



INITIAL STUDY AND DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION
In Compliance with the
California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA")

Draft: 9th of May 2018

Amendment of the General Plan Land Use Element Text and Map, City's Zoning Code Text and Map and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan Related to Seasonal Employee Housing (GPA Case No. 2018-001 and RZ Case No. 2018-001 and 2018-002)



General Information About This Initial Study and Negative Declaration

What's in this document?

The City of King has prepared this Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS-ND) which examines the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. The document describes the project, which represent amendments to the General Plan, Municipal Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan permitting seasonal housing projects within designated areas of the City and establishing criteria for the design, appearance and other features of the seasonal housing. The project also includes the removal of farmworker housing as an allowable use within the FSC Zoning District, and by reference the C-2 Zoning District except where use is designated an allowable use by the overlay zone. Additionally, the General Plan and Zoning maps are amended designating certain areas along First Street as within a Dual Land Use Designation which allows seasonal employee housing in addition to the allowable uses of the underlying zones.

The Negative Declaration (ND) also describes the existing environment that could be affected by the project, potential impacts, if any, of the proposed project, and proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

Purpose of the Initial Study

The City of King has primary authority for carrying out the proposed project and is the lead agency under CEQA. The purpose of this IS-ND is to present to the public and reviewing agencies the environmental consequences of implementing the proposed project and describe the adjustments made to the project to avoid significant environmental effects or reduce them to a less than significant level. This disclosure document is being made available to the public, and reviewing agencies, for review and comment. There are no responsible agencies requiring review of this document. The IS-ND is being circulated for public and agency review and comment for a review period of 20 days as indicated on the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration (NOI). The 20-day public review period for this project begins on May 16, 2018 and ends on June 5, 2018.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT

The requirements for providing an NOI are found in CEQA Guidelines §15072. These guidelines require the City of King to mail the NOI to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who have previously requested such notice in writing. No organizations or individuals have made such a request in writing. In addition, the lead agency is required to notify the general public by utilizing at least one of the following three procedures:

- §15072(b)(1) Publication at least one time in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed project. If more than one area is affected, the notice shall be published in the newspaper of largest circulation in those areas, or
- §15072(b)(2) Posting the NOI on and off site in the area where the project is to be located, or
- §15072(b)(3) Direct mailing to the owners and occupants of property contiguous to the project.
Owners of such property shall be identified as shown on the latest equalized assessment roll.

The City of King has elected to utilize the first of the three notification options. The NOI was published in South County Newspaper *The Rustler* on May 9, 2018.

Negative Declaration and Initial Study, Proposed Amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan (Seasonal Employee Housing Standards/Dual Land Use Designation)

The NOI was posted at two prominent locations on and off site in the area where the project is located for the entire 20-day public review period. The four locations where the NOI was posted during the 20-day public review period are:

1. At City Hall, 212 S. Vanderhurst Avenue, King City, California
2. At the Monterey County Library, King City Branch, 402 Broadway, King City, California
3. At the door of Greyhound Ticket Office, 730 S. First Street, King City, CA 93930
4. At the Clock Tower wall, 218 N. First Street, King City, CA 93930

Electronic versions of the NOI and the CEQA document were also made available for review for the entire 20-day review period through their posting on the following public agency web site:

<http://www.kingcity.com/city-departments/community-development-department/>

What should you do?

- Please read this document. Additional copies of this document are available for review at the City Community Development Department, 212 South Vanderhurst Avenue, King City, California.
- Attend the Public Hearings. The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing on the Initial Study and Negative Declaration on **May 15, 2018** at City Hall, 212 South Vanderhurst Avenue. The City Council is scheduled to review the Initial Study and Negative Declaration on Tuesday, **May 22, 2018** at the City Council Chambers, 212 South Vanderhurst Avenue

We welcome your comments. If you have any concerns about the proposed project, please attend the Planning Commission and City Council Public Hearings. The deadline for written comments ends on **June 5, 2018**.

- If submitted prior to the close of public comment period, views and comments are welcomed from reviewing agencies or any member of the public on how the proposed project may affect the environment. Written comments must be postmarked or submitted on or prior to the date the public review period will close (as indicated on the NOI) for the City's consideration. Written comments may also be submitted via email (using the email address which appears below) but comments sent via email must also be received on or prior to the close of the 20-day public comment period. to:

Attn: Maricruz Aguilar-Navarro, City Planner
Community Development Department
City of King
212 South Vanderhurst Avenue
King City CA 93930
Phone: 831-385-3281
Fax: 831-386-5968

Or you can send comments and/or questions via email to: maguilar@kingcity.com

What happens next?

After comments are received from the public and reviewing agencies, the City Council may:

- 1) give environmental approval and approval of the proposed changes to the FSC Zoning Criteria, or
- 2) require additional environmental studies, or
- 3) require changes to the project or deny the project, if there are issues that cannot be mitigated.

Negative Declaration and Initial Study, Proposed Amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and
Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan (Seasonal Employee Housing Standards/Dual Land Use Designation)

If the City Council approves the IS-ND and the Project those changes of the Municipal Code will
become effective 30-days after the second ordinance reading.

CONTENTS:

I. PROJECT INFORMATION	Page 5
II. SUMMARY	Page 7
III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	Page 9
IV. INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION	Page 9
V. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND IMPACT REVIEW	Page 12
VI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Page 41
EXHIBITS	

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Seasonal Employee Housing

Lead Agency: King City
City Hall
212 S. Vanderhurst Ave.
King City, CA 93930

Case Number(s): GPA 2018-001, ZC 2018-001 and ZC 2018-002

Project Location Applies to certain property along First Street, as reflected in **Exhibits 1 and 2**, and to property with FSC and C-2 Zoning Designations.

Project Sponsor's Name and Address City of King Phone: 831-385-3281
City Hall Fax:
King City, CA 93930
Rep: Steve Adams, City Administrator

City Contact: Doreen Liberto-Blanck, AICP, Phone: 831.386.5923
Community Development Director
Maricruz Aguilar-Navarro, Phone: 831.386.5916
Assistant Planner
212 So. Vanderhurst Ave.,
King City, CA 93930

General Plan Designations: The proposed Seasonal Employee Housing Dual Land Use Designation is applicable to certain properties along First Street. (Reference attached **Exhibits 1 and 2**.) The underlying General Plan designations include: General Commercial (GC), Planned Development (PD), High Density Residential (HDR), General Industrial (GI), and Highway Service Commercial (HSC).

