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Negative Declaration

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21000, et sec.) that the following project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Monterey County Committee on School District Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>September 16, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects Name</td>
<td>Santa Rita Union School District, Alisal Union School District, and Salinas Union High School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Transfer of Territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Proponent</td>
<td>Santa Rita Union School District, Alisal Union School District, and Salinas Union High School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Within the Central Area Specific Plan Area, north of East Boronda Road and east of the planned extension of Natividad Road, City of Salinas, Monterey County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>The proposed project is a transfer of territory (five parcels for a total of 297.71 acres) from the Santa Rita Union School District (&quot;Santa Rita&quot;) boundary, to the Alisal Union School District (&quot;Alisal&quot;) boundary. Both districts are in Salinas Union High School District, but because Santa Rita is a K-8 district and Alisal is a K-6 district, the proposal would also transfer territory from Santa Rita to Salinas Union High School District (Salinas), because the middle school students resulting from the territory transfer would be served by Salinas, as Salinas serves both middle and high school students. The proposed territory transfer would not result in physical changes either directly or indirectly. Schools that have been planned in the Central Area Specific Plan area would be constructed regardless of the district in which the transfer territories would be located. The primary purpose of the transfer is to ensure that territories within the proposed CASP area would be within a single elementary school district (Alisal) rather than straddling both Santa Rita and Alisal. As presently contemplated, the CASP calls for the construction of more than 3,900 dwelling units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address Where Written Comments May Be Sent

Written comments regarding the Negative Declaration should be received by 5:00 p.m. on October 13, 2020. Please address comments or questions to:
Colleen Stanley Ed.D., Chief Business Official
Monterey Office of Education
901 Blanco Circle, Salinas, CA 93901
831.755.0308 public-comment@montereycoe.org

Public Review Period

Begins: September 21, 2020
Ends: October 13, 2020

Proposed Findings. Based upon substantial evidence in the record that, the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment. The attached initial study indicates that the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts. There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the lead agency (the Monterey County Committee on School District Organization), that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

The Monterey Committee on School District Organization is the custodian of the documents and other material that constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based.
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# A. BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Santa Rita Union School District, Alisal Union School District, and Salinas Union High School District Transfer of Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency Contact Person and Phone Number</td>
<td>Colleen Stanley Ed.D., Chief Business Official, Finance and Business Services, Monterey County Office of Education 831.755.0308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Prepared</td>
<td>September 16, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Prepared by</td>
<td>EMC Planning Group Inc. 301 Lighthouse Avenue, Suite C Monterey, CA 93940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>North of E. Boronda Road, East of Natividad Road, and West of the Planned Extension of Constitution Boulevard, partially within the city limits of Salinas and within the Central Area Specific Plan boundary, and partially in unincorporated Monterey County. See Figure 1, Location Map, and Figure 2, Central Area Specific Plan Location and Parcels Subject to Transfer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project Sponsors Names and Addresses                                         | Santa Rita Union School District 57 Russell Rd, Salinas CA 93906  
                                                                                     | Alisal Union School District 155 Bardin Rd, Salinas, CA 93905  
                                                                                     | Salinas Union High School District 431 W. Alisal St, Salinas, CA 93901 |
Project Description

Description and Purpose of Project

The proposed project is a transfer of territory (five parcels for a total of 297.7 acres) from the Santa Rita Union School District ("Santa Rita") boundary, to the Alisal Union School District ("Alisal") boundary. Both districts are in Salinas Union High School District, but because Santa Rita is a K-8 district and Alisal is a K-6 district, the proposal would also transfer territory from Santa Rita to Salinas Union High School District (Salinas), because the middle school students resulting from the territory transfer would be served by Salinas, as Salinas serves both middle and high school students.

The primary purpose of the transfer is to ensure that territories within the proposed CASP area would be within a single elementary school district (Alisal) rather than straddling both Santa Rita and Alisal. As presently contemplated, the CASP calls for the construction of more than 3,900 dwelling units within the Salinas city boundaries, on land that is primarily used for agricultural purposes (CASP, page 25). A relatively small portion of that territory, lying east of Natividad Road, is currently within Santa Rita’s boundaries. The remaining land with the CASP is within Alisal’s boundaries.

