

Exhibit C

This page intentionally left blank.

Addendum Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ARTICLE 11 Section 15164

CHRISP ROBERT P TR Planning File No. PLN200216 Combined Development Permit

Introduction

On November 19, 1991, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors approved a Conditional Use Permit and General Development Plan (RMA-Planning File PC-7783) (Resolution No. 91-232) for a 6,440 square foot automobile repair shop(s).

Environmental review associated with the Use Permit and General Development Plan included consideration of an Initial Study (IS). The IS analyzed potential impacts to Earth, Air, Water, and Transportation/Circulation (categories shown as listed in the original IS/ND). No potentially significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigations were recommended or adopted at the time of permit approval and a Negative Declaration (ND) was prepared. The IS/ND was adopted by the Board of Supervisors prior to approving the Use Permit and General Development Plan.

Scope and Purpose of this Addendum

This addendum has been prepared pursuant to Article 11; Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines to make minor technical changes to a previously adopted Negative Declaration. The purpose of this addendum is to identify minor technical changes and provide clarifications of the site-specific conditions for the proposed development. The adopted ND evaluated environmental effects associated with the Bay Rapid Transit project (PC-7783) which included proposed automotive repair facilities within a 6,440 square foot shop/warehouse. Since approval in 1991, the buildings have not been constructed, and the automotive repair use has not commenced pursuant to the approved permit. The site is currently vacant.

In 2021, an application for a Use Permit to allow the construction of a 11,939 square foot split-level building consisting of a 9,016 square foot shop/warehouse, and two-story 2,923 square-foot office building to support automotive repairs was filed with the County. Although larger by approximately 2,600 square feet (not including the office space and other associated site improvements), the proposed use, automotive repair, is similar in nature to the use previously proposed and considered at the site.

Pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Addendum may be prepared to an adopted ND if the County determines that:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will required major revisions to the ND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous ND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous ND was adopted shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous ND;
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe;
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the ND would substantially reduce on or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The ND adopted for the Bay Rapid Transit (PC-7783) project did not identify any potentially significant environmental effects. Due to the amount of time that has elapsed since review of the ND in 1991, updated Geotechnical, Traffic and Archaeological reports were requested for the recently proposed development. None of these reports identified potentially significant impacts.

This Addendum to the previously adopted ND has been prepared to reflect changes to the project and changes in circumstances that have occurred since the ND was prepared.

Changes to the project

The project involves the construction of a new 11,939 square foot split-level building consisting of a 9,016 square foot shop/warehouse, and two-story 2,923 square-foot office building; 242 square-foot trash enclosure; and 29 parking stalls that will be used for automotive repair and maintenance and coordination of local services by the company. The Chrisp Company provides pavement markings. The changes from the project analyzed in the IS/ND are the following:

- Building coverage size increase from 6,440 square feet to 10,560 square feet, an increase of 4,120 square feet. This change does not increase Geological impacts because the proposed project was designed to meet the recommendations of a project-specific Geotechnical Report and will be monitored and inspected as part of the construction permit to ensure no significant impacts will occur and no mitigation is required. This change does not increase the Aesthetic impacts because the proposed design includes façade articulation in the form of color

changes, color accents, and architectural features that break up the bulk and massing of the structure.

- One company will be served by the operations of the project. The IS/ND analyzed a GDP for up to four companies and more than one was anticipated to serve the public in commercial automotive repairs.
- The project that was analyzed in the IS/ND included a reclassification of the zoning district from “K” (agricultural-residential) to HC (heavy commercial). The current project does not require a rezone, as the rezone was completed in 1991 at a Board of Supervisors public hearing on December 10, 1991.
- Aesthetic differences are that the project analyzed by the IS/ND was a metal building with 38 parking spaces and a looped entry/exit, while the proposed project is mixed fire block and metal with design elements to break up the monotony of the façade, one entry is provided, and the parking is limited. Visually, the project will be more harmonious with the neighborhood.
- Hydrology and Water Quality impacts are very similar. The project analyzed by the IS/ND would increase the water runoff by adding 18,488 square feet of impervious surface to the subject parcel. The Chrisp project will increase impervious surfaces to 34,389 square feet, which is 15,900 square feet more. The IS/ND conclusion of no significant impact remains the same and there are no additional impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality due to the standard conditioning of projects of this size and nature to meet PR No. 4 – Peak Management level Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements (PCRs) for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region.

Changes in the project do not introduce new or more severe impacts that would require subsequent environmental review.

Supplemental Reports

The applicant has prepared three supplemental reports:

- a) *“Phase I Inventory of Archaeological Resources for 1135 Madison Lane, Salinas, CA 93907, APN 261-031-002-000”* by Archives & Archaeology (Ruben G. Mendoza, PH. D, RPA and Jennifer A. Lucido, CRM), 1645 Beacon Hill Drive, Salinas, CA 93906) (LIB200233); and
- b) *“Geotechnical Engineering Report and Soil Percolation Rate Test, Chrisp Company Office/Warehouse, 1135 Madison Lane, Salinas, California”* prepared by Earth Systems Pacific, dated September 2, 2020 (LIB200234).
- c) *“Trip Generation and Operations Analysis for the Proposed Chrisp Company Development at 1135 Madison Lane in Monterey County, California”* and *“VMT Assessment for [same]”* prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. September 6, 2022 (LIB220296).