The Municipal Code and the Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan would be amended to remove "farmworker housing" as a permitted use with a conditional use permit (CUP) in the FSC Zone in Table 4.7 "Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements and, by reference, also removed from the C-2 Zoning District (**Reference attached Exhibit 1**).

Zoning: The Seasonal Employee Housing Dual Land Use Designation is applicable to the Planned Development (PD), Highway Service (H-

Negative Declaration and Initial Study, Proposed Amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan (Seasonal Employee Housing Standards/Dual Land Use Designation)

S), General Commercial (C-2), Industrial (M-2), First Street Corridor (FSC) and Agriculture (A) Zoning Districts. The Municipal Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan would be amended to remove farmworker housing as a permitted use with a conditional use permit (CUP) in the First Street Corridor (FSC) and General Commercial (C-2) Zoning Districts.

Description of Project:

The City of King proposes modifications to the General Plan text and map, Zoning Code text and map, and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan. Proposed Municipal Code Chapter 17.79 would establish seasonal employee housing standards. The General Plan and Zoning Code maps would be amended to create a Dual Land Use Designation on certain properties located along First Street (Project). Properties within the Dual Land Use Designation can either use their underlying zone to develop the property, build seasonal employee housing, or develop a hybrid of both. The Municipal Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan would be amended to remove farmworker housing as a permitted use in the FSC and C-2 Zoning Designations. The proposed Dual Land Use Designation applies to approximately fifteen (15) properties located along the First Street corridor. The Project does not approve specific developments; it only provides standards for future proposed seasonal employee housing.

Surrounding land uses and setting

	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use
North	Varies	Varies	Varies
East	Varies	Varies	Varies
South	Varies	Varies	Varies
West	Varies	Varies	Varies

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Response: No other agency approvals are necessary.

II. SUMMARY

City's Proposal:

The proposal (also described as “proposed project”) involves the modification of the City’s General Plan text and map and the Zoning Code text and maps to establish seasonal employee housing standards and a Dual Land Use Designation along First Street where seasonal employee housing could be constructed. Chapter 17.79 would be added to the Municipal Code and establish seasonal employee housing standards. Additionally, the Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan would be amended to remove farmworker housing as a permitted use.

The proposed changes will encourage a variety of seasonal employee housing types utilizing innovative housing types, landscaping and architecture that will be compatible with the neighborhood and community. The proposal will, if approved, create a “Dual Land Use Designation” that will allow seasonal employee housing on certain areas along First Street.

The proposal also includes the removal of “farmworker housing” as an allowable use within the FSC Zoning District (and by reference, also from the C-2 Zoning District). Reference **Exhibits 1** and **2** for specific language and proposed map changes.

The changes to the Zoning Code and General Plan are in response to a need for additional housing to serve seasonal employees and ensure that farmers and ranchers within and near King City have an adequate workforce available to assist them in producing vegetables, fruits and meats to serve the needs of California and the nation.

The City participated in a Farmworker Housing Study (Study) along with other jurisdictions. The Study found an astounding 47,937 additional units of farmworker housing are needed to alleviate critical overcrowding in Monterey County. The Project will help to address the need for farmworker housing in the City and surrounding region. Some farmers have indicated that their employees live several hours drive from the City, resulting in long commutes and excessive transportation costs. The Project will provide needed housing in close proximity to agricultural employees work.

Some of the local seasonal employees are currently being housed in local neighborhoods, resulting in overcrowding of existing homes and apartments. The proposed “dual use” designation will hopefully result in future construction of well-designed comfortable housing for some of the several thousand seasonal employees needed in our area.

The proposed changes will modify the General Plan and Zoning Code to allow seasonal employee housing as a “dual use” within

designated areas (i.e., Dual Land Use Designation). The Dual Land Use Designation allows the choice to construct seasonal employee housing in addition to the allowable uses of the underlying zone.

Proposed Chapter 17.79 includes architectural and design standards that ensure future seasonal employee housing projects will be similar in appearance to standard housing. It also provides minimum living space per bed/seasonal employee, parking requirements, interior and exterior leisure amenities, and architectural and design standards.

This Negative Declaration evaluates the potential impacts of the proposed Project.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

This section documents the screening process used to identify and focus upon environmental impacts that could result from this project.

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology/Water Quality
	Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population /Housing		Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance

IV. INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

(To be completed by King City, the Lead Agency for the project)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

X	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been

	avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.
--	--

Signature of Preparer: Donald J. Funk, Principal Planner	Date _____
--	------------

EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST CATEGORIES

“**No Impact**” applies where the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved. For example, if the project site is not located in a fault rupture zone, then the item asking whether the project would result in or expose people to potential impacts involving fault rupture should be marked as “No Impact.”

“**Less-Than-Significant Impact**” applies where the impact would occur, but the magnitude of the impact is considered insignificant or negligible. For example, a development which would only slightly increase the amount of surface water runoff generated at a project site would be considered to have a less-than-significant impact on surface water runoff.

“**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less- Than-Significant Impact.” Incorporated mitigation measures should be outlined within the checklist and a discussion should be provided which explains how the measures reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This designation is appropriate for a Mitigated Negative Declaration, where potentially significant issues have been analyzed and mitigation measures have been recommended.

“**Potentially Significant Impact**” applies where the project has the potential to cause a significant and unmitigable environmental impact. If there are one or more items marked as “Potentially Significant Impact,” an EIR is required.

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one

- or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
 - 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
 - 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
 - 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
 - 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
 - 9) The explanation of each issue should identify the:
 - a) significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

V. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND IMPACT REVIEW

The following Initial Study Checklist form was based upon an analysis of the proposed project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

Impact Discussion

1.a First Street is an important entryway to the City and Pinnacles National Park. The views from First Street are important. The amendments do not significantly change the intensity of the proposed land uses already permitted in the existing zoning designations. The proposed amendments to the Municipal Code and General Plan will not significantly change the existing City’s design review process and the changes are not projected to result in any significant negative impacts on aesthetics. Proposed Municipal Code Section 17.79.50 Architectural Design Standards addresses the requirement that new projects will be required to be designed to fit harmoniously into each location. Seasonal employee housing will be designed to be similar to recently approved multi-family residential developments. Projects will be required to meet minimum architectural and design standards and be reviewed by staff and the Planning Commission.

Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will have no impact on scenic vistas.

1.b The proposed modifications of the General Plan and Zoning Code will not result in the damage or blocking of scenic resources.

Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will have no impact on scenic resources.

