



# County of Santa Cruz

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

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

[www.sccoplanning.com](http://www.sccoplanning.com)

### NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

#### NOTICE OF PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT PERIOD

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the following project has been reviewed by the County Environmental Coordinator to determine if it has a potential to create significant impacts to the environment and, if so, how such impacts could be solved. A Negative Declaration is prepared in cases where the project is determined not to have any significant environmental impacts. Either a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is prepared for projects that may result in a significant impact to the environment.

Public review periods are provided for these Environmental Determinations according to the requirements of the County Environmental Review Guidelines. The environmental document is available for review at the County Planning Department located at 701 Ocean Street, in Santa Cruz. You may also view the environmental document on the web at [www.sccoplanning.com](http://www.sccoplanning.com) under the Planning Department menu. If you have questions or comments about this Notice of Intent, please contact Matt Johnston of the Environmental Review staff at (831) 454-3201

The County of Santa Cruz does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs or activities. If you require special assistance in order to review this information, please contact Bernice Shawver at (831) 454-3137 (TDD number (831) 454-2123 or (831) 763-8123) to make arrangements.

#### **PROJECT: Proposed Staub Field Camp, Staff Cabins and Learning/Dining Center**

**APP #: 121314**

**APN(S): 057-121-22 et al (thirteen parcels total, see Table 1 of Initial Study)**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Proposal to expand an existing educational research campus (Staub Field Camp) consisting of the construction of 12 student cabins (3,840 sq. ft. total), 2 staff cabins (1,880 sq. ft. total), a 3,816 sq. ft. Learning Center/Dining Hall, 400 square foot addition to existing classrooms, 900 sq. ft. Comfort Station (bathroom/shower), 720 sq. ft. laundry/break room, outdoor uncovered amphitheater/fire pit, the conversion of an existing non-habitable accessory structure into a training room, a lot line adjustment between APNs 057-121-22 and 057-151-03 and a significant tree removal. The project also includes approximately 468 cubic yards of excavation and 476 cubic yards of fill and improvements to School House Gulch Road at its intersection with Swanton Road.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Located at the end of Schoolhouse Gulch Road approximately 1/3 miles east of the intersection with Swanton Road (900 Schoolhouse Gulch).

**EXISTING ZONE DISTRICT: TP, CA, RA**

**APPLICANT: California Polytechnic State University Foundation**

**OWNER: CalPoly State University Foundation**

**PROJECT PLANNER: Robin Bolster-Grant**

**EMAIL: [Robin.Bolster-Grant@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Robin.Bolster-Grant@santacruzcounty.us)**

**ACTION: Negative Declaration with Mitigations**

**REVIEW PERIOD: February 19, 2015 through March 20, 2015** This project will be considered by the Planning Commission at a meeting on March 25, 2015. The meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean Street, Room 525, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.



# COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> 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: Proposed Staub Field Camp, Staff Cabins and Learning/Dining Center**

**APN(S): 057-121-22, et al (thirteen parcels total; see Table 1 in Initial Study)**

**Project Description:** Proposal to expand an existing educational research campus (Staub Field Camp) consisting of the construction of 12 student cabins (3,840 sq. ft. total), 2 staff cabins (1,880 sq. ft. total), a 3,816 sq. ft. Learning Center/Dining Hall, 400 square foot addition to existing classrooms, 900 sq. ft. Comfort Station (bathroom/shower), 720 sq. ft. laundry/break room, outdoor uncovered amphitheater/fire pit, the conversion of an existing non-habitable accessory structure into a training room, a lot line adjustment between APNs 057-121-22 and 057-151-03 and a significant tree removal. The project also includes approximately 468 cubic yards of excavation and 476 cubic yards of fill and improvements to School House Gulch Road at its intersection with Swanton Road.

**Project Location:** Located at the end of Schoolhouse Gulch Road approximately 1/3 miles east of the intersection with Swanton Road (900 Schoolhouse Gulch).

