

RESOLUTION NO. 11-23 (PC)

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO ADOPT AND CERTIFY A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE DOWNTOWN WATSONVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN; AND ADOPTING CONCURRENTLY ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PROJECT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

Project: Downtown Watsonville Specific Plan

WHEREAS, the Downtown Watsonville Specific Plan (DWSP) is a planning tool to implement the General Plan and to guide development in a specific area; and

WHEREAS, the DWSP is intended to be a tool for developers, property owners, City staff and decision makers by providing strong and clear policies, development standards, and a vision that guides land use decisions, infrastructure improvements, design, and economic development activities in the project area; and

WHEREAS, the overarching goals of the DWSP are to facilitate housing production and preservation; increase retail-entertainment activity; encourage higher-density mixed-use residential projects; add visitor-oriented uses; support a greater range of civic and cultural activities; improve the safety and comfort of pedestrians; enhance bicycle infrastructure and connections; and target uses and activities that appeal to a wide range of Watsonville's residents and employees; and

WHEREAS, the DWSP establishes new zones and overlays, which are intended to concentrate urban activity and intensity in the center of downtown and allows development to transition to existing lower-intensity neighborhood settings at the periphery of the DWSP plan area and to industrial activity to the south; and

WHEREAS, the new zones consist of the Downtown Core and Downtown Neighborhood Zones; and

WHEREAS, the Downtown Core Zone is an active, walkable environment, characterized by buildings up to six stories. This is the heart of Downtown—generally flanking Main Street—where the most active and intense development patterns and uses are anticipated. Upper floors contain residential units or office space. Buildings are close to the sidewalk and have little-to-no side setbacks; and

WHEREAS, the Downtown Neighborhood Zone is characterized by smaller scale buildings than those of the Downtown Core Zone and generally includes a similar mix of active and residential uses; and

WHEREAS, as part of implementing the DWSP, it is anticipated that the City will amend the Zoning Map to reflect the boundaries of the DWSP plan area; and

WHEREAS, as part of implementing the DWSP, it is anticipated that the City will amend the Zoning Code (Title 14 of the Watsonville Municipal Code) to create a new DWSP district and reference the permitted uses and development standards in Chapter 6 of the adopted DWSP document; and

WHEREAS, as the DWSP's zoning is inconsistent with the Watsonville General Plan, the General Plan is being updated concurrent with the Specific Plan to ensure consistency between the two documents; and

WHEREAS, as part of implementing the DWSP, it is anticipated that the City will adopt a General Plan Amendment to add two new mixed-used land use designations and align the General Plan land use diagram by changing the existing land use designations of the DWSP plan area to correspond with the zones shown on the Regulating Plan, Figure 6-1, of the DWSP; and

WHEREAS, the proposed General Plan Amendment also includes amending implementation measures 4.A.3, 4.C.6 and 10.C.2; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 14-12.700 of the Watsonville Municipal Code, the General Plan text and land use diagram may be amended whenever the public necessity, the general community welfare, and good zoning practice permit such an amendment to the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared an Initial Study, in 2022, to evaluate potential impacts of the DWSP (or “project”) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Following preparation of the Initial Study, the City determined the potential for the proposed project to result in potentially significant impacts; and

WHEREAS, on October 7, 2022, the City prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) stating that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project would be prepared. This NOP, along with the accompanying Initial Study was circulated to the public, local, state, and federal agencies, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the project through November 25, 2022. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR; and

WHEREAS, on May 12, 2023, the City published a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR, which started a 45-day public review period. The NOA was filed with the California Office of Planning and Research under State Clearinghouse No. 2022100602. The review period for the Draft EIR ended on June 26, 2023; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15086, the City consulted with and requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies, and others during the public review and comment period; and

WHEREAS, the City received two letters or emails from public agencies and two letters or emails from individual members of the public during the 45-day Draft EIR public review and comment period; and

WHEREAS, the City prepared written responses to the comments received during the comment period and included these responses in a separate volume entitled DWSP Final EIR. The Final EIR includes a list of those who commented on the Draft EIR, copies of written comments, written responses to comments regarding the environmental review, and errata with minor text changes made to the Draft EIR as a result of comments. The Final EIR was made available for public review on August 11, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the Draft EIR and Final EIR, consisting of the comments received during the 45-day public review and comment period on the Draft EIR, written responses to those comments, and revisions to the Draft EIR constitute the EIR prepared for the DWSP (SCH #2022100602). For the purposes of this Resolution, the EIR shall refer to the Draft EIR, as revised by the Errata to the Draft EIR, which is included as chapter 3 in the Final EIR document; and

WHEREAS, the EIR identified certain significant and potentially significant adverse effects on the environment what would result from implementing the DWSP; and

WHEREAS, the EIR outlined various mitigation measures that would substantially lessen or avoid many of the project's significant effects on the environment, as well as alternatives to the project as proposed that would provide some environmental advantages; and

WHEREAS, the City is required to adopt all feasible mitigation measures or feasible project alternatives that can substantially lessen or avoid any significant environmental effects of the project; and

WHEREAS, the EIR analyzed the project alternatives, including a No Project Alternative (#1), Repurposed Walker Street Industrial Uses Alternative (#2), and Reduced Density Alternative (#3); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081 and CEQA Guidelines §15091, a lead agency, before approving a project for which an EIR has been prepared and certified, must adopt findings specifying whether mitigation measures and, in some instances, alternatives discussed in the EIR, have been adopted or rejected as infeasible; and

WHEREAS, a set of Findings of Fact are attached with this Resolution in order to satisfy Public Resources Code §21081 and CEQA Guidelines §15091; and

WHEREAS, all of the alternatives would not sufficiently satisfy the project objectives. For example, the Reduced Density Alternative (#3) would not fulfill to the same or better level objectives related to creating inclusive housing opportunities, promoting local economic prosperity, or innovate mobility options and connections. Additionally, lowered density housing may be less financially feasible; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has determined that none of the alternatives addressed in the EIR would be both feasible and environmentally superior to the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission specifically finds that where more than one reason for approving the proposed project and rejecting alternatives and suggested mitigation measures is given in its findings or in the record, and where more than one reason is given for adopting the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Planning Commission would have made its recommendation on the basis of any one of those reasons; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission desires, in accordance with CEQA, to declare that, despite the potential for significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives, there exist certain overriding economic, social, and other considerations for approving the proposed Project that the Planning Commission believes justify the occurrence of those impacts; and

WHEREAS, all the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines have been satisfied by the City in the EIR, which is sufficiently detailed so that all of the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed project have been adequately evaluated.

WHEREAS, notice of time and place of the hearing to consider the adoption a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and certification EIR for the project was given at the time and in the manner where appropriate public noticing procedures have been followed and a public hearing was held according to Section 14-10.900 of the Watsonville Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has considered all evidence received, both oral and documentary, and the matter was submitted for decision.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Watsonville, California, as follows:

1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct and they are hereby incorporated by reference into this Resolution.

2. Good cause appearing, and upon the Findings, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "A", the Planning Commission of the City of Watsonville does hereby recommend adoption and certification of the Final EIR for the DWSP, and adoption concurrently a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and Statement of

Overriding Considerations for the project, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, which are attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was introduced at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Watsonville, California, held on the 5th of September 2023, by Commissioner Vega, who moved its adoption, which motion being duly seconded by Commissioner Rojas, was upon roll call, carried and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Acosta, Dodge, Radin, Rojas, Sencion, Vega, Veitch-Olson

Noes: Commissioners: None

Absent: Commissioners: None

DocuSigned by:

8B68DD4F44E04B9...
Suzi Merriam, Secretary
Planning Commission

DocuSigned by:

9B77EA562B7442C...
Daniel Dodge, Chairperson
Planning Commission

**CITY OF WATSONVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION**

EXHIBIT A

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT & STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION TO CEQA FINDINGS

The City of Watsonville (City) prepared a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Downtown Watsonville Specific Plan (DWSP or project). The Final EIR, which is comprised of the Draft EIR; Responses to Public Comments; Errata to the Draft EIR; and appendices and supporting technical studies and reports, addresses the potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the DWSP, including potential construction and operation impacts of the development and land uses envisioned in the DWSP.

The Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Findings) set forth below are presented for adoption by the City Council, as the City's findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) relating to the project. The Findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of this Planning Commission regarding the project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives to the project, and the overriding considerations, which in this Planning Commission's view, justify approval of the proposed project, despite significant and unavoidable environmental effects.

A. Project Location

Watsonville is in the southern area of Santa Cruz County, approximately 14 miles southeast of the city of Santa Cruz, approximately 16 miles north of the city of Salinas, and approximately 22 miles northeast of the city of Monterey. Watsonville is bordered by the unincorporated communities of Freedom to the north, Interlaken to the east, and Pajaro to the south. The Monterey Bay/Pacific Ocean is approximately three miles west of the City.

The DWSP plan area encompasses approximately 195.5 acres within Downtown Watsonville, located in the southeastern portion of the City. Approximately 55.5 acres (28 percent) of the DWSP plan area is dedicated to streets and rights-of-way. Downtown is centered on Main Street and extends west to the edge of existing neighborhoods and the industrial district, south to Pajaro, and several blocks east to the existing neighborhoods. State Route 152 runs through the approximate center of the DWSP plan area and operates along portions of Main Street and as a one-way couplet along E Lake Avenue and E Beach Street. Riverside Drive on the south end of the DWSP plan area is a part of State Route 129.

B. Project Description Summary

The proposed project consists of the Downtown Watsonville Specific Plan (DWSP). Generally, a specific plan is a regulatory tool that local governments use to implement their General Plan and to guide development in a localized area. The proposed DWSP has been developed to articulate a community vision and a planning framework for the downtown area of Watsonville that would serve as a guide for the City and other public

agency decision makers, community members, and stakeholders over the next 20 to 30 years. The proposed DWSP provides a land use and mobility plan along with development and design regulations to guide future public and private development projects in the downtown area. Additionally, the DWSP includes an implementation strategy and mechanisms to ensure development is coordinated and satisfying the intent of the DWSP. Implementation of the DWSP would require an amendment to the City's current General Plan.