Figure 3, Current Boundary Map, presents the existing district boundaries, and Figure 4, Proposed Boundary Map, presents the proposed district boundaries.
The 297.7 acres proposed for transfer are currently within the Santa Rita boundary. When homes are development on this acreage, consistent with the CASP, elementary and middle school children would go to Santa Rita schools. The nearest elementary school is McKinnon Elementary School north of E. Boronda Road and McKinnon intersection. This school is approximately one to two miles from the territory transfer area. The nearest middle school is Bolsa Knolls Middle School, approximately one to 1.5 miles from the territory transfer area.

With the approved territory transfer, elementary school children would attend elementary school within the Alisal district and middle school children would attend middle school in the Salinas districts. Alisal has an elementary school planned immediately east of the territory transfer area (less than ½ mile from the future homes in the territory transfer area) and Salinas has a middle school planned a bit further to the east (less than one mile from the Futures homes in the territory transfer area). Therefore, future elementary and middle school children in the territory transfer area would have a shorter travel distance with approval of the territory transfer.

**Setting**

The Central Area Specific Plan ("CASP"), currently under consideration for adoption by the City of Salinas, consists of 760 acres, planned primarily for residential neighborhoods. The plan includes three new schools serving students in K-8th grades. The parcels proposed for the boundary change are currently in agricultural production.

**Background**

In 2009, Santa Rita and Alisal transferred four parcels between their district boundaries: two from Santa Rita to Alisal and two from Alisal to Santa Rita. Prior to approving the transfer, the Monterey County Office of Education prepared an initial study and adopted a negative declaration in compliance with CEQA, with a determination that the transfer would not have a negative impact on the environment (PMC and Monterey County Office of Education 2009).

One school site has been acquired by the Salinas Union High School District within the Central Area Specific Plan area. The district prepared an environmental impact report (EIR) addressing school construction and complied with CEQA (EMC Planning Group and Salinas Union High School District 2016).

One school site was acquired by the Alisal Union School District, according to the specific plan (page 140). Alisal adopted a negative declaration in 2010 addressing site acquisition and complied with CEQA (Office of Planning and Research CEQAnet 2020).
Approach and Methodology

CEQA Requirements (Categorical Exemptions and Negative Declarations)

Compliance with CEQA, such as preparation of this initial study and negative declaration, is required prior to public agencies approving a project that has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts. According to CEQA Guidelines Articles 18 and 19, certain categories of projects are statutorily or categorically exempt from CEQA. Additionally, according to CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3), “the activity is covered by the common sense exemption that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA.”

Schools would be developed within the CASP boundary regardless of whether or not the proposed boundary change occurs. At a community-level, the Central Area Specific Plan EIR evaluates the impacts of buildout of the specific plan area, which includes the new schools. New school construction would be required to serve the children in the new neighborhoods whether the new school locations are within the Santa Rita or Alisal boundaries. Additionally, state law requires that school districts comply with CEQA prior to acquisition of a new school site. For construction of schools that have not already complied with CEQA, a project-level CEQA compliance process would be required for each new school proposed for acquisition and construction by the school districts. Therefore, the proposed territory transfer from Santa Rita to Alisal would not result in a physical change and therefore, would not result in an environmental effect. The environmental effects of school site acquisition and construction, have been, or would be, evaluated on a school-by-school basis.

Although the proposed territory transfer could be considered exempt from CEQA for the reasons discussed above, the Monterey County Office of Education has chosen to prepare this initial study and negative declaration to provide additional opportunities for the public to understand and comment on the proposed territory transfer.

Degree of Specificity

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15146, the degree of specificity in this initial study corresponds to the degree of specificity involved in the proposed project (territory transfer). An environmental analysis document on a well-defined proposed development project will be more detailed than will be one on policy or regulatory document (e.g. land use plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) where the resulting physical environmental changes cannot yet be precisely identified. An environmental analysis document on policy or regulatory project would focus on secondary effects from implementing the plan or regulations, but need not be as detailed as one prepared on the specific construction projects that might follow.
The analysis in this initial study acknowledges that school districts would be required to comply with CEQA prior to construction of schools that may be associated with this proposed territory transfer. This initial study reports the kinds of environmental effects that could occur with future school construction projects based upon the consultant’s research, but where appropriate, concludes that determining the specific impacts of each school would be speculative, and that the territory transfer would not result in a secondary or indirect impact that would not otherwise occur without the territory transfer.

**Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required**

None

**Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

On July 29, 2020, the Monterey County Office of Education sent an offer of consultation letter to Louise J. Miranda Ramirez, Tribal Chairwoman of the Ohlone/Coastanoan-Eselen Nation. See Section D 18 for additional discussion.

*Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.*
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B. 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
- ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Energy
- ☐ Geology/Soils
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
- ☐ Land Use/Planning
- ☐ Wildfire
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Population/Housing
- ☐ Public Services
- ☐ Recreation
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
- ☐ Utilities/Service Systems
- ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
C. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☑ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made 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 (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 that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

______________________________  __________________________
Colleen Stanley Ed.D.  Date
Chief Business Official, Finance and Business Services
D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Notes

1. A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited 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 is 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 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 it has been determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers 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 Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-Than-Significant Impact.” The mitigation measures are described, along with a brief explanation of how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses are used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document or negative declaration. [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)] In this case, a brief discussion would identify the following:
   a. “Earlier Analysis Used” identifies and states where such document is available for review.
   b. “Impact Adequately Addressed” identifies which effects from the checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and states whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
c. “Mitigation Measures” — For effects that are “Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” mitigation measures are described which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, etc.) are incorporated. Each reference to a previously prepared or outside document, where appropriate, includes a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. “Supporting Information Sources” — A source list is attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted are cited in the discussion.

8. This is 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. This is the format recommended in the CEQA Guidelines as amended 2018.

9. The explanation of each issue identifies:
   a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b. The mitigation measure identified, if any to reduce the impact to less than significant.
1. **AESTHETICS**

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099 (Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Transit-Oriented Infill Projects), would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a. Schools developed with the CASP area would be constructed within neighborhoods and therefore, would blend in with surrounding development. Effects on scenic vistas would be evaluated in project-level CEQA documentation prepared by the respective school district when a school site is proposed for acquisition and/or construction.

   However, potential impacts to scenic vistas would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs. The proposed territory transfer would result in no increase in impacts to scenic vistas that would not otherwise occur.

b. The project area is not located near a state scenic highway.
c. Schools developed within the CASP area would be developed within an urbanized area, and would not be expected to conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. It would be speculative to predict the design of the future schools within the CASP area and whether the change in visual character would be substantial. However, the change in visual character would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

d. Schools developed within the CASP area would create a new source of light and/or glare, which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. However, the light and glare impacts would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

Conclusion
Determining aesthetic impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
### 2. Agriculture and Forest Resources

In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects and in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland, 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 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 nonagricultural use? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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))? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comments:

a. According to the CASP EIR, as well as the Salinas General Plan EIR, development within the CASP would result in a loss of important farmland. However, the loss of farmland would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

b. The portion of the CASP area that is currently in unincorporated Monterey County is zoned for agricultural use; however, the properties are not in a Williamson Act contract (CASP EIR, page 2.0-2). With approval of the CASP, including annexation to the city of Salinas, the properties would no longer be zoned for agricultural use. See Appendix A, CASP Illustrative Plan.

c. There is no forest land within the CASP area.

d. There is no forest land within the CASP area.

e. Development of schools within the CASP area would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Conclusion

The future development of schools within the CASP area would result in the loss of farmland. However, the proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
3. **AIR QUALITY**

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a. Development of schools does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans.

b. Development of schools within the CASP area would create air quality impacts associated with construction activities and school operations, primarily through vehicle transportation to and from the school. Air quality impacts would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer air quality impacts associated with student transportation.

c. Schools constructed on hazardous sites, sometimes including farmland, can subject students and staff (sensitive receptors) to substantial pollutant concentrations. School districts are required to comply with strict requirements from the California...
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Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) prior to construction of a school. However, these potential impacts and the DTSC requirements would be applicable to schools within the CASP area whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

d. Schools do not generally result in odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Any odor resulting from school construction and operation would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

