of most of the improvements in areas with 10% or less slope—the visitors complex would be on slopes of 20% or less—and an erosion control plan for the construction phase of the project when the potential for erosion is the greatest. The erosion control plan (Sheet L9) shows a stabilized construction entrance with an adjacent wash down area to limit

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

the tracking of materials into the public right-of-way. Jute netting would cover areas exceeding 20% slope. Hydroseeding of the slopes would further limit erosion on the steeper slopes. Fiber rolls would be installed at appropriate intervals on slopes of 2:1 or greater and at grade breaks, around temporary stockpiles, and along the toe top.

In addition to the erosion control plan for the landscape restoration described above in A.3., Sheet L10 includes 18 "Erosion Control Notes" which describe how erosion would be controlled in general and in specific situations, such as when it rains. As an overall requirement, the contractor would be required to refer to the SWPPP and have an approved Qualified Stormwater Practitioner (QSP) or his/her designee on site during periods of construction to insure that the Best Management Practices (BMP) are being implemented. This QSP would monitor and record erosion and sediment control measures during construction in a BMP Log. Weekly checks of the erosion control measures would be made during periods of heavy usage to insure that the control measures are functioning properly.

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

Discussion: The geotechnical report for the project did not identify any elevated risk associated with expansive soils.

6. Place sewage disposal systems in areas dependent upon soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, leach fields, or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available?

Discussion: The proposed project would use an onsite sewage disposal system, and County Environmental Health Services has determined that site conditions are appropriate to support such a system (see EHS comments, Attachment 10).

7. Result in coastal cliff erosion?

Discussion: The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a coastal cliff or bluff; and therefore, would not contribute to coastal cliff erosion.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

B. HYDROLOGY, WATER SUPPLY, AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | Place development within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Rate Map, dated March 2, 2006, no portion of the project site lies within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. | Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Rate Map, dated March 2, 2006, no portion of the project site lies within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. | Be inundated by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The subject parcel is located at the summit of the Santa Cruz Mountains at about 2,900 feet in elevation with no large bodies of water in the vicinity. Given this, a tsunami or seiche would not affect this property. The project geotechnical engineer did not identify mudflows as a risk for development in this area. The proposed improvements would be located on relatively modest slopes of 20% or less, and the local soil is sandy and is, therefore, unlikely to become saturated in heavy rainfall.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project would rely on a private well for water supply. The site currently has an existing well which was originally constructed to serve the single-family dwelling located on-site. Residential uses typically have a higher water demand than do recreational uses such as a park with landscaping that is anticipated to require little water once established. In addition, there are few wells in the vicinity since most of