1.c As mentioned in 1.a, the proposed amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Code will not change the existing City’s design review process. New seasonal employee housing projects will need to meet minimum architectural and design standards.

Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will have no impact on, nor degrade existing character of King City.

1.d The proposed changes to the General Plan and Zoning Code do not modify existing criteria that prevent glare and excessive light. All new projects will be conditioned to limit outside

lighting for fixtures that do not glare or negatively impact areas off-site. Night-time glare and light will not be an issue.

Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will have no impact on glare.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed policies and ordinance addresses that the future seasonal housing projects will complement existing neighborhoods and enhance scenic vistas.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?			X	
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X	
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X	

Impact Discussion:

2.a The Proposed amendments are proposed for properties within existing urban developed parts of the City and will not impact any farmland or convert existing farmlands within or close to the City. The proposed amendments to the General Plan and addition of provisions for Seasonal Employee Housing in the Municipal Code Chapter 17.79 will potentially increase the availability of needed housing to serve seasonal employees. The provision of potential seasonal employee housing will provide a net benefit for local farm and ranch owners by encouraging additional farmworkers to live in close proximity to local farms and ranches. The proposed change will be a positive impact on agriculture. In addition, the Housing Element encourages the addition of farmworker housing.

Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will have no impact on farmland. The new provisions will result in a probable increase in farmworker employee housing to support farmers and ranchers in and around King City.

2.b The areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are not part of any Williamson Act Contract. The removal of “farmworker housing” from FSC and C-2 Zones has no impact on Williamson Act Contract lands. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

2.c The areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are surrounded by existing commercial and or residential developments. No timberlands are being impacted by the seasonal employee housing nor by the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

2.d The areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are surrounded by existing commercial and or residential developments. No timberlands are being impacted by the proposed Dual Land Use Designation nor are any timberlands being impacted by the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

2.e As described in 2.a, the proposed amendments to the General Plan and addition of provisions for Seasonal Employee Housing in the Municipal Code Chapter 17.79 will potentially increase the availability of needed housing to serve seasonal employees. The provision of potential seasonal employee housing will provide a net benefit for local farm and ranch owners by encouraging additional farmworkers to live in close proximity to local farms and ranches. The proposed change will be a positive impact on agriculture. In addition, the Housing Element encourages the addition of farmworker housing. The proposed removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will be off-set by the addition of seasonal employee housing in the proposed Dual Land Use Designation area. The proposed changes will likely have a positive impact on retaining agricultural lands in and around King City.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which				

exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Impact Discussion:

- 3.a The EPA’s California Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants shows Monterey County having no nonattainments since 1997. In addition, the proposed language changes to the General Plan Land Use Element and the addition of Municipal Code Chapter 17.79 will not change the standards applying to the protection of the public from dust or other air quality standard. In addition, the changes to allow farmworker housing, if it is in the form of apartment units, is not anticipated to have any greater impact than larger residential developments or commercial uses now permitted within the proposed Dual Land Use Designation. The changes will not have or create a significant impact. Each project will be required, through the Environmental Review Process and Permit Review, to have provisions that prevent dust and other pollutants. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on air quality nor will impact the air quality plan for the region. There would be no significant impact.
- 3.b Monterey County has had no nonattainments since 1997. In addition, the proposed amendments do not create any land uses that would have greater impacts than the underlying zoning criteria. Further, trips will be reduced for certain seasonal employees that are provided van or bus transportation to and from work sites. This will especially apply to H2A workers who are required to be provided transportation. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no air quality impacts.
- 3.c The proposed amendments promote the use of bus transit provided by employers, which reduces emissions that impact air quality. The amendments will not result in construction or operational emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on ambient air quality. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.
- 3.d As mentioned in 3.c, the proposed amendments promote the use of bus transit provided by employers, which reduces emissions that impact air quality. The amendments will not result in construction or operational emissions that would expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.
- 3.e The proposed amendments will result in potential housing projects that are not anticipated to produce any objectional odors. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impact on odors. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------

	Impact	with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact	
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X	

Impact Discussion:

- 4.a The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact sensitive habitat areas. The amendments do not significantly change the intensity of the proposed land uses already permitted in the existing zoning designations. The areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are in locations that are devoid of any significant vegetation or habitat areas and are surrounded by existing developments. There are no creek or wetland areas proposed within the proposed seasonal employee housing areas. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact sensitive habitat areas. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 4.b The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact riparian habitat or other sensitive habitat area. The amendments do not significantly change the intensity of the proposed land uses already permitted in the existing zoning designations. Each future project will entail an evaluation of

the specific project impacts prior to approval. The primary significant riparian habitat areas in the City are along and near San Lorenzo Creek and the Salinas River. The Salinas River is also an important corridor for the migration of Steelhead to and from the Pacific Ocean and the upper watershed and tributaries of Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties. The areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are located in locations that are devoid of any significant vegetation or habitat areas and are surrounded by existing developments. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact riparian areas. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

- 4.c The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact wetlands. The amendments do not significantly change the intensity of the proposed land uses already permitted in the existing zoning designations. In addition, the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are do not include wetlands, ponds, lakes or rivers. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact wetlands. There will no significant impact on areas designated as 404 on riparian or wetland habitats.
- 4.d The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact the migration of fish or other species. The amendments do not significantly change the intensity of the proposed land uses already permitted in the existing zoning designations. Additionally, the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are not wetlands, stream or river corridors. No federally protected wetlands exist on or near the site. The migrations of native resident or migratory fish (such as Steelhead along the Salinas River corridor) and other wildlife species and with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors will not be impacted. Nor are native wildlife nursery sites within or near the project area. There are no creek or wetland areas proposed within the proposed seasonal employee housing areas. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact migratory species. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 4.e The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact trees or woodlands. The amendments do not significantly change the intensity of the proposed land uses already permitted in the existing zoning designations. The City does not have a tree ordinance. In addition, the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing have been degraded due to previous urban and farm uses and do not contain significant not habitat or rare or endangered species. The migrations of native resident or migratory fish (such as Steelhead along the Salinas River corridor) and other wildlife species and with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors will not be impacted. The Proposed Project area does not conflict with any ordinances or local policies protecting biological resources. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact trees or woodlands. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 4.f There are no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans within the City. The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact sensitive habitat area. The amendments do not significantly change the intensity of the proposed land uses already permitted in the existing zoning designations. The proposed project area does not conflict with any ordinances or local policies protecting biological resources. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact any Habitat Conservation Plan or other local, regional or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?			X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?			X	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