Conclusion

Determining the air quality impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer air quality impacts associated with student transportation.
4. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (2, 3, 6, 7)

| ☐                | ☐                                                             | ☐                           | ☒         |

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (2, 3, 6, 7)

| ☐                | ☐                                                             | ☐                           | ☒         |

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.), through direct removal, filing, hydrological interruption, or other means? (2, 3, 6, 7)

| ☐                | ☐                                                             | ☐                           | ☒         |

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? (2, 3, 6, 7)

| ☐                | ☐                                                             | ☐                           | ☒         |

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (2, 3, 6, 7)

| ☐                | ☐                                                             | ☐                           | ☒         |

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? (2, 3, 6, 7)

| ☐                | ☐                                                             | ☐                           | ☒         |
Comments:

a. According to the CASP EIR, the area has the potential to have an adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. However, potential impacts to such species would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

b. If a school is located near a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, the impact would be the same whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

c. If a school is located near a wetland, the impact would be the same whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

d. If construction of a school would interfere 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, the impact would be the same whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

e. If construction of a school would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, the impact would be the same whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

f. The CASP area is not subject to a habitat conservation plan.

Conclusion

Determining the specific biological resources impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
5. **Cultural Resources**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to section 15064.5? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a.-c. According to the CASP Draft EIR, no cultural resources have been identified within the Central Area Specific Plan, according to maps and files maintained by the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (page 3.3-6). Although there are no known resources, there is always the potential to accidentally discover buried resources. Standard mitigation measures are generally applied to ensure that impacts do not occur if resources are accidentally discovered during ground-disturbing activities. However, potential impacts to such resources would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

**Conclusion**

Determining the specific, potential cultural resources impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
6. **Energy**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (3, 5)

b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (3, 5)

**Comments:**

a.b. Construction and operation of new schools do not generally result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with applicable state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Construction and operation of new schools would generally have the same energy impacts whether or not the territory transfer occurs. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer energy impacts associated with student transportation.

**Conclusion**

Determining the energy resources impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer energy impacts associated with student transportation.
### 7. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 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? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Strong seismic ground shaking? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Landslides? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 wastewater? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

a.-f. Schools constructed within the CASP have the potential to be affected by strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse of soils; be located on expansive soils; or potentially affect unique paleontological resources (should they be discovered beneath the school sites). However, State law requires preparation of a geologic hazards and/or geotechnical reports prior to school construction, to ensure the soils are adequately prepared for construction of a school. Construction of new schools within the CASP area would be subject to the same requirements, whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

Conclusion

Determining the geology and soils impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
8. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Comments:

a. Development of schools within the CASP area would result in greenhouse gas emissions impacts associated with constructing of and operating a school, primarily through vehicle transportation to and from the school. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer greenhouse gas emissions associated with student transportation.

b. The construction of public schools would not generally conflict with applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. However, if such a conflict were to occur, it would occur whether or not the proposed territory transfer occurs.

Conclusion

Determining the greenhouse gas emissions impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer greenhouse gas emissions associated with student transportation.
9. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a. Schools do not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
b. Schools constructed on hazardous sites, sometimes including farmland, can subject students and staff (sensitive receptors) to substantial pollutant concentrations. School districts are required to comply with strict requirements from the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) prior to construction of a school. However, these potential impacts and the DTSC requirements would be applicable whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

c. Schools do not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.

d. According to the CASP Draft EIR (page 3.5-20), the hazards assessment conducted for the EIR included site reconnaissance, interviews, historical land use research, database research, and soils testing. The CASP area has the potential to 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, the hazardous materials could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. However, these potential impacts and the DTSC requirements, as discussed in “b” above, would be applicable whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

e. According to the CASP Draft EIR (page 3.7-12) the nearest airport or airstrip to the CASP area is the Salinas Municipal Airport, which is located approximately 2.4 miles south of the southern CASP boundary. Therefore, the airport would not represent a hazard to schools located within the CASP.

f. Development of schools within the CASP area would not interfere with local or state emergency response plans or evacuation plans materials (CASP Draft EIR, page 1.0-18).

g. According to the CASP Draft EIR (page 1.0-18), the proposed project is not located in an area that is considered a high risk for wildfires. Therefore, construction of schools in the CASP area would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. See section 20, Wildfires, for additional discussion.