**Owner:** CalPoly State University Foundation

**Applicant:** California Polytechnic State University Foundation

**Staff Planner:** Robin Bolster-Grant

**Email:** [robin.bolster-grant@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:robin.bolster-grant@santacruzcounty.us)

**This project will be** considered by the Planning Commission at a meeting on March 25, 2015. The meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean Street, Room 525, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.

### 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, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Santa Cruz, California.

Review Period Ends: March 20, 2015

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
TODD SEXAUER, Environmental Coordinator  
(831) 454-3511



# County of Santa Cruz

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> 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:** January 26, 2015

**Application Number:** 121314

**Staff Planner:** Robin Bolster-Grant

### I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

**APPLICANT:** Calif. Polytechnic State University Foundation

**APN(s):** 057-121-22, et al (thirteen parcels total; see Table 1)

**OWNER:** CalPoly State Univ. Foundation

**SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT:** 3rd

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Located at the end of Schoolhouse Gulch Road approximately 1/3 miles east of the intersection with Swanton Road (900 Schoolhouse Gulch)

### **SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Proposal to expand an existing educational research campus (Staub Field Camp) consisting of the construction of 12 student cabins (3,840 sq. ft. total), 2 staff cabins (1,880 sq ft total), a 3,816 sq. ft. Learning Center/Dining Hall, 400 square foot addition to existing classrooms, 900 sq. ft. Comfort Station (bathroom/shower), 720 sq. ft. laundry/break room, outdoor uncovered amphitheater/fire pit, the conversion of an existing non-habitable accessory structure into a training room, a lot line adjustment between APNs 057-121-22 and 057-151-03 and a significant tree removal. The project also includes approximately 468 cubic yards of excavation and 476 cubic yards of fill and improvements to School House Gulch Road at its intersection with Swanton Road.

**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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials        | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing      |

Transportation/Traffic

Mandatory Findings of Significance

**DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL(S) BEING CONSIDERED:**

General Plan Amendment

Coastal Development Permit

Land Division

Grading Permit

Rezoning

Riparian Exception

Development Permit

Other: Lot Line Adjustment  
Significant Tree Removal

**NON-LOCAL APPROVALS:**

None

**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

2/13/15  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

Parcel Size (057-121-22; primary): approximately 380 acres  
Existing Land Use: Timber, agriculture, educational and residential facilities  
Vegetation: redwood/Douglas fir forest, cropland, grasslands/coastal terrace prairie  
Slope in area affected by project:  0 - 30%  31 - 100%  
Nearby Watercourse: Winter Creek, Archibald Creek  
Distance To: Bisect Property

### ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Water Supply Watershed: Not Mapped	Fault Zone: Not Mapped
Groundwater Recharge: Yes, portion	Scenic Corridor: Yes, Swanton Road
Timber or Mineral: Timber Resource	Historic: Cheese House
Agricultural Resource: Adjacent Parcels	Archaeology: Yes, no resource found
Biologically Sensitive Habitat: Yes: biotic report completed	Noise Constraint: No
Fire Hazard: Portion, outside development	Electric Power Lines: No
Floodplain: Not mapped	Solar Access: Adequate
Erosion: Moderate	Solar Orientation: Adequate
Landslide: Yes; Geology Report completed	Hazardous Materials: No
Liquefaction: No	Other:

### SERVICES

Fire Protection: CalFire	Drainage District: None
School District: N/A	Project Access: Swanton Road
Sewage Disposal: Private	Water Supply: Private

### PLANNING POLICIES

Zone District: TP, CA, RA	Special Designation:
General Plan: R-M	
Urban Services Line: <input type="checkbox"/> Inside	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outside
Coastal Zone: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inside	<input type="checkbox"/> Outside

### ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES:

The Swanton Pacific Ranch (Ranch) is located approximately 4 miles north of Davenport on the northwestern slopes of Ben Lomond Mountain. The site is reached via Swanton Road, which follows Scott Creek upstream. The project sites are located in the hillslopes east of the Scott Creek drainage. These hillslopes are dissected by westward draining creeks with intervening upland areas. North of the sites is Little Creek. South of the project sites are Winter Creek, Archibald Creek and Molino Creek.