- 5.a The proposed amendments to the Municipal Code, General Plan and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact historical resources. The amendments do not significantly change the future intensity of development. Additionally, the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are located in previously developed properties (urban uses and farmlands) and the area is devoid of any significant known historical resources. Each future development will entail a separate evaluation of historic resources. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact any historical resource. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 5.b The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact archaeological resources. The amendments do not significantly change the future intensity of development. Additionally, the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are located in previously developed properties (urban uses and farmlands) and the area does not have any known significant archaeological resources. The region was populated with indigenous peoples from the Tribe known as Salinan, which extended from the upper reaches of the Salinas River watershed in San Luis Obispo County to near Monterey Bay. Each future development will entail a separate evaluation of archaeological resources. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact any archaeological resource. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 5.c The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact paleontological resources. The amendments do not significantly change the future intensity of development. Additionally, the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are located in previously developed properties (urban uses and farmlands) and the area does not have any known significant paleontological or unique geologic sire or resources. Each future development will entail a separate evaluation of paleontological resources. Further, the removal of “farmworker

housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not impact any paleontological resource. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

- 5.d The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact burials. The amendments do not significantly change the future intensity of development. Additionally, the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are located in previously developed properties (urban uses and farmlands) and the area does not have any known burial sites. Each future development will entail a separate evaluation of burials. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any impact on any burials. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

Impact Discussion:

The areas proposed for the seasonal employee housing are predominantly within developed areas of the City. There are no known archaeological, historic or paleontological resources on the designated areas. The proposed changes do not change the potential intensity of development. The development of each future project will be evaluated for potential impacts on cultural resources and the projects will be required to protect any significant resources as a condition of the individual projects.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating			X	

substantial risks to life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X	

Impact Discussion:

6.a.i The proposed Project will not affect geology or soils. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any impact on exposing persons to earthquakes. Buildings will continue to be required to meet the requirements of the seismic location which depends on soil conditions. proximity of ground water, potential for ground motion and other factors. Certain buildings, such as hospitals and schools, are required to meet stricter structural criteria as defined by the building code.

The valley is generally described as having quaternary deposits according to the State of California Department of Conservation "Geologic Map of California." Quaternary means "belonging to the geologic time, system of rocks, or sedimentary deposits of the second period of the Cenozoic Era, from the end of the Tertiary Period through the present, characterized by the appearance and development of humans and including the Pleistocene and Holocene epochs." (Source: Free Dictionary website.) The Salinas Valley is made up of primarily alluvial soils deposited over time by the periodic flooding processes of the Salinas River and its tributaries. In this sense, flooding is normal and beneficial process in which soils are built up in valley floors.

The City of King is located in the Salinas Valley between the Santa Lucia and Gabilan mountain ranges which is a broad basin filled with several thousand feet of sediment. The City is within close proximity to numerous fault lines, the most prominent being the San Andreas east of the City and the Rinconada to the west. According to the AMBAG 2035 MTP/SCS and RTPs for Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz EIR, Section 4.7 Geology and Soils Section, Monterey County "is susceptible to high levels of groundshaking due to the numerous active faults which pass through or border the area. The portions of Monterey County with the highest susceptibility to ground-shaking are the lower Salinas Valley (northward from the City of Gonzales), the peninsular area from Carmel to the Santa Cruz County line, and in the southeast around Parkfield." According to the EarthquakeTrack.com, in 2013, there were 754 earthquakes of magnitude 1.5 or larger in the region near the City of King, with 63 earthquakes within the past month (at the time of the preparation of this Initial Study). Most of those earthquakes have occurred east of Gonzalez, Soledad, Greenfield and City of King in clusters along the San Andreas Fault which parallels the Salinas Valley.

Future major earthquakes in or near the City of King appear likely. Local building standards require each structure to be designed to meet building code standards. There are no significant impacts.

6.a.ii The proposed Project will not affect geology or soils. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any impact geology or soils or safety of persons due to ground shaking. Buildings will continue to be required to meet the requirements of the seismic location which depends on soil conditions. proximity of ground water, potential for ground motion and other factors. There are no significant impacts. Certain buildings, such as hospitals and schools, are required to meet stricter structural criteria as defined by the building code.

6.a.iii The proposed Project will not affect safety due to liquefaction. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any impact on safety due to

liquefaction. Buildings will continue to be required to meet the requirements of the seismic location which depends on soil conditions, proximity of ground water, potential for ground motion, liquefaction and other factors.

- 6.a.iv The proposed project will not affect safety due to landslides. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any impact safety due to landslide risk. Buildings will continue to be required to meet the requirements of the seismic location including landslide risk.
- 6.b The proposed amendments would not significantly increase the impermeable surface area of the site to a degree that is greater than the underlying allowable uses for each site. Each project will be required to design and implement appropriate erosion control and sediment control measures and reduce potential or soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Required landscaping of the site and use of appropriate construction techniques such as watering, planting, bioretention basins and other Best Management Practices would ensure that the impact is below a level of significance. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any impact on soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant.
- 6.c The proposed amendments would not significantly increase geologic hazards to a greater degree than the underlying allowable uses for each site. The areas proposed for seasonal employee housing would not result in landslides due to the flat terrain of the properties. The Proposed Project would not induce geologic or soil instability on or offsite. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any impact on landslide or other geologic hazard. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant.
- 6.d The areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are located in previously developed properties (urban uses and farmlands) The proposed amendments will not change the intensity or requirements for building design applicable to the underlying allowable uses for each site. The buildings that would be constructed, would be required to include structural measures that would provide stability regardless of soil type. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any significant impact on expansive soils or safety of buildings or persons. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in substantial risks to life or property.
- 6.e The areas proposed for seasonal employee housing are located in the City and will be required to connect to the City sewage system. No on-site septic tanks will be allowed. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result have negative impacts on sewage disposal.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed language changes will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS — Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
--	--	--	--	--

Impact Discussion:

7.a The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not significantly impact greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of primary concern from land use projects include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Construction related activities resulting in exhaust emissions may come from fuel combustion for heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips. Operational GHG emissions would result from motor vehicle trips generated by the residents and visitors, including trips by busses providing transportation to and from work sites, as well as on-site fuel combustion for landscape maintenance equipment.

The proposed amendments do not change the ultimate intensity allowed by the underlying zoning designations. Further, buses and vans used by employee residents of the seasonal employee housing projects will serve to reduce trips and thereby reduce projected future GHG emissions.