**Conclusion**

Determining the hazards impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
10. **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (3)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (3)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Impede or redirect flood flows? (3)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (3)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (3)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

a.-e. The environmental issues addressed in these questions are related to groundwater and surface water quantities and quality. The local water purveyor, ALCO, obtains water from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, East Side Aquifer. ALCO issued a “Can and Will Serve” letter on March 27, 2020 indicating that they will provide water service to the CASP area with their planned system upgrades (CASP Draft EIR, page 2.0-21). Water use would be the same for schools in the CASP area, whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

Portions of the CASP area are within FEMA flood zones, particularly near the two creeks flowing through the area: Gabilan Creek and Natividad Creek. When school sites are acquired, the CEQA process would need to evaluate flooding concerns should school be proposed within flood zones. However, if the school sites would be subject to flooding impacts, the impacts would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

Water quality is regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the regulations would apply to school site, whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

In conclusion, water quantity and water quality issues would be the same whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

Conclusion

Determining the hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
11. **LAND USE AND PLANNING**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a. Development of schools within the CASP area would not divide an established community.

b. Development of schools within the CASP area would be consistent with the CASP and the City of Salinas General Plan.

**Conclusion**

The future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would not divide an established community or cause any significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
12. **MINERAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Result in loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (6, 7)

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in a local general plan, specific plan, or other land-use plan? (6, 7)

**Comments:**

a. b. According to the Salinas General Plan EIR, there are no known mineral resources or mining activities occurring in the CASP area.

**Conclusion**

The future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would not result in impacts to mineral resources.
13. **NOISE**

Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or in applicable standards of other agencies? (3, 5, 6, 7)

b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? (3, 5, 6, 7)

| ☐                | ☐                                                             | ☐                           | ☒         |

c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (3, 5, 6, 7)

| ☐                | ☐                                                             | ☐                           | ☒         |

**Comments:**

a.-c. Noise and vibration issues would need to be evaluated in the CEQA documentation prepared by the school districts prior to acquisition and construction of school sites. Noise and vibration impacts are site-specific and it is likely that construction of schools could result in noise impacts to adjacent sensitive land uses. However, noise impacts would occur associated with construction of schools, whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

The CASP area is not located within two miles of Salinas Airport, the nearest airport.

**Conclusion**

Determining the noise impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Comments:

a. Schools are population accommodating, not population inducing.

b. Construction of schools within the CASP area would not displace existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Conclusion

The future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would not induce unplanned population growth in an area or displace existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
15. **Public Services**

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or 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 following public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorpor</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.  Fire protection? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.  Police protection? (3, 6, 7, 11)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.  Schools? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.  Parks? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.  Other public facilities? (3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a. b. Schools construction within the CASP area would require some level of fire and police protection. The schools would be served by the Salinas Police Department and the Salinas Fire Department. The CASP includes construction of a fire station (page 2.0-12). Therefore, it is assumed this new fire station would serve new schools within the CASP area. The City of Salinas recently completed construction of a new fire station at 312 E. Alisal Street, consisting of two buildings: a two story, 44,352 sq. ft. Headquarters (built to the highest life safety standards) that will house Administration, Investigations, Patrol and Support Staff; and a second, 24,878 sq. ft. Support Building that includes advanced, state-of-the-art evidence storage areas, forensic laboratory and firearms training facility. New schools within the CASP area would be adequately served by the Salinas Fire and Police departments whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

c.-e. Construction of schools within the CASP area would not require construction of additional schools, parks, or other public facilities.

**Conclusion**

The future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would not result in the 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 following public services: fire protection; police protection; schools; parks; and other public facilities.
16. **RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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? (3, 5)

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? (3, 5)

**Comments:**

a. The CASP does include approximately 148 acres of new parks and open space. Construction of schools within the CASP area would not have an effect on existing or planned parks requiring the construction of new parks.

b. Construction of schools within the CASP area would likely include some type of playground and recreational facilities. However, playgrounds and recreational facilities would be included in the schools whether or not the proposed territory transfer occurs.