The Ranch includes thirteen parcels and encompasses 3,280 acres. The Ranch consists of approximately 100 acres of cropland, 1,435 acres of redwood and Douglas fir and 1,500 acres of grassland. The forested land is located primarily on the eastern side of the property with moderate to steep slopes along several creeks that are

tributaries of Scotts Creek. The cropland lies alongside Scotts Creek, which bisects the property in a northwest/southeast direction. The grassland is on the coastal terraces on the west side of the property. The Ranch properties are owned by Cal Poly Corporation and managed by Cal Poly's College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences. The facility provides students and faculty researchers' educational opportunities in areas of sustainable agriculture, timber harvesting, riparian protection and many other areas of study.

The parcels range in size from ½ acre to 585.5 acres and are zoned primarily Commercial Agriculture (CA) and Timber Production (TP). Parcel 057-121-10 lies within the boundaries of the Ranch, but is owned by Al Smith family.

Two access roads currently serve the portion of the Ranch proposed for development: Old Schoolhouse Road and an unnamed access road to the north located at Archibald Creek.

The Ranch properties are developed with a number of existing structures, which are summarized in Table 1 below.

The existing educational programs on the Ranch encompass all thirteen parcels, via both classroom and field settings. All thirteen parcels are used for education and research and were used in the Rural Density Matrix calculation. However, the only parcels proposed for development under this application are APNs 057-121-22, 057-141-01, 057-151-05, 057-151-06, and 057-151-03.

Vegetation in the vicinity of the proposed improvements is primarily grassland with a scattering of *Ceanothus* and coast live oaks. The proposed project site near the Smith House have experienced significant levels of prior disturbance and the proposed cabin complex has been previously used as a staging area for forestry operations and has largely been cleared of most trees and other vegetation.

Surrounding land uses include the Bureau of Land Management (Coast Dairies) property to the south, Peninsula Open Space property to the east, timber property owned by Cemex, and agricultural property to the west and north.

#### **PROJECT BACKGROUND:**

The parcels occupied by the Swanton Ranch were donated to California Polytechnic State University (CalPoly) by Alfred Smith in 1993. The Ranch is used by CalPoly to provide a teaching environment for resource management. The facilities are used for ranch management and student housing.

The proposal to expand the existing facilities on the Ranch began in 1992, with a development review group application. At that time, the proposal consisted of the construction of eight campus buildings, including an administration/cafeteria building, three classrooms, three residence halls, and amphitheater.

Subsequently, a Rural Density Matrix (93-0507) was done to establish the appropriate density for the Ranch expansion. The Rural Matrix was updated several times, with the most recent Matrix completed in 2010.

The subject application was made following the 2010 Rural Density Matrix and a project consultation to review possible geologic hazards.