The land use components of the DWSP would help the City achieve its objective of incorporating higher density commercial and housing opportunities by accommodating additional residential uses in a compact and active mixed-use environment through both new construction and adaptive reuse of historic or existing buildings. The DWSP envisions the addition of up to 3,886 new residential units, 231,151 square feet of commercial development, 376,827 square feet of industrial development, and 114,572 square feet of civic space within the downtown area. Because the planning area is mostly developed with commercial buildings and established residential neighborhoods, the DWSP directs future potential growth toward a limited number of vacant or under-utilized sites that could be redeveloped.

The mobility components of the DWSP focus on the provision of multi-modal transportation options in the downtown area, such as vehicle, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian mode options. It includes design concepts for downtown streets, as well as bicycle and pedestrian network improvements. In addition, the mobility component identifies mobility goals, such as the provision of complete streets, effective and sufficient parking, curb management, a road diet, a roundabout, and travel demand management strategies.

C. Project Objectives

The DWSP would encourage higher-intensity, mixed-use neighborhoods by coalescing the City's Downtown with adjacent industrial and residential areas to create walkable and complete neighborhoods with a mix of retail, services, amenities, employment, and residential uses that would help to activate the Downtown area. The DWSP establishes the following guiding principles and objectives for Downtown Watsonville:

- Preserve key elements that make Downtown unique
- Establish a varied choice of uses and experiences for our diverse community
- Create diverse and inclusive housing opportunities
- Promote local economic prosperity
- Create a vibrant, safe, and active Downtown
- Foster a healthy, inclusive, & culturally connected community where all can thrive
- Re-imagine and innovate mobility options and connections
- Incorporate sustainable design elements to improve community health

D. Procedural Compliance with CEQA

The City of Watsonville prepared an Initial Study to evaluate potential impacts of the proposed project. Following preparation of the Initial Study, the City determined the potential for the proposed project to result in potentially significant impacts. The City prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on October 7, 2022, stating that an EIR for the project would be prepared. This NOP, along with the accompanying Initial Study was circulated to the public, local, state, and federal agencies, and other interested parties to

solicit comments on the project through November 25, 2022. Concerns raised in response to the NOP were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR. The Notice of Availability for the Draft EIR was published on May 12, 2023. The Draft EIR was published for public review and comment on May 12, 2023 and was filed with the California Office of Planning and Research under State Clearinghouse No. 2022100602. The review period for the Draft EIR ended on June 26, 2023.

The City prepared written responses to the comments received during the comment period and included these responses in a separate volume entitled Downtown Watsonville Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report. The Final EIR includes a list of those who commented on the Draft EIR, copies of written comments (coded for reference), written responses to comments regarding the environmental review, and errata with minor text changes made to the Draft EIR as a result of comments. The Final EIR was made available for public review on August 11, 2023.

E. Consideration and Incorporation of the Environmental Impact Report

In adopting these Findings, the Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR was presented, which reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the proposed project. By these Findings, the Planning Commission ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the analysis, explanations, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the Final EIR. The Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Final EIR represents the independent judgment and analysis of the City.

The City finds, accordingly, that the Final EIR was published, circulated and reviewed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and constitutes an accurate, objective, and complete Final EIR. The Final EIR is hereby incorporated by reference into these Findings of Fact.

F. Requirements for CEQA Findings

Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081 and CEQA Guidelines §15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant impact:

- 1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- 2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- 3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

The City of Watsonville has made one or more of these specific written findings regarding each significant impact associated with the DWSP. Those findings are presented below, along with a presentation of facts in support of the Findings of Fact. The City of Watsonville Planning Commission finds that these Findings of Fact are based on full

appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these Findings of Fact, concerning the environmental issues identified and discussed. These Findings of Fact are based on evidence contained in the totality of the administrative record before the City Council, including but not limited to the Final EIR supporting evidence cited herein.

II. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the City of Watsonville's Findings of Fact are based are located at 250 Main Street, Watsonville, California. The custodian of these documents is Justin Meek, AICP, Principal Planner. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code § 21081.6(a)(2) and 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15091(e).

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings of Fact, the Record of Proceedings for the project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

- The Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and all other public notices issued by the City of Watsonville and in conjunction with the project.
- The Draft and Final EIRs, including appendices and technical studies included or referenced in the Draft and Final EIRs, including the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project.
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft EIR.
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the City of Watsonville with respect to the project.
- All Findings and resolutions adopted by the City of Watsonville decision makers in connection with the project and all documents cited or referred to therein.
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc., consultant to the City of Watsonville.
- All reports, memoranda, documentation, data output files relating to the land use and transportation modeling for the project.
- All documents and information submitted to the City of Watsonville by responsible, trustee, or other public agencies, or by individuals or organizations, in connection with the project, up through the date the City of Watsonville City Council approved the project.
- Matters of common knowledge to the City of Watsonville, including, but not limited to federal, State, and local laws and regulations.
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings of Fact, in addition to those cited above.
- Any other materials required to be in the Record of Proceedings by Public Resources Code § 21167.6(e).

III. FINDINGS FOR IMPACTS IDENTIFIED AS POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The City of Watsonville Planning Commission hereby finds that the following mitigation measures identified in the EIR which will avoid or substantially lessen the following environmental impacts reducing them to a less than significant level, have been required

in or incorporated into the project. These findings are based on the discussion of impacts in the detailed impact analyses in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, as well as relevant responses to comments in the Final EIR. ***The findings below are for impacts where implementation of the project may result in the following significant environmental impacts that will be reduced to less than significant levels following mitigation:***

A. Air Quality

1. The development envisioned in the DWSP would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. (EIR Impact AQ-3)

- a) **Potential Impact.** The development envisioned in the DWSP could incorporate generators, other permitted sources of toxic air contaminants, potentially unpermitted sources and potentially heavy-duty truck traffic in excess of 100 vehicles per day. Emissions from these sources could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, such as concentrations of diesel exhaust.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures AQ-3(a) through AQ-3(b) are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
 - (1) **Effects of Mitigation.** The impacts related to sensitive receptors exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations will be mitigated to a less than significant level by requiring the use of specialized construction equipment, such as Tier 4 equipment, and preparation of the Health Risk Assessment to identify and design the measures necessary to reduce pollutant concentrations at receptors.
 - (2) **Remaining Impacts.** Remaining impacts related to sensitive receptors exposure to substantial pollutant concentrations would not be significant.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.2-20 through 4.2-23 of the Draft EIR.

B. Biological Resources

1. Project activities could disturb known special status species or their associated habitat, including migratory nesting birds. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation. (EIR Impact BIO-1)

- a) **Potential Impact.** The proposed project would remove habitat suitable for special-status wildlife species, such as Santa Cruz tarplant, and could directly impact these species if present within the suitable habitat during construction. Additionally, removal of vegetation cover during construction could impact nesting migratory bird species or their nests.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
 - (3) **Effects of Mitigation.** The impacts related to special-status species and nesting migratory birds, including their habitats, will be mitigated to a

less than significant level by requiring surveys to be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to construction, relocation of Santa Cruz tarplant, and excluding construction access from both tarplant and active migratory nest sites.

- (4) **Remaining Impacts.** Remaining impacts related to special-status species, nesting migratory birds, and their habitat would not be significant.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.3-6 through 4.3-8 of the Draft EIR.

C. Cultural Resources

1. **Future development facilitated by the DWSP would have the potential to encounter subsurface resources as excavation required for construction could occur in undisturbed soil. Damage or destruction of archaeological resources would be a potential adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources. Accordingly, project impacts would be potentially significant, and mitigation is required. (Draft EIR Appendix A- Initial Study Section 5, Cultural Resources)**

- a) **Potential Impact.** Construction of the development envisioned in the DWSP, including new buildings and infrastructure, would involve excavation and ground disturbance. Ground-disturbing activities would have the potential to unearth previously unidentified archaeological resources.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3 are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
- (1) **Effects of Mitigation.** The impacts related to archaeological resources will be mitigated to a less than significant level by requiring construction activities to halt near archaeological finds until further evaluated and protected, as applicable, by a qualified archaeologist.
- (2) **Remaining Impacts.** Remaining impacts related to archaeological resources would not be significant.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 19 through 21 of the Initial Study, which is provided as Appendix A to the Draft EIR.

D. Geology and Soils

1. **Future development facilitated by the DWSP would have the potential to encounter subsurface paleontological resources as excavation required for construction could occur in undisturbed soil. Damage or destruction of paleontological resources would be a potentially significant impact, and mitigation is required. (Draft EIR Appendix A: Initial Study Section 7, Geology and Soils)**

- a) **Potential Impact.** Construction of the development envisioned in the DWSP, including new buildings and infrastructure, would involve excavation and ground disturbance. Ground-disturbing activities would have the potential to unearth and damage or destroy paleontological resources.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measure GEO-1 is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP.

- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
 - (1) **Effects of Mitigation.** The impacts related to paleontological resources will be mitigated to a less than significant level by stopping construction work in the area of uncovered paleontological resources until evaluation by a paleontologist is completed and treatment has been applied consistent with the direction of the paleontologist.
 - (2) **Remaining Impacts.** Remaining impacts related to paleontological resources would not be significant.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 29 through 30 of the Initial Study, which is provided as Appendix A to the Draft EIR.

E. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. Implementation of the DWSP could accommodate development on or near hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant. (EIR Impact HAZ-1)

- a) **Potential Impact.** Development envisioned in the DWSP would occur on hazardous sites, depending on the property or properties where specific projects are proposed within the DWSP plan area. Construction on these hazardous sites could expose workers to hazardous materials. Operation of the development could expose people to hazardous materials on these sites.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures HAZ-1(a) and HAZ-1(b) are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
 - (1) **Effects of Mitigation.** The impacts related to hazardous materials sites will be mitigated to a less than significant level by requiring a Phase I and/or Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, and as applicable, a soil management plan and soil remediation activities to remove hazardous materials.
 - (2) **Remaining Impacts.** Remaining impacts related to hazardous materials sites would not be significant.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.5-8 through 4.5-11 of the Draft EIR.

