To:Office of Planning and Research
PO Box 3044, 1400 Tenth Street, Room 212
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

County Clerk

From: (Public Agency) City of Seaside
Community Development Department
City Hall, Seaside, CA 93955
(Address)

Project Title: Water credit transfer from APN 011-293-002
Project Location - Specific:
866-890 Broadway Avenue
Project Location - City: Seaside Project Location-County: Monterey
Description of Project:

Transfer of commercial water credit from APN 011-293-002 to the City of Seaside

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: City of Seaside
Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project: City of Seaside Community Development Department
Exempt Status: (check one)
$\square$ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a));Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
$\square$ Categorical Exemption. State type and section number:
Class 2 - Section 15302Statutory Exemptions. State code number: $\qquad$
Reasons why project is exempt: The project will transfer a documented water credit from previously-existing buildings at $866-890$ Broadway Avenue to the City's water allocation. The City will then commit the water credit back to the same site for development of a small shopping center with possible housing.

## Lead Agency

Contact Person: Louis De11'Angela Area Code/Telephone/Extension: (831) 899-6737

If filed by applicant:

1. Attach certified document of exemption finding.
2. Has a Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No
Director of Community
 Title: Development/Redevelopment

| PROJECT INFORMATION <br> 1. Project Title: <br> Water credit transfer from APN 011-293-002 to City of Seaside's water allocation. |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |
| 3. Contact Person and Phone: <br> Louis Dell'Angela - (831) 899-6737 |
| 4. Project Location: <br> APN: 011-293-002 |
| 5. Project Sponsor's Name/Address: <br> Redevelopment Agency of the City of Seaside 440 Harcourt Avenue <br> Seaside, CA 93955 |
| 6. General Plan Designation: MX = Mixed Use |
| 7. Zoning: <br> $\mathrm{P}=$ Primary Retail |

8. Description of Project:
(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Water credit transfer from APN 011-293-002 to City of Seaside's water allocation.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:
(Briefly describe the project's surroundings.) Vacant land for commercial use and retail and residential properties
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: (Names)

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

## CEQA GUIDELINES APPENDIX G - Page 2 MPWMD ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR:

## (Name of Project) Water Credit Transfer From APN 011-293-002

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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 $\square$ Noise
Biological Resources
Hazards \& Hazardous Materials
Mineral Resources
Public Services
Utilities/Service Systems
Agriculture Resources
Hydrology/Water Quality

Recreation
Mandatory Findings of Significance
Air Quality
Geology/Soils
Land Use/Planning
Population/Housing
Transportation/Traffic

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

V. I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
$\square$ 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A mitigated negative declaration will be prepared.
$\square$ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
$\square$ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or is "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
$\square$ 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 all potentially significant effects:

1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards; and
2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

The earlier EIR adequately analyzes the proposed project, so NO ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.


Printed Name: Louis De11'Angela : Title: Director of Community Development/ Redevelopment

\section*{ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (See attachments for discussion and information sources) <br> |  | Less Than |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potentially | Significant | Less Than | No |
| Significant | with | Significant | Impact |
| Impact | Mitigation | Impact | Impact |}

1. ( AESTHETICS. Would the project:
a) Have a substantial adverse affect a scenic vista?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
(Source: $\qquad$
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character
 or quality of the site and its surroundings?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare Which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

1I. =AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:
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? (Source: $\qquad$
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
(Source: $\qquad$
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?
(Source: $\qquad$
Note: 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland.


## III. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: $\qquad$ )
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
(Source: $\qquad$
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increaseof 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)? (Source: $\qquad$
d) Result in significant construction-related air quality impacts?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
(Source: $\qquad$ )

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directlyor through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish \& Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source: $\qquad$ )
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian


## ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES Potentially Significant (See attachments for discussion and information sources) Significant Impact $\begin{array}{cc}\text { Less Than } & \\ \text { Significant } & \text { Less Than } \\ \text { with } & \text { Significant } \\ \text { Mitigation } & \text { Impact }\end{array}$ $\underset{\text { No }}{\text { No }}$

habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish \& Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source: $\qquad$
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands 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?
(Source: $\qquad$
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? (Source: $\qquad$
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?
(Source: $\qquad$
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?
(Source: $\qquad$

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a) Cause substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Sec. 15064.5?
(Source: $\qquad$
b) Cause substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Sec. 15064.5?
(Source: $\qquad$
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique

\section*{Potentially <br> Significant Impact <br> | $\left.\begin{array}{ccc}\text { Less Than } & & \\ \text { Significant } & \text { Less Than } & \text { No } \\ \text { with } & \text { Significant } & \text { Impact } \\ \text { Mitigation } & \text { Impact } & \end{array}\right)=$Incorporated  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |}

paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)
d) Disturb any human remains, including those)

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## VI. GEOLOGIC AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving:
(Source: $\qquad$
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.
(Source: $\qquad$
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
iv) Landslides?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)
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?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)

## ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

(See attachments for discussion and information sources)
 Significant Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Source: $\qquad$
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the publicor the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? (Source: $\qquad$
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
(Source: $\qquad$
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
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? (Source: $\qquad$
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?
(Source: $\qquad$ )

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
(See attachments for discussion and information sources)
 airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
(Source: $\qquad$
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?
(Source: $\qquad$ )

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
(Source: $\qquad$
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? (Source: $\qquad$
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?
(Source: $\qquad$
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
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Source: $\qquad$
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
(Source: $\qquad$
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flows? (Source: $\qquad$
i) Expose people or structures to a property to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Source: $\qquad$
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow? (Source: $\qquad$ _)

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (See attachments for discussion and information sources)

Potentially Significant Impact
manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?
(Source: $\qquad$
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?
(Source: $\qquad$
 )$\square$$\square$
 )


## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

X. 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 residents of the state?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
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?
(Source: $\qquad$ )

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noiselevels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
(Source: $\qquad$
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive

 groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Source: $\qquad$ _)
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise
 levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
(Source: $\qquad$
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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (See attachments for discussion and information sources)

Potentially Significant Impact

airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)
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?
(Source: $\qquad$ )

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial 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)?
(Source: $\qquad$
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
(Source: $\qquad$ )

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associatedwith the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:
(Source: $\qquad$
i) Fire Protection?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)
ii) Police Protection?


ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES<br>(See attachments for discussion and information sources)

Potentially
Significant Impact
Less Than
Significant
with
Mitigation
Incorporated
Less Than Significant Impact
$\underset{\text { Impact }}{\text { No }}$
(Source: $\qquad$ )
iii) Schools?
(Source: $\qquad$
iv) Parks?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
v) Other public facilities?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:

a) 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?
(Source: $\qquad$
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
(Source: $\qquad$

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (Source: $\qquad$ _)
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways?
(Source: $\qquad$
c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively,

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
(See attachments for discussion and information sources)

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant with
Mitigation Incorporated

a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways?
(Source: $\qquad$
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
(Source: $\qquad$
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?
(Source: $\qquad$ )
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

## XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) 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?
(Source: $\qquad$ _)
b) Does the project have impacts that are individuallylimited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the 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.)
(Source: $\qquad$
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Source: $\qquad$ )

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:


Potentially
Significant Impact


## XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [State CEQA guidelines Section $15063(\mathrm{c})(3)(\mathrm{D})$ ]. In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets.

Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

## Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

U:|Debbielwordlforms|Water Credit Transfers|CEQA Environmental Checklist_021004.doc