<b>Table 1 Existing Ranch Structures by Parcel Number</b>						
<b>Parcel</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Zone</b>	<b>GP</b>	<b>Primary Use</b>	<b>Development</b>	<b>Structure Size (Sq. Ft.)</b>
057-121-07	259.2	TP	RM	Timber	No	N/A
057-121-14	28.9	TP	RM	Timber/Range	No	N/A
057-121-22	382.4	TP	AG	Timber/Range	Staub House	1,972
057-131-18	272.8	CA	AG	Range/Timber	Hay Barn	Unknown
057-131-60	277.2	TP	AG	Range/Timber/ Crops	Scout Camp	Unknown
057-141-01	0.8	A	RM	Residence	Little Creek House	2,600
057-151-03	496.8	TP-L CA	AG	Timber/Range	Archibald House Al Green House Bunkhouse Cheesehouse	655 2,922 1,909 650
057-151-05	40.2	TP CA-P	AG	Crops	Barn	Unknown
057-151-06	585.5	PR-P CA-P	AG	Range/Timber	Red House Cabin Mobile Home George's Cottage Cal Barn Car Barn Machine Shop Round House	1,595 540 1,680 757 1,100
057-151-07	249.2	CA-P	AG	Range/Crops	None	N/A
057-251-08	0.7	TP	RM	Timber	None	N/A
057-251-09	40.2	TP	RM	Timber	None	N/A
057-301-01	550.8	CA-P	AG	Crops	Cowboy Shack Barn Yurt	300
<b>Zone Legend:</b>			<b>GP (General Plan Legend)</b>			
TP – Timber Production			AG - Agriculture			
TP-L – Timber Production – Historic Resource			RM – Mountain Residential			
CA – Commercial Agriculture						
CA-P – Commercial Agriculture – Ag Preserve						
PR-P – Parks, Recreation, Open Space – Ag Preserve						

## **DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The proposed expansion of the existing educational and research facilities includes the construction of a learning center and dining hall, twelve field camp cabins, two faculty duplexes, a comfort station with showers and restrooms, a cantina, and uncovered amphitheater. The physical development would occur in four primary locations on Swanton Ranch, the intersection of Swanton Road and Old Schoolhouse Road, the Learning Center and Dining Hall, and the Student and Staff Housing. The project also includes a lot line adjustment between two parcels (APNs 057-121-22 and 057-151-03).

### Swanton Road/Schoolhouse Gulch Road Intersection (APN 057-151-03)

Currently, the intersection of Swanton Road and Schoolhouse Gulch Road does not meet County of Santa Cruz Department of Public Works standards relative to safe line of sight. To address this, minor improvements are proposed. The proposed intersection improvements would include widening the existing entrance into the property and shifting the centerline of Schoolhouse Gulch Road approximately 25 feet to the south. The new intersection alignment would allow Schoolhouse Gulch Road to intersect Swanton Road in a more perpendicular configuration. Additionally, the intersection would become a right turn only and prevent vehicles leaving the Field Camp from making a left turn on to Swanton Road. This would require the construction of a raised island on the approach of Old Schoolhouse Road to Swanton Road and signage indicating right turn only.

### Learning Center and Dining Hall (APN 057-121-03)

The 3,816 square foot Learning Center and Dining Hall building is proposed to be constructed just west of the Al Smith House (existing) and attached to an existing classroom. A 400 square foot lab addition is proposed at the opposite (eastern) end of the existing classroom. This area is relatively flat and only a minimal amount of grading is proposed. Drainage Improvements in this area include the placement of a 30-foot long level spreader with perforated pipe and drain rock to receive the increased stormwater runoff from the new structure.

### Student and Staff Housing (APN 057-121-22)

Twelve (12) new 320 square foot cabins are proposed to be constructed just west of Smith Road. Additionally, an outdoor amphitheater, 900 square foot comfort station and 720 square foot cantina and laundry facility would be constructed in this area to serve the student residents. Grading for this portion of the project would require 224 cubic yards of cut and 381 cubic yards of fill, with five soldier pier retaining walls totaling 347 lineal feet, to a maximum height of 4 feet. Drainage improvements in the vicinity consist of 75-80 lineal feet of infiltration trenching on the downhill side of the cabins, and two 100 square foot bioretention swales at the eastern edge of the development.

Two 940 square foot staff duplexes are proposed south of Staub Road. Grading for this location consists of 44 cubic yards of cut and 95 cubic yards of fill. Two (2) soldier pier retaining walls are included, totaling 108 lineal feet and maximum height of 3 feet. Drainage improvements at this location consist of gravel sumps to capture drainage behind the retaining walls and grass swales leading to infiltration basins.



### Lot Line Adjustment

Approximately 12.4 acres of land would be transferred from APN 057-121-22 to 057-151-03. The intent of this adjustment is to consolidate the existing improvements onto APN 057-121-03.