F. Tribal Cultural Resources

1. Development envisioned in the DWSP would have the potential to adversely change tribal cultural resources. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would reduce the impact to less than significant. (EIR Impact TCR-1)

- a) **Potential Impact.** Subsurface excavation and grading required for the construction of the development envisioned in the DWSP would have the potential to uncover and either damage or destroy unknown or unidentified tribal cultural resources, if present.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measure TCR-1 is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:

- (1) **Effects of Mitigation.** The impacts related to tribal cultural resources will be mitigated to a less than significant level by requiring construction work to halt around discovery of a potential tribal cultural resource, and development of a mitigation plan is the resource is determined to be a tribal cultural resource, in consultation with a representative from the applicable Native American tribe.
- (2) **Remaining Impacts.** Remaining impacts related to tribal cultural resources would not be significant.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.9-4 through 4.9-5 of the Draft EIR.

IV. FINDINGS FOR IMPACTS IDENTIFIED AS SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

The City of Watsonville Planning Commission hereby finds that the following environmental impacts would be significant and unavoidable. These findings are based on the discussion of impacts in the detailed impact analyses in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, as well as relevant responses to comments in the Final EIR. ***The findings below are for impacts where implementation of the project may result in the following significant environmental impacts that will remain significant following mitigation, and therefore are also unavoidable:***

A. Air Quality

1. **The proposed project would introduce additional housing to the area and contribute to population growth that conflicts with the growth assumptions in the Air Quality Management Plan. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. (EIR Impact AQ-1)**
 - a) **Potential Impact.** The proposed project would add an estimated 3,866 additional residential units, which would increase the City's population by 13,679 to approximately 64,348. According to AMBAG's population forecast, the City's population would be 56,344 in 2045. Therefore, the estimated population of 64,348 with buildout of the DWSP would exceed AMBAG's population forecasts for 2045 by approximately 8,004 people. Since the anticipated increase in population would be inconsistent with long-term growth projections for the county, implementation of the DWSP would conflict with an air quality plan. Additionally, emissions from operation of the development envisioned in the DWSP would exceed regional threshold of ROG, CO and PM₁₀.
 - b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measure AQ-1, as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measure AQ-1, the impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.
 - c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
 - (1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measure AQ-1 is determined to be the only feasible measures the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts resulting from conflicts with an air quality plan. Mitigation measure AQ-1 requires project level analysis of air pollutant emissions and development of project specific mitigation to reduce those emissions below applicable thresholds established by the

Monterey Bay Air Resources District. This mitigation measure applies to discretionary projects in the DWSP plan area that are not exempt from CEQA.

- (2) **Remaining Impacts.** There are no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce population and employment and be consistent with the objectives of the DWSP. Reducing the growth envisioned in the DWSP would not necessarily reduce population growth because people could still move to the region or Basin, but would reside outside of the DWSP plan area. Additionally, as the AQMP is updated to reflect new growth assumptions, the anticipated growth from the DWSP would be accounted for in the next AQMP emissions calculations. However, as the growth forecasts are currently inconsistent with AQMP projections, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable until that time.
- (3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting in potential conflicts with an air quality plan, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.2.16 through 4.2-17 of the Draft EIR.

2. Construction and operation of development envisioned by the DWSP would result in the temporary and long-term generation of air pollutants, which would affect local air quality and exceed MBARD thresholds. Therefore, this impact is significant and unavoidable. (EIR Impact AQ-2)

- a) **Potential Impact.** Long-term operation of the development envisioned in the DWSP would generate emissions attributed to vehicle trips (mobile emissions), the use of natural gas and electricity (energy source emissions), and consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscape maintenance equipment (area source emissions) from development envisioned in the DWSP. The emissions from operational sources would exceed Monterey Bay Air Resources District's significance thresholds for ROG, CO, and PM₁₀. Construction emissions would be below these thresholds.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measure AQ-1, as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measure AQ-1, the impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
 - (1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measure AQ-1 is determined to be the only feasible measures the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts resulting from operational air pollutant emissions. Mitigation measure AQ-1 requires project level analysis of air pollutant emissions and development of project specific mitigation to reduce those emissions below applicable thresholds established by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District. This mitigation measure applies to discretionary projects in the DWSP plan area that are not exempt from CEQA.

- (2) **Remaining Impacts.** While mitigation measure AQ-1 is feasible and would be implemented, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the cumulative emissions of the development envisioned in the DWSP could still exceed thresholds established by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District.
- (3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting in the generation of air pollutant emissions, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.2-17 through 4.2.20 of the Draft EIR.
3. **The DWSP would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to emissions of air pollution and conflicts with an applicable air quality management plan. (EIR Impact AQ-C1)**
- a) **Potential Impact.** Long-term operation of the development envisioned in the DWSP would generate emissions attributed to vehicle trips (mobile emissions), the use of natural gas and electricity (energy source emissions), and consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscape maintenance equipment (area source emissions) from development envisioned in the DWSP. The cumulative total emissions from operational sources would exceed Monterey Bay Air Resources District's significance thresholds for ROG, CO, and PM10. Additionally, cumulative population growth in the region would exceed AMBAG's population forecasts for 2045.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures AQ-1, AQ-3(a), and AQ-3(b), as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.2, Air Quality, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1, AQ-3(a), and AQ-3(b), the impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
- (1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measures AQ-1, AQ-3(a), and AQ-3(b) are determined to be the only feasible measures the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts resulting from cumulative population growth and air pollutant emissions. Mitigation measure AQ-1 requires project level analysis of air pollutant emissions and development of project specific mitigation to reduce those emissions below applicable thresholds established by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District. Mitigation measures AQ-3(a) and AQ-3(b) require specialized construction equipment, such as Tier 4 equipment, and project-specific health risk assessments to ensure sensitive land uses are not exposed to concentrations of toxic pollutants that exceed regulatory thresholds. These mitigation measures apply to discretionary projects in the DWSP plan area that are not exempt from CEQA.
- (2) **Remaining Impacts.** While mitigation measures AQ-1, AQ-3(a), and AQ-3(b) are feasible and would be implemented, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the cumulative emissions of the

development envisioned in the DWSP could still exceed thresholds established by the Monterey Bay Air Resources District. Likewise, these mitigation measures would not prevent cumulative population growth, which would exceed current AMBAG's population projections for 2045.

(3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse cumulative impact of the project resulting in the generation of air pollutant emissions and population growth, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.

d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to page 4.2-24 of the Draft EIR.

B. Cultural Resources

1. Development envisioned in the DWSP could adversely affect known and previously unidentified historical resources. Impacts to historical resources would be significant and unavoidable. (EIR Impact CUL-1)

a) **Potential Impact.** Development under the proposed project could impact historical resources through construction activities associated with buildout. Future infill development could consist of modern-style architecture, which if located near a historic building, could adversely change the historic context or setting in which the historic building occurs. Moreover, if future infill development would involve redevelopment/demolition of existing structures, it is possible that such structures could have historical significance (as determined by site specific evaluation) given the presence of structures that are over 50 years old within the DWSP plan area. Redevelopment or demolition could result in the permanent loss of or permanent adverse changes to historic structures.

b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures CUL-1(a), CUL-1(b), and CUL-1(c), as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1(a), CUL-1(b), and CUL-1(c), the impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.

c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:

(1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measures CUL-1(a), CUL-1(b), and CUL-1(c) are determined to be the only feasible measures the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts to historic resources. Mitigation measure CUL-1(a) requires a historic resources evaluation for individual projects in the DWSP plan area. Mitigation measure CUL-1(b) requires treatment of historic properties consistent with standards of the Secretary of the Interior. Mitigation measure CUL-1(c) requires site-specific documentation of historic resources if impacts to those resources are unavoidable. Other measures were considered but rejected because they were deemed infeasible or ineffective, including complete avoidance of historic and potentially historic resources in the DWSP plan area. However, complete avoidance of these resources would prohibit much of the development envisioned in the DWSP, resulting in the inability to achieve project objectives. Accordingly, mandatory avoidance of the existing and potential historic resources is infeasible.

- (2) **Remaining Impacts.** While mitigation measures CUL-1(a), CUL-1(b), and CUL-1(c) are feasible and would be implemented, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the DWSP envisions development that would require unavoidable changes to historic or potentially historic resources.
- (3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting in the demolition or loss of a historic resource, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.4-15 through 4.4-17 of the Draft EIR.

2. The DWSP would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on historic-era cultural resources. (EIR Impact CUL-C1)

- a) **Potential Impact.** Development envisioned in the DWSP would alter or demolish historic structures or alter the setting in which historic structures occur within the DWSP plan area. Other development in Watsonville but outside of the DWSP plan area could also impact historic resources. Because the proposed project would result in direct significant impacts to historic resources in the DWSP plan area, and historic resources elsewhere in Watsonville could also be impacts, there would be fewer historic resources remaining in the City of Watsonville.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures CUL-1(a), CUL-1(b), and CUL-1(c), as set forth in Final EIR Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1(a), CUL-1(b), and CUL-1(c), the impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
 - (1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measures CUL-1(a), CUL-1(b), and CUL-1(c) are determined to be the only feasible measures the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts to historic resources. Other measures were considered but rejected because they were deemed infeasible or ineffective, as set forth in Finding III.B.1(c)(1) above, incorporated herein by this reference.
 - (2) **Remaining Impacts.** There are no mitigation measures that would meet the objectives of the DWSP while retaining the historic resources. While mitigation measures CUL-1(a), CUL-1(b), and CUL-1(c) are feasible and would be implemented, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the DWSP envisions development that would require unavoidable changes to historic or potentially historic resources.
 - (3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting in the demolition or loss of a historic resource, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.

- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.4-17 through 4.4-18 of the Draft EIR.

C. Noise

1. **Construction of development envisioned by the DWSP would temporarily increase noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive receptors. Operation of development envisioned by the DWSP would introduce new onsite noise sources and contribute to increases in traffic noise. Construction and onsite operational noise could exceed standards. This impact would be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation. (EIR Impact NOI-1)**

a) **Potential Impact.** Construction of the development envisioned in the DWSP would require heavy machinery and power tools, which would generate noise that exceeds thresholds of significance. Likewise, operation of the development would also generate noise that exceeds thresholds, such as noise from vehicle travel.

b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures NOI-1(a) and NOI-1(b), as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.6, *Noise*, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measures NOI-1(a) and NOI-1(b), the impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.

c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:

(1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measures NOI-1(a) and NOI-1(b) are determined to be the only feasible measures the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts related to noise. Other measures were considered but rejected because they were deemed infeasible or ineffective, such as prohibiting construction. Prohibiting construction is not feasible because it would prevent development envisioned in the DWSP, thereby preventing implementation of the DWSP.