The California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB32) signed into law in September 2006, required statewide GHG emissions to be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. AB32 established regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve this goal and provides guidance to help attain quantifiable reductions in emissions efficiently, without limiting population and economic growth. In September of 2016, Senate Bill (SB) 32 was signed by the Governor, to establish a California GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

The GHG emissions resulting from the future projects would be evaluated at the time of the permit request for each project. The GHG emissions are not expected to exceed the levels that would be produced by uses already permitted in the underlying zoning categories and therefore would not substantially hinder the State’s ability to attain the goals identified in SB 32. Thus, the construction and operation of the project would not generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, which may be considered to have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any significant impact on GHG. No mitigation measures are required.

7.b The City has adopted policies to reduce Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Placing seasonal employee housing in relatively close proximity to the farms around the City will result in fewer and shorter trips to the work sites, thereby reducing vehicle emissions. The proposed amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Code adding seasonal employee housing do not conflict with City’s policies to reduce GHG emissions. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones will not have any significant impact on GHG. Impacts will not be significant.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

Negative Declaration and Initial Study, Proposed Amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan (Seasonal Employee Housing Standards/Dual Land Use Designation)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:			X	
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

Impact Discussion:

8.a The proposed amendments will not have significant impacts on hazards of transport and disposal of hazardous substances. The use of hazardous substances during normal construction and residential activities is expected to be limited in nature and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the transport and disposal of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts hazardous substances including transport and disposal. No mitigation measures are required.

- 8.b As described in 8.a, the proposed amendments will not have significant impacts on hazards. The use of hazardous substances during normal construction and residential activities is expected to be limited in nature and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on hazardous substances. No mitigation measures are required.
- 8.c There are no public schools within one-quarter mile of the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing. There is an existing private un-licensed un-permitted school located approximately one block (about 500 feet) west of First Street, near the existing Farmworker barracks at 218 N. First Street. The proposed amendments won’t create hazardous conditions that are any different that uses already permitted in the underlying zoning designations. The typical project implementation of seasonal employee housing development includes usual grading operations which would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. However, because of the dispersive properties of DPM, and the distance from any sensitive receptors to the future project sites, the impacts on those receptors would be less than significant. Further, operation of the future seasonal employee housing projects do not propose a use that involves activities that would emit hazardous substances or waste that would affect a substantial number of people and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on hazardous substances. No mitigation measures are required.
- 8.d The proposed amendments to permit seasonal employee housing will not have a significant impact on hazardous sites. Further, a search of the Envirostar Geotracker website indicates no sites are within the proposed Dual Land Use Designation area. The location of each future project is not known at this time. To ensure that no subsurface contamination has occurred, each future development site will be evaluated for the potential for subsurface pollution at the time of permit review. The proposed area for seasonal employee housing is not indicated as being located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. While no exiting data indicates contaminants, each future project will be evaluated prior to issuance of permits. That analysis could involve soil tests and/or tests of existing structures for contaminants or hazardous materials and mitigation measures would be implemented prior to grading and construction. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on hazardous substance sites. Therefore, there is no significant impact.
- 8.e The proposed amendments will not have any impacts on airports. Further, the area proposed for seasonal employee housing is not within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has been adopted. The project site is not within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip or public use airport. The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on airports. Therefore, there is no significant impact.
- 8.f The proposed amendments will not have any impacts on airstrips. The area proposed for seasonal employee housing is not within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has been adopted. The project site is not within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip or public use airport. The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on airstrips. Therefore, there is no significant impact.

8.g The proposed amendments are not anticipated to impair implementation of or physically interfere with any City emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Roadway networks for escape are not being impacted by development of any of the areas designated for seasonal employee housing. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on evacuation plans. Therefore, there are no significant impacts.

8.h The potential sites for future seasonal employee housing are primarily located within existing urban built-up areas. There are no forest areas in or adjacent to the City. However, fire protection will be required in each future project, including, where required by code, fire sprinkler systems and other protective measures. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on wildland or other fire hazards. Therefore, there are no significant impacts.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood			X	

Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	

Impact Discussion:

- 9.a The proposed amendments will have no significant impacts on water resources. Additionally, water for future development in the seasonal employee housing areas would not rely on groundwater wells as a potable water source. Potable water for this project will be treated water from the California Water Service Company (Cal Water). The project will not violate water quality standards with respect to potable water. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on water resources. Therefore, there are no significant impacts.
- 9.b The proposed amendments will not significantly impact water resources. The proposed uses will not have significantly greater water use than the uses allowed under existing underlying zoning designations. Additionally, the proposed Dual Land Use Designation area may contain existing wells that will only be used for agricultural purposes, not for potable water for seasonal employee housing. There are no new wells proposed, and for that reason the creation of the Dual Land Use Designation will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The project will not create water uses that are significantly different from the existing base underlying zoning districts. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on groundwater supplies. Therefore, there are no significant impacts.
- 9.c The proposed amendments do not modify future drainage. The changes will not, by themselves, cause significant changes to surface hydrology. Drainage will generally remain within its historical pattern. By existing City standards contained in the Municipal Code, storm water runoff discharge points will not change from the pre-project to post-project condition and there is no diversion of storm water from one watershed to another. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on drainage. The proposed project’s impacts associated with altering the existing drainage patterns of the site are less than significant.
- 9.d The proposed amendments will not result in any significant changes in land coverage or runoff as compared with the underlying zoning districts. Run-off would not exceed planned stormwater drainage systems capacity. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction and permanent BMPs for ultimate completed projects to reduce impacts to stormwater drainage systems. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on drainage or the course of any stream or river. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant.
- 9.e The proposed amendments will not result in any significant changes in land coverage or runoff as compared with the underlying zoning districts. The capacity of existing systems are adequate to handle the expected runoff. Each project will be required to have adequate capacity of on-site bioretention basins or other measures that will help maintain runoff at existing levels. Also, the proposed amendments would not substantially degrade water

quality because the future projects will be required to comply with provisions of Municipal Code Section 17.56.100. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on water runoff. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts.