### Erosion Control

Erosion control at the four areas of disturbance would consist of straw mulch and seed at the housing and learning center locations, with an erosion control blanket placed at the steeper graded area at the Swanton Road intersection. A stabilized construction entrance with base rock underlain by filter fabric, placed at the road leading to the staff cabins.

### Utilities

Three new septic tanks would be required, with a 5,000-gallon tank at the Learning Center and Dining Hall, a 6,000 gallon tank for the student cabins, and a 2,000 gallon tank at the staff cabin location. New leach field trenches and expansion areas would be provided for these three areas of development.

A new 100,000 gallon water storage tank would be constructed to the east/northeast of the new facilities, with 6-inch water lines to connect all three locations.

All utility extensions would be underground.

No new roads are proposed, with transportation between venues to be provided by van service to provide accessibility.

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 type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Landslides?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" 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 14.1 miles southwest of the San Andreas fault zone, and approximately 2.3 miles northeast of the San Gregorio 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.

A geologic investigation for the project was prepared by Pacific Geotechnical Engineering, dated November 12, 2010 (Attachment 5), and a geotechnical investigation was prepared by Dees & Associates, Inc., dated June 22, 2012 (Attachment 7). These reports have been reviewed and accepted by the Environmental Planning Section of the Planning Department (Attachment 6). The reports conclude that fault rupture would not be a potential threat to the proposed development, and that seismic shaking can be managed by constructing with conventional spread footings or pier and grade beam foundation systems and by

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

following the recommendations in the geologic and geotechnical reports referenced above.

The Geologic Feasibility Investigation and Revised Staub Housing Cluster Site letter, dated July 26, 2011 indicate the entire project area is underlain by a large landslide complex that is comprised of large blocks of displaced bedrock. The report and letter concluded that the potential for significant movement between the mapped landslide blocks to be low and the proposed sites for the student and staff cabins are geologically acceptable as long as the structures are not placed on top of the landslide boundaries. According to the Geotechnical Assessment, the site plan indicates that the proposed structures are not located on the landslide boundaries.

The Geotechnical Assessment further indicated no signs of ridgetop shattering or rock creep and low potential for these hazards to impact the proposed improvements.

A condition of project approval will require the implementation of the project design recommendations included in the review letter prepared by Environmental Planning staff (Attachment 6).

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 potential risk from landslide. The recommendations contained in the geotechnical report, locating all structures off the landslide boundaries, use of conventional spread footing embedded into firm, native soils, and drilled piers for structures located on slopes steeper than 20 percent are included as conditions of approval and would be implemented to avoid substantial adverse effects.

3. Develop land with a slope exceeding 30%?

**Discussion:** There are slopes that exceed 30% on the property. However, the only development on steep slopes is the grading proposed at the intersection of Swanton Road and Old Schoolhouse Road. The area to be graded will be developed with a 10-foot retaining wall with adequate subdrainage, therefore no significant impacts associated with improvements of the steep slope are anticipated.

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

**Discussion:** Some potential for erosion exists during the construction phase of the project; however, this potential is minimal because standard erosion controls are a required condition of the project, including the use of an erosion control blanket at the

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

area of steepest cut. Prior to approval of a grading or building permit, the project must have an approved Erosion Control Plan, which will specify detailed erosion and sedimentation control measures. The plan will include provisions for disturbed areas to be planted with ground cover and to be maintained to minimize surface erosion.

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. Additionally, the geotechnical engineer for the project evaluated the proposed leach field locations to assess suitability with respect to mapped landslides on the site (Attachment 14). The assessment found that the slopes below the leach field sites are gentle and underlain by shallow bedrock and concluded that there is low potential for deep seated landslides to develop below the leach field site.

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.

## 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?

**Discussion:** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Rate Map, dated May 16, 2012, no portion of the proposed development area lies within a 100-year flood hazard area.