**Conclusion**

The future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would not result in the need for new or physically altered recreational facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.
17. **Transportation**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? (3)</th>
<th>☒</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (3, 10)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a. Construction of schools within the CASP area would be developed to accommodate students within the CASP area. The CASP includes a circulation system and is consistent with the Salinas General Plan. Therefore, schools constructed within the CASP area would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

b. CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) requires an evaluation of vehicle miles traveled associated with project under CEQA review. School districts developing schools within the CASP area would be required to evaluate vehicle miles traveled in their CEQA documentation. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer vehicle miles traveled associated with student transportation.

c. d. The schools to be constructed within the CASP area have yet to be designed and therefore, it would be speculative to determine if any school would increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, or result in inadequate emergency access.
Conclusion

Determining the transportation impacts associated with the future placement, design and development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer vehicle miles traveled associated with student transportation.
18. **Tribal Cultural Resources**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. 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, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

(1) 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

[☐] [☐] [☐] [☒]

(2) 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

[☐] [☐] [☐] [☒]

**Comments:**

a. On July 29, 2020, the Monterey County Office of Education sent an offer of consultation letter to Louise J. Miranda Ramirez, Tribal Chairwoman of the Ohlone/Coastanoan-Esselen Nation. As of September 16, 2020, no response to the offer has been received.
# 19. **UTILITIES AND SERVICES SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporate</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? (2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a. Construction of schools within the CASP would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, other than what is necessary to connect the new schools with the adjacent water and wastewater lines, storm drainage infrastructure, and electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications lines. No off-site improvements outside of the CASP are anticipated. Utility hook-ups would be the same for schools in the CASP area, whether or not the territory transfer occurs.
b. The local water purveyor, ALCO, obtains water from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, East Side Aquifer. ALCO issued a “Can and Will Serve” letter on March 27, 2020 indicating that they will provide water service to the CASP area with their planned system upgrades (CASP Draft EIR, page 2.0-21). Water use would be the same for schools in the CASP area, whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

c. According to the CASP Draft EIR, the CASP project does not trigger a need to expand or relocate the Monterey One Water Treatment Plant located outside of the City of Marina (page 3.11-12).

d. According to the CASP Draft EIR, the Johnson Canyon Landfill is estimated to have 38-45 years of disposal capacity to meet the needs of current jurisdiction served by the landfill. Therefore, schools constructed within the CASP would not result in the need to expand an existing landfill or to construct a new landfill. Additionally, solid waste generation would generally be the same regardless of whether or not the territory transfer occurs.

e. Schools constructed within the CASP would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste, whether or not the proposed territory transfer occurs.

**Conclusion**

Determining the environmental impacts associated with providing utilities for the future development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
20. **Wildfire**

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (3, 4, 12)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire? (3, 4, 12)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? (3, 4, 12)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? (3, 4, 12)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a.-d. According to the CalFire website, the CASP is not located within a state responsibility area; however, the area east of Old Stage Road is so designated. According to Figure 1-6 of the CASP, the nearest school site is planned approximately ½ mile west of Old State Road and therefore, it would not be adjacent to the designated state responsibility area. However, this issue would be required to be addressed in CEQA documentation associated with school site acquisition and development. Additionally, this potential hazard would be the same whether or not the territory transfer occurs.
Conclusion

Determining the environmental impacts associated with proximity to a state responsibility area for the future development of schools within the CASP area would be speculative at this time. The proposed transfer of territory would not result in any direct or indirect impacts that would not otherwise occur without the proposed transfer.
## 21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, 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) (3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14)

c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13)

### Comments:

a. – c. Impacts to fish and wildlife populations, important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, as well as cumulative impacts, and adverse effects on human beings, all associated with construction of schools in the CASP, would occur whether or not the territory transfer occurs. However, as discussed in the project description, the planned elementary school in the Alisal district and the planned middle school in the Salinas district are closer than the existing elementary and middle schools in the Santa Rita district. Therefore, with the territory transfer, the travel distance would be shorter resulting in fewer air quality impacts, energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, and vehicle miles traveled associated with student transportation.
E. Sources
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14. Monterey Bay Air Resources District. CEQA Air Quality Guidelines
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Figure 2-6. Illustrative Map