

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

---

This chapter evaluates the potential environmental impacts that would occur with implementation of the project: adoption and implementation of the West Broadway Urban Village Specific Plan. **Sections 4.1** through **4.14** of this chapter each address a different environmental issue area, as identified below. Each section describes the existing environmental conditions in the project area, discusses the project's consistency with regulations in each issue area, considers the project impacts resulting from implementation of the project, provides mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts of the project to the extent possible, and considers cumulative impacts as a result of the project in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects.

### ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THIS DRAFT EIR

The following environmental topics are addressed in this chapter:

- |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 4.1 Aesthetics                            | 4.8 Land Use and Planning   |
| 4.2 Air Quality and Global Climate Change | 4.9 Noise                   |
| 4.3 Biological Resources                  | 4.10 Population and Housing |
| 4.4 Cultural Resources                    | 4.11 Public Services        |
| 4.5 Geology and Soils                     | 4.12 Recreation             |
| 4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials       | 4.13 Transportation         |
| 4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality           | 4.14 Utilities              |

Preliminary analysis determined that the project would not result in significant impacts to energy and mineral resources. Subsequently, these issues are not examined in depth in sections within **Chapter 4.0** of this EIR, but are briefly discussed in **Chapter 6.0, CEQA Required Conclusions**.

### EXISTING CONDITIONS

Existing conditions are discussed in each environmental issue section with consideration of the physical setting of the project. The analysis provides information on the existing resources and, when appropriate, discusses the methodology that was used to determine these existing conditions. The information in the existing conditions discussions frequently originate from technical reports prepared for the project. In the sections related to public services, recreation, and utilities (**Sections 4.11, 4.12, and 4.14**, respectively), information is also provided on the

local utility and service providers, which was generally gathered from discussion with public service providers and employees.

## REGULATORY SETTING AND PROJECT CONSISTENCY

The regulatory setting section provides a description of the relevant regulations and guidelines that pertain to the issue area. This section may contain information from a variety of sources, such as from the Seaside General Plan, regional water or air quality plans, or other local, regional, state, or federal agency guidelines or regulations. A policy consistency analysis is also provided for each regulation. This analysis provides a brief evaluation of the project's conformity with the applicable policies and regulations.

## PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The evaluation of impacts considers the significance criteria, the level of environmental impact, and makes a determination as to whether there is a "significant impact," a "less-than-significant impact," a "beneficial impact," or if there is "no impact." Under CEQA §21068, a significant effect is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment. Each impact section of this Chapter is prefaced by a summary of significance criteria, used to determine whether impacts are likely to occur with development of the proposed project. These criteria have been developed using Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines as a foundation, with some refining of the criteria based on local regulations and other applicable federal, state, and local agencies' guidelines and regulations.

A "significant" designation is used under circumstances where the environmental impacts would meet or exceed one of the significance criteria. "Less-than-significant" impacts are those project related effects that would not reach a level of significance. For example, for a sensitive biological species, impacts would be generally considered significant if there was a potential to harm members of the species, or to reduce their habitat. Conversely, impacts would be considered less than significant if the habitats and species affected were common and widespread in the region and in the State. Where a "beneficial" impact would occur, implementation of the project would improve conditions related to the significance criteria. In some cases it is determined that there is "no impact" to a resource category. Areas where the project would not result in impacts are discussed under the subheading "Issues Not Discussed Further."

Any identified impacts are numbered and shown in bold type. For significant impacts, mitigation measures are provided that would reduce the effects of these impacts. Following the discussion of mitigation measures, there is an evaluation of the "Significance After Mitigation". The majority, but not all, of the significant impacts identified in this EIR can be mitigated to a "less-than-significant" level.

## CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

A cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project together with other projects causing related impacts. Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts as "two or more individual effects which, when taken

together, are considerable, or which can compound or increase other environmental impacts.” The cumulative impacts discussion describes whether the impacts of the project in combination with the impacts from other reasonably foreseeable projects would be significant, and determines whether the project’s contribution to any significant cumulative impacts would be cumulatively considerable. Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines provides direction regarding cumulative impact analysis as follows:

- An EIR should not discuss cumulative impacts that do not result, in part, from the proposed project;
- A lead agency may determine that an identified cumulative impact is less than significant, and shall briefly identify facts and analysis in the EIR supporting its determination;
- A lead agency may determine a project’s incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable and, therefore, is not significant and shall briefly describe in the EIR that basis for its determination; and
- A lead agency may determine a project’s cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact may be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and, therefore, residually not significant, if the project implements or funds its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact.

## CUMULATIVE IMPACT METHODOLOGY

When evaluating cumulative impacts, CEQA recommends one of two methods:

- 1) A list of past, present, and probable future project producing related or cumulative impacts
- 2) A summary of projects contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document which describes or evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.

For this EIR, both methods are utilized depending on the environmental topic area under consideration. Discussions of aesthetics, biological resources, land use, public services/utilities, recreation, and traffic utilize the list method. Other topical discussions utilize the 2004 Seaside General Plan and the associated EIR.<sup>1</sup> **Table 4.1** lists both approved and pending projects in the cities of Sand City, Marina, and Seaside.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Traffic Analysis utilized a blended approach. Cumulative impacts calculated for the year 2012 relied on the list method, taking into account approved but not yet constructed projects. To determine cumulative impacts for the anticipated buildout year of 2027, the Traffic Analysis applied a growth rate on top of the traffic anticipated under year 2012 cumulative conditions.

Table 4.1 Cumulative Projects

Project	Location	Anticipated Development
<b>Projects Approved, Not Yet Constructed</b>		
Cypress Knolls	Off Del Monte Boulevard, City of Marina	712 unit active adult housing units; new senior center, school or park
Marina Station	City of Marina	Mixed Use Project: 1360 residential units, 60,000 square feet retail space, 144,000 square feet of office space, 652,000 square feet business park/industrial development
Seaside Auto Center	Off Del Monte Boulevard, City of Seaside	Improvements to the existing auto mall; no change in development intensity is anticipated
Seaside Resort	Off General Jim Moore Boulevard, City of Seaside	300 room hotel, 170 timeshare units; 150 residential units
The Dunes on Monterey Bay	Off Imjin Parkway, City of Marina	Mixed Use Project.. Phase I (retail component) has been constructed.
<b>Projects in Approval Pipeline</b>		
Del Monte Hotel	Off Del Monte Boulevard, City of Seaside	95 room hotel adjacent to project area
MainGate Shopping Center	North of Lightfighter Drive, City of Seaside	560,000 sq ft commercial; 250 room hotel. Contingent on execution of land swap with Fort Ord Reuse Authority
Concours Luxury Auto Center/ Public Amphitheater	South of Lightfighter Drive, City of Seaside	Development of combined auto mall with public performance center. Contingent on execution of land swap with Fort Ord Reuse Authority
Southeast Sector Planning Area	East of General Jim Moore Boulevard, City of Seaside	Approximately 650 acres of low to medium density residential development, plus 50 acres of neighborhood commercial development on the eastern flank of the City.

Source: City of Seaside, 2008.