- 9.f As described above, the proposed amendments will not result in any significant changes in land coverage or runoff as compared with the underlying zoning districts. Run-off would not exceed planned stormwater drainage systems capacity. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction and permanent BMPs for ultimate completed projects to reduce impacts to stormwater drainage systems and improve water quality of runoff. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on water quality. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant.
- 9.g The proposed seasonal employee housing areas are not located within a 100-year floodway or flood hazard area. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on flooding, floodways or floodplains. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 9.h The proposed seasonal employee housing areas are not located within a 100-year floodway or flood hazard area. The project would not impede flood waters or cause flooding to occur on adjacent properties. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on floodways or flood hazards. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 9.i The proposed seasonal employee housing areas are not located in area identified as at risk from flooding due to levee or dam failure. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on persons in flood hazards or areas of dam failures, levees or other similar facilities. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 9.j The proposed seasonal employee housing areas are located inland with no substantial bodies of water nearby other than San Lorenzo Creek. The designated areas are not located in the floodway. Therefore, the risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is considered to be low. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on areas of risk of inundation. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

No mitigation measures are required.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance)			X	

adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			X	

Impact Discussion:

10.a The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts on dividing the community. Additionally, the proposed areas for seasonal employee housing are generally located adjacent to or near other existing developments and would not divide an existing community. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on physically dividing the City. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

10.b The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan are consistent with the City’s policies that encourage the development of affordable housing. The proposed Dual Land Use Designation area allows construction of seasonal employee housing, which furthers the intent of the General Plan Housing Element. Currently, based upon statements of local farmers and ranchers, there are insufficient quarters for seasonal employees in and near King City. Farm owners indicate that they bus farmworkers from long distances to work the local farms. The lack of existing housing for seasonal employees has produced pressures on existing housing within the City, including potentials for overcrowding. The removal of farmworker housing from the FSC and C-2 Zoning Districts will not negatively impact housing for farmworkers because additional seasonal employee housing will be provided along First Street.

In addition, the following Housing Element Goal #3 and Policy #4.3 apply to the proposed change to the proposed changes to the Zoning Code for the addition of Seasonal Employee Housing:

Housing Element Goal 3: To meet the housing needs of special groups of City residents, including a growing senior population, large families, single mothers, farmworkers, homeless, seniors and the disabled.

Housing Element Policy 4.3 Encourage housing opportunities for those residents who have special housing needs, such as farm workers, large families, elderly, disabled persons, and other identified special needs groups.

The proposed amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Code will expand the areas within the City where seasonal employee housing could be developed. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on housing because the dual use provisions of the proposed amendments will add new housing opportunities for seasonal employees. Therefore, there will be no significant negative impact.

10.c The proposed amendments will have no impact on conservation plans. Further, the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community plan. The nearest habitat areas, San Lorenzo Creek and the Salinas River, will not be impacted by proposed uses in the proposed seasonal employee housing areas. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on any conservation plan. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Less Than Significant	No Impact
--	-------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------

	Impact	with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact	
11. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X	
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X	

Impact Discussion:

- 11.a The proposed amendments have no impact on mineral resources. The proposed seasonal employee housing areas are located within or adjacent to existing developed areas of the City. No mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state have been identified. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on mineral resources. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 11.b The proposed amendments have no impact on mineral resources. There are no locally important mineral resource recovery sites delineated on a local plan, specific plan, or general plan in the vicinity of the proposed seasonal employee housing areas. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on mineral resources. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

Impact Discussion:

12.a The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan will not create any noise levels that exceed those levels identified in the Municipal Code Section 17.56.030 since no specific projects are being approved.

As noted, the proposal does not approved any specific development projects. At the time development applications are submitted, staff will address specific noise issues using City standards, such as the Noise Element. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on noise. Therefore, there are no significant impacts.

12.b The proposed General Plan Amendment, Zoning Code Amendment and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan do not approve development projects and therefore, would not create any groundborne vibration levels that would be perceptible, damaging, or otherwise disturbing to nearby noise-sensitive land uses.

The proposed standards require that future projects are subject to discretionary review and noise will be addressed at that time. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on groundborne vibration. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

12.c The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zoning Code Amendment will not create any permanent noise levels that would be perceptible, damaging, or otherwise disturbing to nearby noise-sensitive land uses. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on ambient noise. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

12.d The proposed seasonal employee housing standards will not create any temporary or periodic ambient noise levels that would be perceptible, damaging, or otherwise disturbing to nearby noise-sensitive land uses. The seasonal employee housing is similar in nature to other multi-family residential uses that typically do not create excessive noise levels. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on temporary or periodic noise. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

12.e The proposed amendments allowing seasonal employee housing areas are not located within an airport land use plan or located within two (2) miles of an airport. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on airport or airport noise. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

12.f The proposed amendments allowing seasonal employee housing areas are not located near an airstrip. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has

Negative Declaration and Initial Study, Proposed Amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan (Seasonal Employee Housing Standards/Dual Land Use Designation)

no impacts on airstrip noise or noise created by airstrips. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not result in the generation of noise from the proposed uses and therefore will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	

Impact Discussion:

13.a The proposed amendments to the General Plan, and Zoning Code will not significantly impact population or housing. The proposed addition of seasonal employee housing is anticipated to increase the availability of housing for local farmworkers and other seasonal employees, thus resulting in improving the availability of affordable housing within the City.

All of the potential building sites within the area proposed for a dual land use designation for seasonal employee housing have existing access to roadways, utilities and other infrastructure.

In addition, seasonal employee housing is encouraged within the Housing Element. Furthermore, seasonal employee housing is acutely needed within and near King City to provide housing for those working in agriculture. The proposed amendments will improve the availability of affordable and well-designed housing to serve seasonal employees who work in and near the City. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on population growth. Impacts will be less than significant.

13.b The proposed amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Code will increase the availability of housing for local farmworkers and other seasonal employees, thus resulting in improving the availability of affordable housing within the City. It will also free-up existing housing in the City for full-time residents. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on housing because the existing farmworker

housing located on First Street is proposed to be permitted based on the proposed dual use provisions for seasonal employee housing. Impacts will be less than significant.