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

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

**Discussion:** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Rate Map, dated May 16, 2012, no portion of the proposed development area lies within a 100-year flood hazard area.

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

**Discussion:** The proposed housing and associated facilities are located at an elevation hundreds of feet above sea level and therefore not subject to a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow hazard.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project would rely on a private well for water supply. Comments from Environmental Health Services indicate that groundwater supply is adequate in this area (Attachment 15). While a portion of the subject parcel is located in Mapped Groundwater Recharge, the proposed development would be outside the resource area.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. | Substantially degrade a public or private water supply? (Including the contribution of urban contaminants, nutrient enrichments, or other agricultural chemicals or seawater intrusion). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project would not discharge runoff either directly or indirectly into a public or private water supply. However, runoff from this project may contain small amounts of chemicals and other household contaminants. No commercial or industrial activities are proposed that would contribute contaminants. Potential siltation from the proposed project will be addressed through implementation of erosion control measures.

The parking and driveway associated with the project would incrementally contribute

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

urban pollutants to the environment; however, the contribution would be minimal given the size of the driveway and parking area. Potential siltation from the proposed project will be addressed through implementation of erosion control measures.

6. Degrade septic system functioning?

**Discussion:** There is no indication that existing septic systems in the vicinity would be affected by the project. Additionally, new septic tanks of 3,000, 5,000 and 6,000 gallons are proposed to accommodate the proposed development, as well as expanded leach and expansion areas. The large amount of available leach area will and distance from existing leach areas, would further ensure that the proposed development will not impact existing septic system functioning.

7. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding, on- or off-site?

**Discussion:** While the proposed project is located in the vicinity of watercourses, proposed grading is minimal and the addition of impervious surfaces is offset by the use of bioswales and percolation trenches to ensure that stormwater runoff is allowed to percolate and would not alter the existing overall drainage pattern of the site. Department of Public Works Drainage Section staff has reviewed and approved the proposed drainage plan.

8. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Discussion:** Drainage Analysis prepared by Fall Creek Engineering, Inc., dated September 9, 2012, has been reviewed for potential drainage impacts and accepted by the Department of Public Works (DPW) Drainage Section staff. The calculations show that stormwater runoff generated from the addition of impervious areas on the site would be retained and infiltrated into the native soils with infiltration trenches, bioretention swales or level spreaders. Stormwater runoff in excess of the capacity of the infiltration basins and bioretention swales would sheet flow over existing vegetation and terminate in natural drainage channels throughout the site. DPW staff have determined that existing stormwater facilities are adequate to handle the increase in drainage associated with the project. Refer to response B-5 for discussion of urban contaminants and/or other polluting runoff.

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

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 9. | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The proposed improvements do not occur within areas prone to flooding or in the vicinity of dams or levees.

- |     |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 10. | Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** A Site Assessment was performed by Fall Creek Engineering, dated October 1, 2012 (Attachment 16) to determine whether the location of the onsite sewage treatment posed risks to groundwater. The assessment concluded that soil conditions and groundwater monitoring in the vicinity of the improvements are well suited for a subsurface disposal system for wastewater with no anticipated impacts to groundwater.

### C. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- |    |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** A Wildlife Report was prepared for this project by Dan Grout, dated June 14, 2013 (Attachment 9). This report has been reviewed and accepted by the Planning Department Environmental Planning Section (Attachment 11). While several sensitive wildlife species are known to occur in the Swanton area, no species of concern were detected within the disturbed sites proposed for development. The project site does not harbor any habitat that is essential to any listed or sensitive wildlife species, nor are any sensitive species likely to occur within the project site.

The Wildlife Report found that while no listed or sensitive species were found to occur on the proposed project site, some sensitive species may occur in the general vicinity.

Reconnaissance level raptor surveys were conducted between March 15 and August 15, 2011 during the time of year considered by California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) as the critical breeding period. Surveys covered suitable raptor habitat and involved looking for nests, pellets, feathers and other signs of raptor nesting.