(2) **Remaining Impacts.** There are no mitigation measures that would meet the objectives of the DWSP while avoiding noise that exceeds thresholds of significance. While mitigation measures NOI-1(a) and NOI-1(b) are feasible and would be implemented, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the DWSP envisions development that would require heavy machinery for construction and subsequent operational activities that produce noise.

(3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting from the generation of noise, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.

- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.6-9 through 4.6-13 of the Draft EIR.

2. **Construction of development envisioned by the DWSP would temporarily generate groundborne vibration. If required for construction, pile driving or use of a vibratory roller could potentially exceed FTA vibration thresholds**

and impact people or buildings. This impact would be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation. (EIR Impact NOI-2)

- a) **Potential Impact.** Construction of the development envisioned in the DWSP would require heavy machinery that would generate groundborne vibration that could damage buildings or disturb sensitive receptors.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measure NOI-2, as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.6, *Noise*, is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measure NOI-2, the impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
 - (1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measure NOI-2 is determined to be the only feasible measures the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts related to groundborne vibration. Mitigation measure NOI-2 requires the development of a groundborne vibration plan for specific projects in the DWSP plan area if they would utilize certain construction equipment in proximity to certain land uses and structures. The vibration control plan must include measures to reduce vibration below significance thresholds, or to avoid structural damage where reduction of vibration is not possible. Other measures were considered but rejected because they were deemed infeasible or ineffective, such as prohibiting construction activities involving heavy machinery. Prohibiting construction with heavy machinery is not feasible because it would prevent development envisioned in the DWSP, thereby preventing implementation of the DWSP.
 - (2) **Remaining Impacts.** There are no mitigation measures that would meet the objectives of the DWSP while preventing groundborne vibration in excess of thresholds of significance. While mitigation measure NOI-2 is feasible and would be implemented, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the DWSP envisions development that would require heavy machinery for construction.
 - (3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting from the generation of groundborne vibration, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.6-13 through 4.6-16 of the Draft EIR.

3. The construction activities for the development envisioned in the DWSP would have a cumulatively considerable contribution toward a significant cumulative impact on noise. (EIR Impact NOI-C1)

- a) **Potential Impact.** Construction of the development envisioned in the DWSP plus construction in Watsonville but outside of the DWSP plan area would require heavy machinery that would generate noise levels in excess of thresholds of significance.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measures NOI-1(a) and NOI-1(b), as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.6, *Noise*, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation

measures NOI-1(a) and NOI-1(b), the cumulative impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.

- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
- (1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measures NOI-2 is determined to be the only feasible measures the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts related to groundborne vibration. Other measures were considered but rejected because they were deemed infeasible or ineffective, such as prohibiting construction activities involving heavy machinery. Prohibiting construction with heavy machinery is not feasible because it would prevent development envisioned in the DWSP, thereby preventing implementation of the DWSP.
 - (2) **Remaining Impacts.** There are no mitigation measures that would meet the objectives of the DWSP while preventing noise levels from exceeding thresholds of significance. While mitigation measure NOI-1(a) and NOI-1(b) are feasible and would be implemented, cumulative noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the DWSP envisions development that would require heavy machinery for construction alongside other development in Watsonville requiring similar machinery.
 - (3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting from the generation of cumulative noise levels, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.6-16 through 4.6-18 of the Draft EIR.

D. Transportation

1. Development envisioned in the DWSP would conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts would be significant and unavoidable. (EIR Impact TRA-2)

- a) **Potential Impact.** Residential development envisioned in the DWSP would generate vehicle miles traveled (VMT), but residential VMT would not exceed applicable thresholds of significance. However, commercial and industrial development envisioned in the DWSP would generate VMT that exceeds thresholds of significance. Specifically, commercial/office development would generate 9.0 VMT per employee, which is less than the 9.6 VMT under existing conditions but still above the significance threshold of 7.4 VMT. Industrial development would generate 13.5 VMT per employee, which would be less than 14.2 VMT per employee under existing conditions but still exceed the significance threshold of 11 VMT.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measure TRA-1, as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.8, *Transportation*, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measure TRA-1, the impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:

- (1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measure TRA-1 is determined to be the only feasible measure the City can impose to reduce the proposed development's impacts related to VMT per employee. Mitigation TRA-1 requires each individual office and industrial development project in the DWSP plan area to have a corresponding transportation demand management (TDM) plan and monitoring program developed by the applicant or developer of the project. Other measures were considered but rejected because they were deemed infeasible or ineffective, such as prohibiting commercial/office and industrial development. Prohibiting these land uses is not feasible because it would prevent implementation of the DWSP and block its objectives from implementation.
- (2) **Remaining Impacts.** There are no mitigation measures that would meet the objectives of the DWSP while avoiding VMT per employee that exceeds thresholds of significance. While mitigation measure TRA-1 is feasible and would be implemented, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the DWSP envisions a full range of land uses in the DWSP plan area to promote walkability and active modes of transportation.
- (3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting from the generation VMT per employee, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.8-14 through 4.8-16 of the Draft EIR.
2. **The DWSP would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative VMT impact related to a conflict or inconsistency with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). (EIR Impact TRA-C1)**
- a) **Potential Impact.** Residential development envisioned in the DWSP would generate vehicle miles traveled (VMT), but residential VMT would not exceed applicable thresholds of significance, even when combined with VMT generated from other residential growth in Watsonville and Santa Cruz County through 2040. However, commercial and industrial development envisioned in the DWSP would generate VMT that exceeds thresholds of significance when combined with VMT from other commercial and industrial development in Santa Cruz County. Specifically, cumulative commercial/office development would generate 8.5 VMT per employee in 2040, which would exceed the significance threshold of 7.4 VMT. Cumulative industrial development in Santa Cruz County, including the DWSP plan area, would generate 12.8 VMT per employee, which would exceed the significance threshold of 11 VMT.
- b) **Mitigation Measures.** Project mitigation measure TRA-1, as set forth in Draft EIR Section 4.8, *Transportation*, are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the MMRP. After implementation of mitigation measure TRA-1, the cumulative impact will still be considered significant and unavoidable.
- c) **Findings.** Based on the Final EIR and the entire record before this Planning Commission, the Planning Commission finds that:
- (1) **Mitigation is Feasible.** Mitigation measure TRA-1 is determined to be the only feasible measure the City can impose to reduce the proposed

development's impacts related to VMT per employee. Mitigation TRA-1 requires each individual office and industrial development project in the DWSP plan area to have a corresponding transportation demand management (TDM) plan and monitoring program developed by the applicant or developer of the project. Other measures were considered but rejected because they were deemed infeasible or ineffective, such as prohibiting commercial/office and industrial development. Prohibiting these land uses is not feasible because it would prevent implementation of the DWSP and block its objectives from implementation.

- (2) **Remaining Impacts.** There are no mitigation measures that would meet the objectives of the DWSP while avoiding VMT per employee that exceeds thresholds of significance. While mitigation measure TRA-1 is feasible and would be implemented, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable because the DWSP envisions a full range of land uses in the DWSP plan area to promote walkability and active modes of transportation.
 - (3) **Overriding Considerations.** The environmental, economic, social, and other benefits of the project override remaining significant adverse impacts of the project resulting from the generation VMT per employee, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section IX, below.
- d) **Supporting Evidence.** Please refer to pages 4.8-16 through 4.8-17 of the Draft EIR.

V. FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

A. Legal Requirements for Alternatives

CEQA requires that environmental impact reports assess feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that may substantially lessen the significant effects of a project prior to approval Public Resources Code Section 21002). Apart from the "no project" alternative, the specific alternatives or types of alternatives that must be assessed are not specified. CEQA establishes no categorical legal imperative as to the scope of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR. Each case must be evaluated on its own facts, which in turn must be reviewed in light of the statutory purpose. (*Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors*, 52 Cal.3d. 553, 556 1990)]. The legislative purpose of CEQA is to protect public health and welfare and the environment from significant impacts associated with all types of development by ensuring that agencies regulate activities so that major consideration is given to preventing environmental damage while providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian Public Resources Code Section 21000).

In short, the objective of CEQA is to avoid or mitigate environmental damage associated with development. This objective has been largely accomplished in the project through the inclusion of project modifications and mitigation measures that reduce the potentially significant impacts to an acceptable level. The courts have held that a public agency "may approve a developer's choice of a project once its significant adverse environment effects have been reduced to an acceptable level— that is, all avoidable significant damage to the environment has been eliminated and that which remains is otherwise acceptable" (*Laurel Hills Homeowners Assoc. v. City*, 83 Cal.App.3d 515, 521 [1978]).

B. Identification of Project Alternatives

The CEQA Guidelines state that the “range of potential alternatives to the project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects” of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)). Thus, consideration of the project objectives is important to determining which alternatives should be assessed in the EIR.

The EIR identifies the following objectives for the DWSP:

- Preserve key elements that make Downtown unique
- Establish a varied choice of uses and experiences for our diverse community
- Create diverse and inclusive housing opportunities
- Promote local economic prosperity
- Create a vibrant, safe, and active Downtown
- Foster a healthy, inclusive, and culturally connected community where all can thrive
- Re-imagine and innovate mobility options and connections
- Incorporate sustainable design elements to improve community health

The City evaluated the alternatives listed below in the EIR:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Repurposed Walker Street Industrial Uses Alternative
- Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative

Given that the main purpose of the DWSP is to provide a comprehensive land use and mobility plan, along with development and design regulations, to guide future public and private development in the downtown area of Watsonville, it would not be feasible to evaluate an alternative location (i.e., another city or location in Watsonville). The DWSP must, by its nature, guide future development located in the DWSP plan area, which is downtown Watsonville. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) allows for consideration of alternatives to a project, or its location (emphasis added), but does not mandate inclusion of a location alternative in an EIR. Accordingly, to evaluate another location for downtown development would not be meaningful for the purposes of informing a decision about the proposed DWSP, and a Location Alternative was not discussed or evaluated further in the EIR.