- 13.c As described above, the proposed amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Code will increase the availability of housing for local farmworkers and other seasonal employees, thus resulting in improving the availability of affordable housing within the City. It will also free-up existing housing in the City for full-time residents. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts because the proposed dual use provisions will permit the existing housing development located on First Street north of Broadway Street. It will not displace persons living within the City. Impacts will be less than significant.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?			X	

ii. Police protection?			X	
lii. Schools?			X	
iv. Parks?			X	
v. Other public facilities?			X	

Impact Discussion:

- 14.a.i The proposed amendments would not create more intensive development than the underlying zoning designations. Therefore, the amendments do not increase the demand for fire protection services. Each project will be reviewed individually at the time of the application for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and conditions to for fire protection will be established at that time. It should be noted that buildings may be required to provide fire sprinkler systems as specified by fire standards. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on fire protection. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.
- 14.a.ii The proposed amendments would not create more intensive development than the underlying zoning designations. The projects are anticipated to reduce overcrowding now being experienced in other parts of the City due to a lack of adequate housing for seasonal employees. The current overcrowding in residential neighborhoods brought about by a lack of seasonal employee housing sometimes may result in police or health issues. Each project will be reviewed individually at the time of the application for a specific plan or CUP, and conditions to for police protection will be established at that time. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on police protection. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.
- 14.a.iii The proposed amendments will result in some additional school children when families of seasonal employees are included in such housing. Not all seasonal employee housing is for single-men. Often, seasonal employees need housing for their wives and children. Such developments may be required to pay applicable school fees at the time of building permit issuance. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on schools. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
- 14.a.iv The proposed amendments will not require significantly greater recreational uses than those residential uses that are currently allowed under the existing criteria. The proposed Seasonal Employee Housing standards require exterior open space and interior leisure area to be incorporated into projects., This requirement will ensure that impacts on existing City facilities will be less than significant. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on recreational facilities.
- 14.a.v The proposed amendments will not require significantly greater public services than those ruses that are currently allowed under the existing criteria. There may be an insignificant increase in visitors to the City Library. The potential increase in visitors would be minimal and would not require extension of facilities or resources. No other impacts to public services are anticipated. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on other public facilities such as sewer treatment plant, water treatment plant, library or other facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

Impact Discussion:

15.a The proposed amendments will not impact recreational services because the proposed regulations require exterior open space and interior leisure area to serve the residents of the proposed seasonal employee housing developments. It is anticipated that large facilities may be required to provide on-site recreation facilities for the farmworker residents. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.

15.b The proposed amendments not result in recreational facilities that would, in themselves, create a significant effect on the environment. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on recreational facilities or the impacts of new recreational facilities on the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures or other			X	

standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?			X	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.			X	

Impact Discussion:

16.a The proposed amendments are not expected to impact existing or proposed circulation systems nor conflict with any plans, ordinances or policies related to the circulation system. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant. The planned Multi-modal Transit Center (MMTC) is proposed near the center of the areas being proposed for seasonal employee housing. This MMTC facility can provide access to trains, buses and other modes of transit for the occupants of the seasonal employee housing. The projects will be mutually benefited. Pedestrian access will not be impacted. Future sidewalk extensions will be constructed along the frontages of the proposed sites. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on the circulation system. Impacts will be less than significant.

16.b The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts on congestion. Furthermore, the future uses created by the proposed changes to the General Plan and Zoning Code allow seasonal employee housing which are not projected to create any significant traffic problems or congestion. Some seasonal employee housing facilities, such as H-2A projects, will provide bus transportation for occupants, reducing vehicle trips.

Future uses, including the seasonal employee housing that would be permitted within the dual-use districts will continue to be required to meet all access and parking requirements of the City. New standards for off-street parking will address parking needs of any future seasonal employee housing project. The code will reflect the variation in parking needs for the various different types of seasonal housing projects. Some projects will be similar in nature to other housing if employees and their families have personal transportation verses other projects where employers or others provide bus or van pool transportation for the residents. The regulations will reflect the type of use requiring parking and adapt the number of parking spaces accordingly. The changes are not anticipated to create significant impacts to traffic or the street system.

According to the 2010 Traffic Study conducted for the Downtown Addition Specific Plan, nearby roadways experience good Level of Service (LOS). First Street and Lonoak Road has LOS of A and B for AM and PM Peak Hour. First Street and Division has AM and PM Peak Hour LOS ranging from A to C. First Street and Pearl also has LOS ranging from A to C. First Street and Broadway has LOS of A and B as does the intersection of Metz Road and Bitterwater Road. Development of seasonal employee housing is not expected to cause significant changes in the LOS for any of these intersections.

Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on congestion. Therefore, the impacts will be less than significant.

- 16.c Seasonal employee housing that would be created by the proposed changes to the General Plan and Zoning Code are not projected to create any significant air traffic issues. The local airport does not, at this time have any commercial airlines. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on air traffic. Air traffic impacts will be less than significant.
- 16.d The proposed amendments will not result in any significant new roadway construction or increase any hazards. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on hazards at intersections or other traffic or roadway impacts. Impacts will be less than significant.
- 16.e The proposed amendments will not have significant impacts on streets or bus service. Furthermore, they will not result in a blockage of a major arterial and bus services would not interfere with emergency access. Emergency access will not be blocked or affected. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on streets or bus service. Therefore, there will be no significant impact.
- 16.f The proposed amendments will not have any significant impact on adopted plans or ordinances related to transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In fact, the proposed amendments will result in the provision of bus or van transportation for residents living in H-2A housing, which will likely result in a positive impact on reduction of street congestion. Residents are expected to walk, bike and use transit while living at the facilities. City adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities will not be impacted by the proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan. The future residences will not decrease the performance or safety of City transit and circulation facilities. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, there will be no significant impact.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts. Transportation and street system will not be significantly impacted.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>17. Tribal Cultural Resources. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape,</p>				

Negative Declaration and Initial Study, Proposed Amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan (Seasonal Employee Housing Standards/Dual Land Use Designation)

sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X	
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

Impact Discussion:

17.a The proposed amendments will not have a significant impact on tribal cultural resources. There are no known listings in the California Register of Historic Resources or local register of historic resources within the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing. Any future designations would be evaluated at the time of issuance of a discretionary permit (e.g., specific plan, CUP). The local Tribe(s) will be notified of future pending projects. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on Tribal lands. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.