Protocol-level surveys for Marbled murrelets were also conducted in the areas

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

surrounding the project site in 2009, 2010, and 2011. Standard CDFW Marbled murrelet survey protocol guidelines were used during those focused surveys.

An acoustic bat monitoring survey was conducted on Swanton Pacific Ranch in June 2011 and a list of local bat species present on the site was developed utilizing this and other data.

A site assessment for California red-legged frog (CRLF) habitat was first conducted on the proposed project site on August 12, 2011 by Dan Grout, who has conducted CRLF surveys in every watershed in Santa Cruz County during the past 12 years. The habitat assessment revealed that no suitable CRLF occurs on the site due to the absence of any aquatic or wetland features. However, because a known CRLF breeding pond occurs at Lower Staub pond approximately 1,000 feet east of the project site, a series of day and night CRLF surveys were conducted on the project site during the non-breeding season to assist in confirming that the site is not regularly used as upland refugia by any foraging, resting or migrating red-legged frogs (see Attachment 9).

The Wildlife Report concluded that while direct impacts to listed species were not anticipated, several mitigation measures should be employed to ensure that no significant indirect or temporary impacts to bird, amphibian, or fish species occur. Required mitigation measures are as follows:

#### Bird Impact Avoidance Measures

- Conduct construction operations during the fall and winter, outside of the nesting period. Alternatively, a nest site (clearance) survey could be conducted in the spring/summer months just prior to planned construction to identify, mark and avoid any active bird nest trees in the few remaining trees left on the site.
- Use directional (downward-facing) outdoor lighting and low wattage so as to minimize light pollution
- Secure human food and food waste related to the construction and operation of the facility to reduce the likelihood of attracting corvids and potential predation of bird eggs.

#### Mammal Impact Avoidance Measures

- Prohibit the use of rodenticides in the Field Camp area.
- Restrict exterior lighting to downward-pointing outdoor lighting
- Remove any potential bat roost trees during the period when no maternity roosts are likely present (September 15 – January) or install exclusionary devices on the trees to prevent roosting prior to felling selected trees.



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

### California Red-legged Frog Impact Avoidance Measures

All construction shall comply with the following measures:

- Minimize the area over which wet-season construction activities occur.
- Attempt to construct most ground-disturbing activities to the dry months of the year when the red legged frogs (RLF) are unlikely to inhabit or move across upland sites.
- Require construction monitoring for red-legged frogs just prior to and during all the construction and delivery of equipment/supply activities to ensure no take of this species could occur during construction. The designated RLF Monitor will be notified by the Swanton Pacific Ranch Resource manager in a timely manner regarding the upcoming schedule for all construction activities. The RLF Monitor will be present during and prior to all construction activities, to conduct clearance surveys of roads and staging areas and construction zones, guide delivery trucks entering the site, and to give environmental training to all construction workers and associated vehicles and personnel those entering the site.
- The RLF monitoring and red-legged frog training should be conducted by an independent professional biologist certified as having experience conducting red-legged frog monitoring. Training of staff and construction crews will include red-legged frog identification, habits, occurrence in the area, legal status, how to operate and drive vehicles in the area, and what to do and who to contact should a frog be seen or detected in or near the construction zone. Laminated pocket cards regarding RLF avoidance procedures, field identification and reporting procedures will be handed out by SP staff to all those anticipated making more than one visit to the site for construction purposes.
- The SP Resource Manager will be responsible for ensuring that a RLF Avoidance and Monitoring Plan is implemented whereby the designated RLF Monitor will be present each day throughout the delivery/construction period or available by phone to assess what level of monitoring the proposed day's/week's construction activities will require.
- Any project-related trucks that need to use the upper Staub Road or drive past the Staub Pond or any staging areas within 300 feet of the pond will require that the designated RLF Monitor be notified and present to conduct a clearance survey and ensure that those areas are clear of any red-legged frogs immediately prior to them being used.
- The independent experienced RLF Monitor could delegate some minor or ongoing RLF construction monitoring duties to specifically identified and trained Ranch staff or student, at the discretion of the independent monitor. The decision by the independent RLF Monitor will take into consideration the time of year, type of work being done that day/week, proximity to Staub Pond and adjacent road, and the training and experience level of the staff/student monitor.