C. Findings on Alternatives

1. No Project Alternative

- a. Description.** Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed DWSP would not be adopted or implemented. Therefore, the City’s General Plan would not need to be amended to reflect the DWSP. Thus, any new development in the DWSP plan area would occur consistent with the existing land use designations and the allowed uses within each designation in the City’s General Plan. Development under this alternative is anticipated to be less intensive and result in greater low-density development within the DWSP plan area compared with the DWSP, because the proposed DWSP envisions increased density compared to the General Plan. Specifically, under this alternative, the DWSP plan area would have approximately 64 housing units, approximately 1.6 million square feet of commercial space, and approximately 809,000 square feet of

industrial space, all of which includes existing development already in the DWSP plan area. The transportation and mobility improvements envisioned in the DWSP would also not occur under this alternative. For example, as describe in Table 2.2 in Section 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the proposed DWSP envisions uncoupling East Lake Avenue and East Beach Street as pair one-way streets in opposing directions and instead making each a two-way street. The current General Plan does not envision this mobility improvement.

- b. Findings and Rationale.** The No Project Alternative is a feasible alternative but it would not achieve the project objectives as listed on page 5-1 of the Draft EIR. The objectives of the proposed project center on encouraging and facilitating growth in the DWSP plan area, which consists of the downtown area of Watsonville. The City's General Plan also facilitates growth in the DWSP plan area, and therefore, Alternative 1 is consistent with this component of the project objectives. However, Alternative 1 would not satisfy specific project objectives about the types and density of growth within the DWSP plan area. For example, Alternative 1 includes only 64 housing units in the DWSP plan area, which would fail to meet the objective of creating diverse and inclusive housing opportunities. Because the DWSP would provide more density in the DWSP plan area compared with the General Plan, Alternative 1 could also fail to promote economic prosperity and a vibrant and active downtown when compared with the DWSP. Additionally, because the General Plan does not envision the mobility improvements contained in the DWSP, Alternative 1 would also not meet the project objective to re-imagine and innovate mobility options in the DWSP plan area.
- c. Supporting Evidence** – Please refer to pages 5-2 through 5-4 of the Draft EIR.

2. Repurposed Walker Street Industrial Uses Alternative

- a. Description** – Under the Repurposed Walker Street Industrial Uses Alternative, the Walker Street corridor would be changed into an active transit-oriented area. The transit-oriented area would include new housing in proximity to transit and new retail, galleries, breweries, coffee roasters, and coffee shops, as well some creative offices and makerspaces. The existing industrial uses on Walker Street would be phased out over time. Specifically, over time, Alternative 2 would remove approximately 7,300 square feet of existing retail space and approximately 375,827 square feet of industrial space. The General Plan and zoning designations for this area would be Downtown Mixed Use and Downtown Neighborhood, respectively. These designations would allow for a mix of residential and retail uses, including within the same building. Other parts of the DWSP plan area would remain as envisioned in the proposed DWSP.
- b. Findings and Rationale** – The Repurposed Walker Street Industrial Uses Alternative is a feasible alternative, but it would not achieve most of the project objectives, as listed on page 5-1 of the Final EIR. The objectives of the proposed project center on encouraging and facilitating growth in the DWSP plan area, which consists of the downtown area of Watsonville. Alternative 2 would also facilitate growth in the DWSP plan area, and therefore, Alternative 2 is consistent with this component of the project objectives. Alternative 2 could fulfill select objectives to a greater extent than the DWSP, such as establishing a varied choice of uses and experiences downtown and creating diverse and

inclusive housing opportunities. Alternative 2 could better fulfill these objectives because it would facilitate more housing and mixed-use development within the DWSP plan area compared with the DWSP. However, Alternative 2 would fail to satisfy select objectives as well as the DWSP. For example, Alternative 2 could be less successful at promoting local economic prosperity, because it would remove much of the industrial development and employment from the DWSP plan area.

- c. Supporting Evidence** – Please refer to pages 5-4 through 5-7 of the Draft EIR.

3. Reduced Density Alternative

a. Description – The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce the residential and non-residential development density facilitated by the proposed DWSP such that approximately 25 percent fewer new residential dwelling units and 25 percent less office, commercial, dining, and industrial development square footage would be created. Development would occur within the same areas where development would occur under the proposed DWSP, only at a reduced density. Generally, this would be achieved by reducing the height of new residential buildings by a story and the overall size of other types of new buildings in the DWSP plan area compared with the heights or FAR proposed or envisioned in the DWSP.

b. Findings and Rationale – The Reduced Project Alternative is a feasible alternative, but it would not achieve some of the project objectives, as listed on page 6-1 of the Final EIR. The objectives of the proposed project center on encouraging and facilitating growth in the DWSP plan area, which consists of the downtown area of Watsonville. The Reduced Project Alternative would also facilitate growth in the DWSP plan area, but development would occur at reduced density. Therefore, compared with the DWSP, the Reduced Project Alternative would fulfill several objectives to a lesser extent. For example, Alternative would not fulfill to the same or better level objectives related to creating inclusive housing opportunities, promoting local economic prosperity, or innovate mobility options and connections. Alternative 3 would not fulfill the objective to innovate mobility options and connections as well as the DWSP because it would place fewer residents downtown where many goods and services are easily reached by active transportation modes, such as walking and cycling.

- c. Supporting Evidence** – Please refer to pages 5-7 through 5-10 of the Draft EIR.

D. Environmentally Superior Alternative

The environmentally superior alternative is discussed on page 5-11 of the Draft EIR. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified. For the EIR analysis, the Reduced Density Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. The Reduced Density Alternative is also referred to as “Alternative 3” in the Draft EIR.

The Reduced Density Alternative would reduce or slightly reduce impacts to air quality, cultural resources, and noise, compared to the DWSP. However, compared with the

DWSP, the Reduced Density Alternative would result in a slightly more severe impact related to transportation. The Reduced Density Alternative would be the most effective alternative to reduce the potentially significant impacts of the DWSP. For this reason, the Reduced Density Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives considered and evaluated in the EIR. The Reduced Density Alternative would be feasible to implement. However, as discussed above in Findings V.C.3.b, compared with the DWSP, the Reduced Density Alternative would fulfill several objectives to a lesser extent. For example, the Reduced Density Alternative would not fulfill to the same or better level objectives related to creating inclusive housing opportunities, promoting local economic prosperity, or innovate mobility options and connections. Additionally, lowered density housing may be less financially feasible.

Based on the foregoing findings, and even though the Reduced Density Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the Commission rejects that Alternative 3.

VI. FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES AND MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED IN DRAFT EIR COMMENTS

Comments received on the Draft EIR did not recommend alternatives to the DWSP. Some comments on the Draft EIR suggested revisions to the mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR. In response to Draft EIR comments, some mitigation measures were revised, including mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2. The revisions to mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 were for purposes of clarification and do not constitute “significant new information” requiring recirculation. (See Public Resources Code Section 21092.1; CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.)

VII. FINDINGS ON RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND REVISIONS TO THE FINAL EIR

Appendix 1 of the Final EIR includes the comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. The focus of the responses to comments is on the disposition of significant environmental issues as raised in the comments, as specified by CEQA Guidelines § 15088(b). The Final EIR also incorporates information obtained and produced after the Draft EIR was completed, including additions, clarifications and modifications. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and all of this information.

The Planning Commission finds that responses to comments made on the Draft EIR (Chapter 2 to the Final EIR) and revisions contained in the Errata to the Draft EIR (Chapter 3 to the Final EIR) merely clarify, amplify or make insignificant modifications to the analysis presented in the document and do not trigger the need to recirculate per CEQA Guidelines §15088.5(b). Revisions made to the Draft EIR are shown in Section 3 of the Final EIR in ~~strikethrough~~ and underline text to denote deletions and additions, respectively.

VIII. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The Planning Commission finds that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the DWSP EIR has been prepared and has been adopted concurrently with

these Findings of Fact (Public Resources Code, § 21081.6(a)(1)). The MMRP for the project has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code and Sections 15091(d) and 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines.

The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure the adopted mitigation measures adopted in the Findings of Fact for the DWSP EIR are implemented, in accordance with CEQA requirements. The Findings of Fact adopt feasible mitigation measures to reduce the significant environmental impacts of the project. The mitigation measures adopted in the DWSP EIR Findings of Fact are listed in their entirety in the MMRP. The MMRP is available at City Hall at the address provided in Section II.

IX. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO THE DWSP FINDINGS

The City is the lead agency under CEQA, responsible for the preparation, review and certification of the Final EIR for the Downtown Watsonville Specific Plan. As the lead agency, the City is also responsible for determining the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and which of those impacts are significant. CEQA also requires the lead agency to balance the benefits of a proposed action against its significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts in determining whether or not to approve the proposed action.

In making this determination the lead agency is guided by the CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, which provides as follows:

a) "CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region -wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region -wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered ` acceptable,"

b) "When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record."

c) "If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination"

In addition, Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) requires that where a public agency finds that economic, legal, social, technical, or other reasons make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR and thereby leave significant

unavoidable adverse project effects, the public agency must also find that overriding economic, legal, social, technical or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant unavoidable adverse effects of the project.

The Final EIR identified a number of alternatives to the proposed DWSP, and the administrative record of proceedings, including without limitation the Final EIR and these findings, determined the extent to which these alternatives meet the basic project objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening any significant adverse impacts of the proposed DWSP.

Analysis in the Final EIR for the Downtown Watsonville Specific Plan has concluded that the proposed project will result in air quality, historic resources, noise, and transportation impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. These impacts are set forth in Section III, above, which is incorporated herein by this reference. All other potential significant adverse project impacts have been mitigated to a level less than significant based on mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 and other applicable law, the City has, in determining whether or not to approve the DWSP, balanced the economic, social, technological, and other benefits of the DWSP against its unavoidable environmental risks, and finds that each of the benefits of the project set forth below outweigh and make acceptable the significant adverse environmental effects that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels. This statement of overriding considerations is based on the City's review of the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record.