17.b The proposed amendments will not have a significant impact any resource of any California Native American Tribe. There are no known archeological or known tribal sites within the areas proposed for seasonal employee housing. The City will notify the local Salinan Tribe of pending environmental determinations for future proposed projects. If there are no Negative Declaration or EIR proposed, the City should notify the Salinan Tribe prior to issuance of a discretionary permit (e.g., specific plan, CUP). Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on resources of any California Native American Tribe. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or				

Negative Declaration and Initial Study, Proposed Amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan (Seasonal Employee Housing Standards/Dual Land Use Designation)

wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

Impact Discussion:

- 18.a The proposed amendments will not have any significant impact on sewage treatment or sewage service. The sewage treatment service needs created by proposed amendments for seasonal employee housing are not projected to be any greater than the uses already identified in those zones. The capacity of the sewer plant will not be significantly affected. No non-compliance of RWQCB resulting from the proposed amendments is contemplated. The change will be less than significant. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on sewage lines or treatment. Impacts will be less than significant.
- 18.b. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impact on the City’s sewage treatment plant sewage service. The sewer service needs created by proposed amendments for seasonal employee housing are not projected to be any greater than the uses already identified in those zones. Extensions of wastewater sewer lines may be required for some of the properties within the dual land use designations. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on the City sewage treatment plant. The change will be less than significant. Impacts will be less than significant.
- 18.c The proposed amendments will not have any significant impact on storm drainage or storm drainage systems. Each future project will be required to provide on-site percolation and biorientation basins or other similar measures that result in no-net increase in runoff of storm water. They would also be responsible for constructing any needed extension or expansion of storm drainage systems where deemed necessary by the City Engineer. Further, the removal of “farmworker housing” from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on storm drainage. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 18.d The water supply and service needs caused by the proposed amendments for seasonal employee housing are not projected to be any greater than the uses already identified in the

underlying zones. The change will be less than significant. Fire water supply is also required for buildings. Each project will be evaluated for the construction of utility systems that meet the needs of the proposed facility.

Water for the area within the proposed Dual Land Use Designation is provided by Cal Water. From the 2010 Water Management Plan for Cal Water Service: "The water supply for the King City District is very reliable. Even in drought years there has always been sufficient supply to meet demand. Because of the reasons outlined earlier, Cal Water makes the assumption that an adequate supply will be available to its customers in all years. According to well level records, the groundwater level has been consistent over time." Further, the removal of "farmworker housing" from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on water or water supply. Impacts are less than significant.

- 18.e The proposed amendments will not have any significant impact on sewage treatment or sewage service. There is anticipated capacity within the City Wastewater Treatment Plant for additional wastewater generated by the proposed seasonal employee housing projects. The amount of wastewater generated by the Proposed Project would not be substantial. Further, the removal of "farmworker housing" from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on sewage or sewage treatment. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 18.f The proposed amendments will not have any significant impact on landfill capacity. The proposed seasonal employee housing is similar to uses allowed in the base zoning districts and is not anticipated to generate a substantially different amount of solid waste than would be generated by uses permitted in the base zoning designations. Solid waste from the proposed seasonal employee housing projects would be transported off-site to the Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority. The Authority operates two transfer stations (Jolon Road outside of King City and Sun Street in Salinas) to consolidate waste and transfer it to Johnson Canyon Landfill outside of Gonzales. Further, the removal of "farmworker housing" from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on solid waste. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.
- 18.g The proposed amendments will not have any significant impact on solid waste. Solid waste from the future uses is not anticipated to be significantly greater than the solid waste produced by other uses permitted in the base zoning categories. The solid waste from the proposed future seasonal housing projects would be disposed of in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations. Further, the removal of "farmworker housing" from the FSC and C-2 Zones has no impacts on solid waste. Therefore, there would be no significant impact.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:

None necessary. The proposed amendments will not have any significant impacts.

VI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §15065)

A project may have a significant effect on the environment and thereby require a focused or full environmental impact report to be prepared for the project where any of the following conditions occur (CEQA §15065):

	Significant	Unknown Potential Significant	Potential Significant And Mitigated	Not Significant	Impact Reviewed in Previous Document
Potential to degrade: Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X	
Cumulative: Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable means that incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X	
Substantial adverse: Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X	

a. The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Zoning Code and Historic Corridor Revitalization Plan do not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species. It is possible during grading and construction activities that unknown cultural resources may be unearthed, which may result in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the mitigation measures for Cultural Resources would ensure the proposed project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. The proposed changes will not result in storm-related runoff pollutants. During construction related activities of land uses permitted under the amendments, the proposed changes would have the potential to generate storm-related runoff pollutants. Future projects will be required to prepare a plan that addresses all potential pollutants, including but not limited to soil erosion and sediment, and that plan shall be followed during grading and construction as well as maintained for the entire term of the use of the properties within the District. Other measures to address the protection against all subsurface and surface pollution shall be implemented during construction and for the full duration of the use of the properties.

c. The proposed amendments that could potentially result in construction dust and equipment exhaust emissions, and noise will be required to reduce dust and emissions to reduce substantial adverse effect on human beings to less than significant levels.

EXHIBIT 1

PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND GENERAL PLAN MAP



Legend	
	City Limit
	Parcels
Land-Use Designations	
	LDR - LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
	MDR - MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
	PD/MHP - PLANNED DEVELOPMENT / MOBILEHOME PARK
	MDR/MHP - MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL / MOBILEHOME PARK
	MHR - MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
	HDR - HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
	PD - PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
	AG - AGRICULTURE
	OS - OPEN SPACE
	NC - NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL
	GC - GENERAL COMMERCIAL
	RC - RETAIL COMMERCIAL
	RCT - RETAIL COMMERCIAL / TRANSITIONAL
	HSC - HIGHWAY SERVICE COMMERCIAL
	PQ - PUBLIC / QUASI PUBLIC
	LI - LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
	GI - GENERAL INDUSTRIAL

REVISED 31 MARCH 2015



Resolution No. _____
 Seasonal Employee Housing Regulations
 Applicable to Area Designated

General Plan
 Dual Land Use Designation

EXHIBIT 2

PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS AND ZONING MAP



Legend			
	CITY LIMITS		
	PARCELS		
Zoning District Classifications			
	A.P. COMBINING AIRPORT DISTRICT		C.N. NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT
	A. AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT		C-1/TD RETAIL COMMERCIAL TRANSITION DISTRICT
	F-1/C FIRST STREET CORRIDOR		C-1 GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT
	VB VILLAGE BUSINESS		H-S HIGHWAY SERVICE DISTRICT
	CCGH CIVIC CENTER AND CITY HALL		M-1 INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
	VC VILLAGE CORE		M-2 INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
	R-1 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT		M-3 HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
	R-2 MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT		P-D PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
	R-2M MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD		O OPEN SPACE DISTRICT
	R-3 MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT		P-F PRIMARY FLOOD PLAN DISTRICT
	R-3M MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD		S-F SECONDARY FLOOD PLAN DISTRICT
	R-4 MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND PROFESSIONAL OFFICES DISTRICT		F-G/SP PLANNED DEVELOPMENT / SPECIFIC PLAN DISTRICT
	R-4N MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD		

** N - denotes 'not regulated by the form base code'*



Ordinance No. _____
 Seasonal Employee Housing Regulations
 Applicable to Area Designated

Zoning Map
 Dual Land Use
 Designation