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

- Reduce to the maximum extent possible activities and practices that could result in sediments reaching Lower Staub Pond due to truck traffic on the road past the pond.
- Require all trucks and construction equipment to be cleaned with a pressure-hose prior to being driven onto the site to reduce the chance of introduction of invasive species or seeds/eggs to the site.
- The staging areas for construction materials, equipment and trucks from contracted personnel should be clearly delineated on aerial photographic maps and roped off on the ground to ensure the footprint of the project is minimized.
- Construction equipment and related trucks should be limited to moving and staging within the project site, which should be marked with norplex fencing. Should a staging area or trucks turn around area be needed in the Staub House area, norplex fencing should be erected prior to construction activity by a certified Red-legged frog biologist, with regular monitoring of the road and construction area if construction occurs during frog breeding or dispersal periods.

Once construction has been completed, the following operational measures shall be followed:

- Vehicles using the Field Camp Cabins will be parked more than 500 meters from Staub Pond, thus reducing the probability of road-killed frogs to nearly zero.
- With the exception of emergency vehicles and handicapped access, travel off-road on the campus is limited to foot traffic on a system of developed footpaths.
- Placement of signboards at two locations near the pond identifying this area as habitat for a threatened species and giving a brief description of red-legged frog natural history and habitat use.
- Prohibition of any activities within the pond and within 10 meters of the pond except those related to research, livestock management, forest management (as directed by the State-approved NTMP) and designated trail use of the existing trail by the Staub Pond. These uses will be limited to only those CalPoly staff/contractors that have received training in red-legged frog identification, biology, and impact avoidance measures by a certified RLF biologist.
- Require all students and staff residing at the field camp to watch a PowerPoint, video or printed presentation on red-legged frogs, prepared by a certified specialist. The material should cover red-legged frog identification, biology, and impact avoidance measures during the first two weeks of their attendance at the field camp. All staff and students and visitors should sign a form indicating that they have reviewed the educational materials and will comply with the provisions required by the regulatory agencies as conditions of project approval.

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

- Special precautions will be taken with food and trash storage to avoid attracting predators like raccoons. Trash containers in and/or near the cabin sites will be secured.

A Botanical Report was prepared by Grey Hayes, PhD, dated February 11, 2013 (Attachment 10) to assess the project site for the presence of protected plant species. The botanical report concluded that there would be no significant direct impacts to botanical resources as a result of the proposed project. Indirect impacts were identified as a result of plantings associated with the proposed development and disturbance fostering areas of establishment of new invasive plant populations. The following mitigation measures will be required to ensure no adverse impacts to botanical resources occur:

- No planting of CallIPC (California Invasive Plant Council (CallIPC) 2011) listed species, which are recognized threats in the region, shall occur.
- No planting of species in the following genera, as these could hybridize with sensitive species in the vicinity, threatening the integrity of the genepool. If these genera are desired, local collections shall be used in the landscape.
  - 1) Arctostaphylos
  - 2) Ceanothus
  - 3) Quercus
  - 4) Pinus

Invasive Species

- Plant species prioritized for the region as cited by CallIPC shall be controlled in areas disturbed and adjacent to disturbance associated with the project until replacement plantings have been established.

All recommendations made in the Wildlife and Botanical reports would be incorporated into the project conditions of approval. Implementation of these recommendations would ensure impacts to biotic resources resulting from the project would be less than significant.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. | Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations (e.g., wetland, native grassland, special forests, intertidal zone, etc.) or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** No riparian or other identified sensitive habitat has been identified in the