Each of the benefits identified below provides a separate and independent basis for overriding the significant environmental effects of the project. The benefits of the project are as follows:

- Facilitating a diverse mix of housing production and preservation in the DWSP plan area
- Encouraging higher-density mixed-use residential development in the DWSP plan area
- Increasing retail-entertainment activity in the DWSP plan area
- Adding visitor-oriented uses to the DWSP plan area
- Supporting a greater range of civic and cultural activities in the DWSP plan area
- Improving the safety and comfort of pedestrians
- Enhancing bicycle infrastructure and connections
- Highlighting Watsonville's unique setting and resources to make downtown a regional attraction
- Enhancing commercial activity in the DWSP plan area as a driver for downtown's economic vitality and growth
- Targeting uses and activities that appeal to a wide range of Watsonville's residents and employees and providing these uses and activities in the DWSP plan area

Effectively, the benefits of the project would be to improve the livability of downtown Watsonville by increasing infill potential and mobility and providing a full range of land uses and services in proximity to one another.

A. Conclusion

Based on the objectives identified for the project, review of the project, review of the EIR, and consideration of public and agency comments, the Planning Commission has determined that the project should be approved and that any remaining unmitigated environmental impacts attributable to the project are outweighed by the specific social, environmental, land use, and other overriding considerations.

The Planning Commission has determined that any environmental detriment caused by the proposed DWSP has been minimized to the extent feasible through the mitigation measures identified herein and, where mitigation is not feasible, has been outweighed and counterbalanced by the significant social, environmental, and land use benefits to be generated to the City. Accordingly, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth above and finds that the benefits of the project outweigh the benefits of other examined alternatives.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Air Quality							
<p>AQ-1. Conduct Project Specific Air Quality Analysis. The City shall require future projects that are subject to discretionary approval and that are not found to be exempt from CEQA review to evaluate potential air quality impacts as part of project-level CEQA analysis and implement respective mitigation measures to minimize impacts that exceed MBARD project level thresholds.</p>	<p>Ensure non-exempt CEQA projects evaluate air quality impacts and implement mitigation, if applicable.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading or building permits.</p>	<p>Once prior to start of construction, and if applicable, annually in accordance with respective mitigation measures.</p>	<p>City of Watsonville.</p>			
<p>AQ-3(a). Construction Equipment The project applicant for individual developments or projects envisioned in the DWSP shall ensure the following requirements are incorporated into applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts. Contractors shall confirm the ability to supply the compliant construction equipment prior to any ground-disturbing and construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mobile off-road construction equipment (wheeled or tracked) greater than 50 hp used during construction of the project shall meet the U.S. EPA Tier 4 final standards. In the event of specialized equipment use where Tier 4 equipment is not commercially available at the time of construction, the equipment shall, at a minimum, meet the Tier 3 standards. Zero-emissions construction equipment may be incorporated in lieu of Tier 4 final equipment. A copy of each equipment's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available to the City upon request at the time of mobilization of each piece of equipment. ▪ Mobile off-road construction equipment less than 50 hp used during construction of the individual projects shall be electric or other alternative fuel type. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification or model year specification shall be available to the City upon request at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment. ▪ Electric hook-ups to the power grid shall be used instead of temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators, whenever feasible during construction of development or projects envisioned in the DWSP. If generators need to be used, the generators shall be non-diesel generators. 	<p>Ensure that all bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts for projects confirm that contractors can supply compliant construction equipment.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading or building permits.</p>	<p>Once prior to start of construction, then as needed during construction activities.</p>	<p>City of Watsonville - Public Works Engineering/ Building Inspectors.</p>			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>AQ-3(b). Operational Health Risk Assessment The City shall require all applicants for development projects in the plan area that are within the buffer distances cited in the CARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective April 2005, and incorporate any of the following features, to conduct an operational health risk assessment. The health risk assessment shall follow MBARD and the Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment guidelines. The health risk analysis shall mitigate the risk in exceedance of regulatory thresholds to below the regulatory thresholds. The features that shall require an operational health risk analysis include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporation of unpermitted sources (such as industrial processes that emit TACs); ▪ Incorporation of diesel heavy duty-vehicles greater than 100 trips per day; or ▪ Incorporation of more than 300 hours per week of diesel transportation refrigeration unit operations. 	For individual projects where construction activities would occur within the buffer distances cited in the CARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook, prepare an operational health risk assessment to determine potential risk and compare the risk to MBARD thresholds.	Prior to construction.	Once.	City of Watsonville.			
Biological Resources							
<p>BIO-1. Pre-Disturbance Santa Cruz Tarplant Survey and Mitigation Planting Prior to commencement of construction activities on property with undeveloped areas or unmaintained landscaping within the plan area, an experienced botanist, familiar with the native plant communities of Santa Cruz County, shall conduct a focused Santa Cruz tarplant survey during the blooming period of the species, from June to October. The surveys shall occur throughout the entire project area where potential Santa Cruz tarplant habitat has been identified, prior to the initiation of construction and the results shall be included in the project environmental document. Surveys shall be conducted according to CDFW's Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special-Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities. If Santa Cruz tarplant is detected or likely to occur within the project area, additional measures may be needed to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate potential project impacts. Measures may include work stoppage, flagging and avoidance of occurrences, collection of propagation material, and/or site restoration. In the event that State-</p>	Ensure qualified biologist conducts pre-construction surveys using specified protocol and methods. If species is found during surveys, ensure biologist prepares a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan that includes information specified in measure. If applicable, ensure replacement population is established at ratio specified by CDFW or 1:1; whichever is greater, and monitored according to the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. Ensure annual monitoring reporting is provided to the City.	Implement surveys, as described in the mitigation measure, prior to the start of construction. If applicable, establish mitigation population or other mitigation determined by CDFW following project construction. If applicable, implement success monitoring annual, following established of mitigation population.	Once prior to start of construction, and if applicable, annually in accordance with the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.	City of Watsonville – qualified biologist.			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification Initial	Date	Comments
<p>listed plants cannot be avoided during construction, the project proponent shall obtain an ITP pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 2081, subdivision (b) (See cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §§ 783.4 & 786.9). If a population of Santa Cruz tarplant is found, mitigation for the loss of individuals shall be conducted. Mitigation shall be achieved by establishing a new population of Santa Cruz tarplant in an area approved by the USFWS and CDFW. This area shall not be developed and shall contain suitable habitat types for establishing a new population. Mitigation shall be a 1:1 ratio (impact mitigation) of plant establishment on an acreage basis.</p> <p>Monitoring of the new mitigation population shall occur annually. Annual monitoring shall include quantitative sampling of the Santa Cruz tarplant population to determine the number of plants that have germinated and set seed. This monitoring shall continue annually or until success criteria have been met; once annual monitoring has documented that a self-sustaining population of this annual species has been successfully established on site, this mitigation measure shall be determined to have been met and the project applicant released from further responsibility.</p> <p>Establishment of the plant population shall be subject to a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. To ensure the success of mitigation sites required for compensation of permanent impacts on Santa Cruz tarplant, the project applicant for specific development projects in the plan area for which this mitigation measure applies shall retain a qualified biologist to prepare a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. The Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall be submitted to the City of Watsonville for review and approval prior to the start of construction. The Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall include, at a minimum, the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A summary of habitat and species impacts and the proposed mitigation for each element ▪ A description of the location and boundaries of the mitigation site(s) and description of existing site conditions ▪ A description of any measures to be undertaken to enhance (e.g., through focused management) the mitigation site for special-status species 							