The Archaeological Report (LIB200233) concluded that *“...no resources, particularly significant archaeological resources, were identified within the parcel.”* Therefore, no potentially significant impacts are expected from implementation of the project. Per standard protocols, if, during the course of construction, the property owner(s) and contractor(s) uncover cultural, archaeological, historical resources at the

site (surface or subsurface resources), work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the find until a qualified professional archaeologist can evaluate it and additional steps are taken.

The Geotechnical Report (LIB200234) involved subsurface exploration consisting of three (3) boring holes drilled at the site on September 11, 2020. The upper soils encountered in the borings were classified as stiff to hard sandy lean clays (CL); the next layers were interbedded layer of very stiff to hard lean clays (CL) to medium dense to very dense clayey sands (SC). Free subsurface water was not encountered within the 15-foot depth of exploration. The report concluded that the site is geotechnically suitable for the proposed project, as the site has no soil expansion potential, and low liquefaction potential. Therefore, no potentially significant impacts are expected from implementation of the project. It is recommended that site development be completed following the standard recommendation found in the geotechnical report, and the project be designed per the standards of California Building Code (CBC).

The Traffic Study (LIB220296) concluded that there are no operational issues under “existing” or “existing with Project” scenarios. The main intersection/entrance point (Madison Lane at Boronda Road) is operating at Level-of-service of A in both scenarios. The passenger vehicle trip generation is 65, which screens the project out of detailed Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) analysis. Therefore, no potentially significant impacts are expected from implementation of the project.

Changes in Circumstance/Information Analyses

Since the time of analyses for the IS/ND, CEQA has been updated to include new topics and this Addendum considers that a minor change in the regulatory setting. Below are the new topics and the analysis for them, all of which are without impact.

Agricultural and Forest Resources. The project site is not designated as either Prime Farmland or Other under the Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. It is not directly related to a reduction in farmland or involved other changes in the existing environment which, due to location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. The City of Salinas noted that the parcel would require an agrarian easement upon annexation to the City. However, the subject parcel does not abut agricultural land and is in the built-up area of Boronda Community Area. No impacts to agricultural resources were found. The California Public Resources Code (PRC) defines Forest Land as land that can support 10 percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits (PRC §12220(g)). The project will not result in the loss of forest land. *Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impact related to agricultural and forest resources.*

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The amended use is approximately the same as the entitled use. Temporary construction-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would result from usage of equipment and machinery. Operationally, the project would have a low level of commercial-type energy consumption. GHG emissions are not anticipated to be significant. The proposed project does not conflict with policy direction contained in the Monterey County Climate Action Plan because such a plan has not yet been adopted. City of Salinas and County anticipate urban uses at the subject location and the proposed use is consistent with the planned growth and uses for the area. *Overall, the project is considered to have no impact on GHG Emissions.*

Recreation. Because the project would not result in an increase in population, there would be no increase in demand for recreational facilities. No parks, trail easements, or other recreational facilities would be impacted by the proposed project. *Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impact related to recreation.*

The possibility of cumulative impact to Traffic and Transportation in 2022 and beyond is addressed through the regulatory environment of 2022, whereby Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) and County traffic fees are paid by the owner. *Therefore, the proposed project would result in no cumulative impact related to traffic and transportation.*

Tribal Cultural Resources. The County discussed the Chrisp project with the local tribes that are on our consultation list. The Esselen Tribe of Monterey County requested consultation and reviewed the project with staff on September 3, 2021. The tribal representatives decided not to request any mitigations.

Wildfire. No impacts to Wildfire were found to have potential due to the location of the project in a built-up urban location.

Conclusion

An Initial Study was prepared, circulated, considered, and adopted for RMA-Planning File No. PC-7783. All physical impacts were reviewed, and the County determined that the project does not have the potential to have a significant effect on the environment. The original IS/ND focused on analyzing potential impacts to Earth, Air, Water, and Transportation/Circulation. No potentially significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigations were recommended or adopted. The current application (PLN200216) included the preparation and submittal of updated Geotechnical and Archaeological reports to ensure no potential impacts were evident.

Based on review of the current application, plans, and the staff's site visits via Google Earth on December 22, 2020 and February 11, 2022, no other potentially significant issues have been identified for the proposed project. The current proposal avoids potential impacts and does not alter the analysis or conclusions reached by the previous study.

Attachment:

Negative Declaration/Initial Study for PC7783/Bay Rapid Transit, dated July 1, 1991, attached to Planning Commission Resolution (PC-7783) dated October 9, 1991.