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of an adequate funding mechanism for long-term management ▪ A description of management and maintenance measures intended to maintain and enhance habitat for the target species (e.g., weed control, fencing maintenance) ▪ A description of habitat and species monitoring measures on the mitigation site, including specific, objective performance criteria, monitoring methods, data analysis, reporting requirements, monitoring schedule, etc. Monitoring will document compliance with each element requiring habitat compensation or management. At a minimum, performance criteria will include a minimum 1:1 mitigation ratio for the number of plants in the impacted population (at least one plant preserved for each plant impacted). ▪ A contingency plan for mitigation elements that do not meet performance or final success criteria within described periods; the plan will include specific triggers for remediation if performance criteria are not met and a description of the process by which remediation of problems with the mitigation site (e.g., presence of noxious weeds) will occur ▪ A requirement that the project proponent will be responsible for monitoring, as specified in the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, for at least three (3) years post-construction; during this period, annual reporting will be provided to the City’s Supervising Environmental Planner. At the request of CDFW or USFWS, the annual reporting shall also be provided to these agencies. 							
<p>BIO-2. Nesting Bird Avoidance</p> <p>To the extent feasible, construction activities shall be scheduled to avoid the nesting season. The nesting season for most birds in Santa Cruz County extends from February 1 through August 31. If Project-related work is scheduled during the nesting season (typically February 15 to August 30 for small bird species such as passerines; January 15 to September 15 for owls; and February 15 to September 15 for other raptors), a qualified biologist shall conduct two surveys for active nests of such birds within 14 days prior to the beginning of project construction, with a final survey conducted</p>	<p>Ensure qualified biologist conducted pre-construction nesting bird surveys. If applicable, ensure construction-free buffers are established and maintained until the end of nesting season (August 31) or until a biologist determines the young have fledged the nest.</p>	<p>No more than seven days prior to the initiation of construction activities and prior to tree removal, tree trimming, or other vegetation clearing.</p>	<p>Prior to start of project construction. Ongoing throughout construction occurring during the nesting bird season.</p>	<p>City of Watsonville-qualified biologist.</p>			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>within 48 hours prior to construction. Appropriate minimum survey radii surrounding the work area are typically the following: i) 250 feet for passerines; ii) 500 feet for small raptors such as accipiters; and iii) 1,000 feet for larger raptors such as buteos. Surveys shall be conducted at the appropriate times of day and during appropriate nesting times. These surveys shall be conducted no more than seven days prior to the initiation of construction activities and shall be conducted prior to tree removal, tree trimming, or other vegetation clearing. During the survey, the biologist shall inspect all trees and other potential nesting habitats, including trees, shrubs, ruderal grasslands, and buildings in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas for nests.</p> <p>If the qualified biologist documents active nests within the project area or in nearby surrounding areas, a species appropriate buffer between the nest and active construction shall be established by the biologist. The buffer shall be clearly marked and maintained until the young have fledged and are foraging independently. Prior to construction, the qualified biologist shall conduct baseline monitoring of the nest to characterize "normal" bird behavior and establish a buffer distance which allows the birds to exhibit normal behavior. The qualified biologist shall monitor the nesting birds daily during construction activities and increase the buffer if the birds show signs of unusual or distressed behavior (e.g., defensive flights and vocalizations, standing up from a brooding position, and/or flying away from the nest). If buffer establishment is not possible, the qualified biologist shall have the authority to cease all construction work in the area until the young have fledged, and the nest is no longer active.</p>							
Cultural and Tribal Resources							
<p>CUL-1. Archaeological Resources Investigation At the time of application for discretionary land use permits that involve grading, trenching, or other ground disturbance in native soil with the potential for encountering unknown archaeological resources, the project applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior standards in archaeology to complete a Phase 1 cultural resources</p>	<p>The project applicant shall hire a qualified professional to investigate the potential to disturb archaeological resources on a project site. A Phase 1 cultural resources study shall be performed by a qualified</p>	<p>The City shall review and approve the relevant Phase 1, 2, and/or 3 technical report prior to implementation of recommendations.</p>	<p>Once</p>	<p>City of Watsonville-qualified archaeologist.</p>			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>assessment of the development site. A Phase 1 cultural resources assessment shall include an archaeological pedestrian survey of the development site, if possible, and sufficient background archival research and field sampling to determine whether subsurface prehistoric or historic remains may be present. Archival research shall include a current (no more than one-year old) records search from the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) and a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search conducted with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Identified prehistoric or historic archaeological remains shall be avoided and preserved in place where feasible. Where preservation is not feasible, the significance of each resource shall be evaluated for significance and eligibility for listing in the CRHR through a Phase 2 evaluation. A Phase 2 evaluation shall include any necessary archival research to identify significant historical associations as well as mapping of surface artifacts, collection of functionally or temporally diagnostic tools and debris, and excavation of a sample of the cultural deposit to characterize the nature of the sites, define the artifact and feature contents, determine horizontal boundaries and depth below surface, and retrieve representative samples of artifacts and other remains.</p> <p>Cultural materials collected from the sites shall be processed and analyzed in the laboratory according to standard archaeological procedures. The age of the materials shall be determined using radiocarbon dating and/or other appropriate procedures; lithic artifacts, faunal remains, and other cultural materials shall be identified and analyzed according to current professional standards. The significance of the sites shall be evaluated according to the criteria of the CRHR. The results of the investigations shall be presented in a technical report following the standards of the California Office of Historic Preservation publication "Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Content and Format (1990 or latest edition)" (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/armr.pdf). Upon completion of the work, all artifacts, other cultural remains, records, photographs, and other documentation shall be curated an appropriate curation facility. All</p>	<p>professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's PQS for archaeology. If necessary, a Phase 2 and/or 3 evaluation(s) shall be conducted. The City shall approve the appropriate technical report(s) and the project applicant shall implement the recommendations.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of building permits.</p>					

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>fieldwork, analysis, report production, and curation shall be fully funded by the applicant.</p> <p>If the resources meet CRHR significance standards, the City shall ensure that all feasible recommendations for mitigation of archaeological impacts are incorporated into the final design and permits issued for development. If necessary, Phase 3 data recovery excavation, conducted to exhaust the data potential of significant archaeological sites, shall be carried out by a qualified archaeologist meeting the SOI standards for archaeology according to a research design reviewed and approved by the City prepared in advance of fieldwork and using appropriate archaeological field and laboratory methods consistent with the California Office of Historic Preservation Planning Bulletin 5 (1991), Guidelines for Archaeological Research Design, or the latest edition thereof.</p> <p>As applicable, the final Phase 1 Inventory, Phase 2 Testing and Evaluation, and/or Phase 3 Data Recovery reports shall be submitted to the City prior to issuance of construction permit. Recommendations contained therein shall be implemented throughout all ground disturbance activities.</p>							
<p>CUL-2. Archaeological Resources Construction Monitoring</p> <p>During construction of development envisioned in the Specific Plan, construction activities involving ground disturbance such as grading or excavation shall be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. Archaeological monitoring shall be performed under the direction of an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archaeology (National Park Service, 1983). Should the construction site be determined to have little if any potential to yield subsurface cultural resources deposits, the qualified archaeologist may recommend that monitoring be reduced or eliminated after consulting with the City and Native American representatives.</p>	Ensure qualified archaeologist is present to monitor all ground disturbing construction activities.	Concurrent with the start of project construction.	Ongoing throughout project construction involving ground disturbance.	City of Watsonville-qualified archaeologist.			
<p>CUL-3. Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Cultural Resources</p> <p>In the event that archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during ground-disturbing</p>	Stop work upon discovery of archaeological resources.	Concurrent with the start of project construction.	Ongoing throughout project construction	City of Watsonville-qualified archaeologist.			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>activities, work within 50 feet of the find shall halt and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If the resource is determined by the qualified archaeologist to be prehistoric, then a Native American representative shall also be contacted to participate in the evaluation of the resource. If the qualified archaeologist and/or Native American representative determines it to be appropriate, archaeological testing for CRHR eligibility shall be completed. If the resource proves to be eligible for the CRHR and impacts to the resource cannot be avoided via project redesign, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare a data recovery plan tailored to the physical nature and characteristics of the resource, per the requirements of CCR Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C).</p>	<p>Ensure qualified archaeologist evaluates the discovery for significance. If required, prepare a treatment plan and archaeological testing. If resource is determined significant, implement additional mitigation determined by qualified archaeologist.</p>		<p>involving ground disturbance.</p>				
Geology and Soils							
<p>GEO-1. Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resources In the event an unanticipated fossil discovery is made during project development, work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall be stopped, and a qualified professional paleontologist shall be retained to evaluate the discovery, determine its significance, and identify if mitigation or treatment is warranted. Significant paleontological resources found during construction monitoring shall be prepared, identified, analyzed, and permanently curated in an approved regional museum repository. Work around the discovery shall only resume once the find is properly documented and authorization is given to resume construction work.</p>	<p>Stop work upon discovery of fossils and contact qualified paleontologist. Ensure qualified paleontologist evaluates the fossils for significance before work resumes. If the fossil or fossils are scientifically significant, the find shall be recovered under supervision of the qualified paleontologist. Ensure significant fossils are identified, prepared for curation, and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection. If determined necessary by the qualified paleontologist, implement and adhere to a Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Program.</p>	<p>Concurrent with the start of project construction and during project construction.</p>	<p>Ongoing throughout project construction involving ground disturbance.</p>	<p>City of Watsonville-qualified paleontologist.</p>			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Hazards and Hazardous Materials							
<p>HAZ-1(a). Property Assessment – Phase I and II ESAs Prior to the start of construction (demolition or grading) on a known hazardous site within the plan area, project applicants shall retain a qualified environmental professional (EP), as defined by ASTM E-1527, to complete one of the following. If the project is not listed in DTSC (GeoTracker) or SWRCB (EnviroStor) resources or other database comprising Government Code Section 65962.5, and requires more than five feet of excavation, then the proponent shall retain a qualified environmental consultant, California Professional Geologist (PG) or California Professional Engineer (PE), to prepare a Phase I ESA. If the Phase I ESA identifies recognized environmental conditions or potential concern areas, a Phase II ESA shall be prepared. If the project site is currently listed, previously listed, or un-listed with a regulatory closure or no further action letter in DTSC (GeoTracker) or SWRCB (EnviroStor) resources or other database comprising Government Code Section 65962.5, then the project proponent shall retain a qualified environmental consultant, California Professional Geologist (PG) or California Professional Engineer (PE), to prepare a Phase II ESA to project proponent shall test to confirm that there are no existing hazardous materials posing a risk to human health. The Phase II ESA shall determine whether the soil, groundwater, and/or soil vapor has been impacted at concentrations exceeding regulatory screening levels for commercial/industrial land uses. All recommended actions included in the Phase II ESA shall be followed. This may include the preparation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP) for Impacted Soils (see below) prior to project construction and/or completion of remediation at the proposed project prior to onsite construction. The completed ESAs shall be submitted to the lead agency for review and approval prior to issuance of building or grading permits. Soil Management Plan Requirements: The SMP, or equivalent document, shall be prepared to address onsite handling and management of impacted soils or other impacted wastes, and reduce hazards to construction workers and offsite receptors during construction. The</p>	<p>Ensure that for projects located on known hazardous sites, project applicants retain a qualified EP to complete a Phase I and/or II ESA. Ensure that the measures specified in the ESA are adhered to.</p>	<p>Prior to the start of construction; prior to issuance of building or grading permits; prior to demolition and grading activities; prior to soil removal.</p>	<p>Once prior to permit issuance; then periodically throughout construction, as needed.</p>	<p>City of Watsonville – qualified environmental professional, as defined by ASTM E-1527.</p>			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification Initial	Date	Comments
<p>plan shall be submitted to the lead agency and must establish remedial measures and/or soil management practices to ensure construction worker safety, the health of future workers and visitors, and the off-site migration of contaminants from the site. These measures and practices may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stockpile management including stormwater pollution prevention and the installation of BMPs ▪ Proper disposal procedures of contaminated materials ▪ Monitoring and reporting ▪ A health and safety plan for contractors working at the site that addresses the safety and health hazards of each phase of site construction activities with the requirements and procedures for employee protection <p>The health and safety plan shall also outline proper soil handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction.</p> <p>The lead agency shall review and approve the development site Soil Management Plan for Impacted Soils prior to demolition and grading (construction).</p> <p>Soil Remediation Requirements: If soil present within the construction envelope at the development site contains chemicals at concentrations exceeding hazardous waste screening thresholds for contaminants in soil (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 22, Section 66261.24), the project proponent shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE), to conduct additional analytical testing and recommend soil disposal recommendations, or consider other remedial engineering controls, as necessary.</p> <p>The qualified environmental consultant shall utilize the development site analytical results for waste characterization purposes prior to offsite transportation or disposal of potentially impacted soils or other impacted wastes. The qualified environmental consultant shall provide disposal recommendations and arrange for proper disposal of the waste soils or other impacted wastes (as necessary), and/or provide recommendations for remedial engineering controls, if appropriate.</p> <p>Remediation of impacted soils and/or implementation of remedial engineering controls, may require additional delineation of impacts; additional analytical testing per</p>							

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
landfill or recycling facility requirements; soil excavation; and offsite disposal or recycling. The City shall review and approve the development site disposal recommendations prior to transportation of waste soils offsite and review and approve remedial engineering controls, prior to construction.							
HAZ-1(b). Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessment If groundwater is encountered during construction on properties included on a list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 or through a Phase I or Phase II ESA pursuant to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, an Environmental Professional shall be called to the site to determine safe handling procedures. The groundwater shall be pumped into appropriate containers and samples shall be obtained for chemical analysis of the Contaminants of Potential Concern in accordance with the requirements of the waste disposal facility to which the material would be sent. If water sample analytical results indicate the water is free of all detectable concentrations of Contaminants of Potential Concern, such water can be re-used at the site if deemed appropriate by the RWQCB. If water sample analytical results indicate the water contains concentrations of Contaminants of Potential Concern above appropriate RWQCB screening levels, such water shall not be re-used at the site. The contractor and the Environmental Professional shall elect to: (a) treat the groundwater onsite to render it free of detectable concentrations of Contaminants of Potential Concern (e.g., by activated carbon filtration); or, (b) transport the groundwater to a local treatment or disposal facility for appropriate handling.	Ensure that if groundwater is discovered, it is handled in accordance with the requirements of the waste disposal facility. Verify that if groundwater is determined to be contaminated, it is treated or transported from the site.	Prior to the issuance of building or grading permits.	Once.	City of Watsonville – qualified environmental professional, as defined by ASTM E-1527.			
Noise							
NOI-1(a). Conduct Construction Noise Analysis The City shall require future projects that are subject to discretionary approval and that are not found to be exempt from CEQA review to evaluate potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive uses as part of project-level CEQA analysis and implement respective mitigation measures to minimize impacts on	Conduct a site-specific Construction Noise Analysis. Pending outcome of site-specific analysis, if noise reduction is determined necessary, implement noise reduction actions, such as	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to issuance of grading or building permits; prior to construction; and as-needed throughout ground- 	Ensure noise reducing actions are implemented prior to commencement of construction and then periodically	City of Watsonville.			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>these uses. Examples of mitigation measures to reduce construction noise include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mufflers. During excavation and grading construction phases, construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards. ▪ Stationary Equipment. Stationary construction equipment shall be placed so that emitted noise is directed away from the nearest sensitive receptors. ▪ Equipment Staging Areas. Equipment staging shall be located in areas that will create the greatest distance feasible between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors. ▪ Electrically-Powered Tools and Facilities. Electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools and to power any temporary structures, such as construction trailers or caretaker facilities. ▪ Smart Back-up Alarms. Mobile construction equipment shall have smart back-up alarms that automatically adjust the sound level of the alarm in response to ambient noise levels. Alternatively, back-up alarms shall be disabled and replaced with human spotters to ensure safety when mobile construction equipment is moving in the reverse direction. ▪ Signage. For the duration of construction, the applicant or contractor shall post a sign in a construction zone that includes contact information for individuals who desire to file a noise complaint. ▪ Temporary Noise Barriers. Where necessary to meet the FTA criterion of 80 dBA Leq(8 Hr) for daytime construction affecting residential uses, erect temporary noise barriers at a height of 12 feet minimum to block the line-of-sight between construction equipment and receptors. Barriers shall be constructed with a solid material that has a density of at least 1.5 pounds per square foot with no gaps from the ground to the top of the barrier. ▪ Noise Disturbance Coordinator. The project applicant shall designate a "noise disturbance coordinator" responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of any noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) 	<p>examples listed in mitigation measures.</p>	<p>disturbing activities and project construction.</p>	<p>throughout project construction.</p>				

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>and shall require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. A telephone number for the disturbance coordinator shall be posted at the construction site.</p> <p>The City shall confirm that these measures are implemented during construction by monitoring the project at least once per month.</p>							
<p>NOI-1(b). Conduct Stationary Operational Noise Analysis</p> <p>The City shall require future development projects that are subject to discretionary approval to evaluate potential onsite operational noise impacts as part of project-level CEQA analysis on nearby noise-sensitive uses and to implement any required mitigation measures to minimize impacts on these uses. Examples of mitigation measures to reduce onsite noise include, but are not limited to, operational restrictions, selection of quiet equipment, equipment setbacks, enclosures, silencers, and/or acoustical louvers. The effectiveness of noise reducing measures shall be monitored to confirm effectiveness.</p>	Conduct a site-specific Stationary Operational Noise Analysis.	Prior to issuance of grading or building permits.	Periodically throughout project construction.	City of Watsonville.			
<p>NOI-2. Vibration Control Plan</p> <p>Based on the attenuation distances of vibration from standard construction equipment, prior to issuance of a building permit for a project requiring pile driving during construction within 135 feet of fragile structures such as historical resources, 100 feet of non-engineered timber and masonry buildings (e.g., most residential buildings), or within 75 feet of engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster); a vibratory roller within 25 feet of any structure; or a dozer or other heavy earthmoving equipment within 15 feet of any structure, the project applicant shall prepare a vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential vibration impacts related to these activities. This vibration analysis shall be conducted by a qualified and experienced acoustical consultant or engineer. The vibration levels shall not exceed FTA architectural damage thresholds (e.g., 0.12 in/sec PPV for fragile or historical resources, 0.2 in/sec PPV for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, and 0.3 in/sec PPV for engineered concrete and masonry). If vibration levels would exceed this threshold, alternative uses such as</p>	Prepare a Vibration Control Plan which shall be provided to the City upon request. Submit Statement of Compliance signed by the applicant and to the City Building Department.	Prior to the issuance of any permits and prior to construction.	Once.	City of Watsonville.			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification Initial	Date	Comments
<p>drilling piles as opposed to pile driving, static rollers as opposed to vibratory rollers, and lower horsepower dozers shall be used. If necessary, construction vibration monitoring shall be conducted to ensure vibration thresholds are not exceeded.</p> <p>Where vibration monitoring is determined to be necessary, a pre-construction baseline survey shall be conducted at buildings and structures within the screening distances by a licensed structural engineer. The condition of existing potentially affected properties shall be documented by photos and description of existing condition of building facades, noting existing cracks. A vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan shall be developed to identify where monitoring would be conducted, set up a vibration monitoring schedule, and define structure-specific vibration limits. Construction contingencies would be identified for when vibration levels approach the limits. If vibration levels approach limits, the contractor shall suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structure.</p> <p>Where historic structures are involved, the engineer shall provide a shoring design or other methods to protect such buildings and structures from potential damage. At the conclusion of vibration causing activities, the qualified structural engineer hired by the applicant shall issue a follow-up letter describing damage, if any, to impacted buildings. The letter shall include recommendations for repair, as may be necessary, in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Repairs shall be undertaken and completed by the contractor and monitored by a qualified structural engineer in conformance with all applicable codes including the California Historical Building Code (Part 8 of Title 24). A Statement of Compliance signed by the applicant and owner is required to be submitted to the City of Watsonville Building Division at plan check and prior to the issuance of any permit. The Vibration Control Plan, prepared as outlined above, shall be documented by a qualified structural engineer, and shall be provided to the City upon request. A Preservation Director shall be designated, and this person's contact information shall be posted in a location near the project site that is clearly</p>							

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
visible to the nearby receptors most likely to be disturbed. The Director would manage complaints and concerns resulting from activities that cause vibrations. The severity of the vibration concern should be assessed by the Director, and if necessary, evaluated by a qualified noise and vibration control consultant.							
Transportation							
TRA-1. Transportation Demand Management Program Each individual office and industrial development project in the DWSP plan area shall have a corresponding transportation demand management (TDM) plan and monitoring program developed by the applicant or developer of the project. This plan shall identify the TDM reductions specific to their project. The monitoring program shall establish goals and policies to ensure the efficient implementation of the TDM plan and demonstrate its effectiveness at reducing VMT such that VMT is below the significance thresholds presented in Table 4.8-2, above. Examples of TDM measures that could be employed, depending on specific project conditions and circumstances, include reduced parking supply, new transit stops, emergency ride home programs, bike-share programs, and traffic calming improvements.	Ensure that office and industrial development project applicants develop a TDM program which reduces VMT below the identified significance threshold.	Prior to the final inspections or building occupancy.	Once.	City of Watsonville.			
Tribal Cultural Resources							
TCR-1. Suspension of Work In The Area of Potential Tribal Cultural Resources In the event that potential tribal cultural resources, such as archaeological resources of Native American origin or tribal traditional tangible spaces or artifacts (historic-era and pre-contact era), are identified during implementation of a development project within the DWSP plan area, onsite project activities within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily suspended or redirected until either an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find (if archaeological) as a pre-contact or Native American-associated resource and an appropriate local Native American representative is consulted, or an appropriate local Native American representative is consulted regarding the significance of the resource (if not archaeological). If the City of Watsonville, in	In the event that cultural resources of Native American origin are encountered during project construction, stop all work in the vicinity of the find. Ensure a Native American representative is allowed monitoring access if cultural resources of or expected to be of Native American origin are found.	Concurrent with the start of project construction, and throughout project construction.	Ongoing throughout project construction involving ground disturbance.	City of Watsonville.			

Mitigation Measure	Action Required	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency or Party	Compliance Verification Initial	Date	Comments
<p>consultation with local Native Americans, determines that the resource is a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented for the specific development project in accordance with state guidelines and in consultation with local Native American group(s). The plan shall include avoidance of the resource or, if avoidance of the resource is infeasible, the plan shall outline the appropriate treatment of the resource in coordination with the appropriate local Native American tribal representative and, if applicable, a qualified archaeologist. Examples of appropriate mitigation for tribal cultural resources include, but are not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting traditional use of the resource, protecting the confidentiality of the resource or providing Tribal cultural sensitivity training about the resource to applicable City staff if it will be managed, appropriate public outreach regarding the resource, or heritage recovery (recovering items of tribal cultural heritage according to established tribal customs).</p>							