

Exhibit G

This page intentionally left blank.

MONTEREY COUNTY

PLANNING & BUILDING INSPECTION DEPARTMENT
PO BOX 1208 SALINAS, CA 93902
PHONE: (831) 755-5025 FAX: (831) 755-5487



INITIAL STUDY (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project: Dolan Industrial Park Vehicle Dismantling Yards

	File No.	Property Owner/Applicant	Assessor's Parcel Number	Acreage
Parcel A:	PLN030510	S&S Land Development	131-054-001-000	7.52 acres
Parcel B:	PLN030498	Pick-n-Pull	131-054-002-000	4.51 acres
Parcel C:	PLN030501	Gerald & Deborah Cutler	131-054-003-000	5.0 acres
Parcel D:	PLN030504	Dolan Development Partners	131-054-004-000	70.08 acres

Location: 516 Dolan Road, Moss Landing

Land Use Plan Designation: Light Industrial (LI), Coastal Zone (CZ) (Parcels A, B, C);
Light Industrial (LI), Agricultural Conservation (AC), Resource Conservation (RC), Coastal Zone (CZ) (Parcel D);

Zoning District: "LI(CZ) & AC(CZ)" (Parcel A); "AC(CZ)" (Parcel B);
"LI(CZ) & AC(CZ)" (Parcel C); "LI(CZ), AC(CZ) & RC(CZ)" (Parcel D)

Lead Agency: Monterey County, Planning & Building Inspection Department

Prepared By: Eric Lee, Associate Planner

Date Prepared: June 1, 2005

Contact: Eric Lee, Associate Planner

Phone No: (831) 883-7521

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Background

Since the early 1970s vehicle dismantling activities have occurred at Dolan Industrial Park, which is made up of four (4) separate parcels (Parcels A, B, C, D) (Figure 1). Parcel D is the largest of the properties and surrounds the other three parcels. It also includes residential and agricultural activities. Presently six (6) separate dismantling yards operate on the four parcels. Two additional yards currently used for storage and impound purposes are proposed as additional dismantling facilities. Permits allowing the dismantling use were granted in 1995 (PC94195; PC94196; PC94210; PC94223), but expired in 2000.

Previous Permits & Environmental Review

The permits obtained in 1995 for the dismantling operations on the four parcels permitted five (5) dismantling yards on Parcel D and one yard each on the three (3) remaining parcels for a total of eight (8) yards. The permits required improvements to address stormwater runoff from the dismantling facilities and included earthen berms, catch basins, runoff interceptors with oil/grease separators, and spreaders to dissipate water. Additional requirements included dismantling canopies, impervious surfaces, operational improvements, road improvements, and a fire suppression water system.

An initial study, prepared by Linda Weiland dated April 3, 1995, was completed for the 1995 permits. It included mitigation measures, primarily related to stormwater runoff, drainage, erosion control, fire and aesthetic issues. The permits subsequently expired in 2000 before the owners were able to obtain permit renewals as required. Operations were allowed to continue as existing uses provided new permits were applied for and because they were determined to be in substantial compliance with the permit conditions. However, a water system for fire suppression was not completed or installed as required. The owners have currently applied for new use permits to allow continuation of the dismantling activities. This initial study evaluates the potential environmental impacts of those activities using the baseline of 1995 when environmental review was last completed to assess new or changed circumstances. Policies from Monterey County's North County Land Use Plan generally serve as guidance for thresholds of significance, unless otherwise stated.

General Operations

The auto dismantling yards provide opportunities for recycling and reusing vehicle parts, a place to impound and disposal of abandoned cars, and lower cost auto repair options. The yards operate either as a self-service "do-it-yourself" facility or service counter facilities where customers request specific parts from staff. Some operators specialize in providing specific parts. Vehicles are generally obtained from auto salvage auctions, through agreements with towing and insurance companies, or as abandoned vehicles.

Dismantling operations at Dolan Industrial Park are conducted according to Best Management Practices and the measures outlined in the previous 1995 permits. They require dismantling and storage to occur on impervious surfaces with secondary containment features, the collection and

control of runoff, and the appropriate storage of vehicles or parts containing contaminants. After all the usable, sellable, or recyclable parts have been salvaged, the vehicles are transported elsewhere for disposal. A comprehensive stormwater management plan was prepared for the dismantling yards directing runoff to controlled areas on each parcel where the runoff is intercepted and pollutants such as oil and grease are separated from the drainage water and subsequently collected and disposed offsite. Drainage and erosion control improvements consist of detention basins, earthen berms, haybales, and runoff dissipation. Inspections are conducted by the Monterey County Division of Environmental Health for compliance with regulations on an annual basis or as needed. Regular inspections and sampling are also required by the State Water Resources Control Board.

Existing Conditions and Proposed Improvements

Parcels A, B, and C are used exclusively for vehicle dismantling activities. Parcel D includes agricultural and residential uses. Combined acreage of all four parcels totals 87.11 acres. Existing facilities are summarized in below (Table 1).

Table 1: Existing and Proposed Dismantling Facilities

<u>Location</u>	<u>Acreage</u>	<u>Usage</u>	<u>Operator</u>
Parcel A	7.52 acres	Dismantling Facility	"Salinas Salvage"
Parcel B/ Parcel C	9.51 acres	Dismantling Facility	"Pick-n-Pull"
Parcel D Yard #1	2.27 acres (3.93 acres proposed)	Dismantling Facility	"Jim Pettit"
Parcel D Yard #2	4.34 acres (5.26 acres proposed)	Vehicle Impound (proposed Dismantling Facility)	"Marina Beach Towing & Dismantling"
Parcel D Yard #3	1.64 acres	Dismantling Facility	"All Import/All American Autowreckers"
Parcel D Yard #4	1.83 acres	Dismantling Facility	"Lopez Autodismantlers"
Parcel D Yard #5	2.50 acres	Dismantling Facility	"Villarreal Autodismantlers"
Parcel D Yard #6	2.09 acres	Vehicle Storage (proposed Dismantling Facility)	"All Import/All American Autowreckers"
Total	31.70 acres currently (34.28 acres proposed)	6 facilities currently (8 facilities proposed)	

Overall the proposed projects include:

- Installation of a water system for fire suppression and domestic use;
- Completion of measures addressing stormwater runoff;
- Maintenance and upgrades to various drainage facility components;
- Site improvements for traffic, circulation and parking;
- Grading to increase in the usable acreage on two of the yards and improve drainage; and
- Two additional dismantling facilities on Parcel D.

- Landscaping to screen the site from adjacent offsite uses
- Specific details and proposed improvements for each parcel follow.

Parcel A

Parcel A consists of a 7.52 acre dismantling yard operated by "Salinas Salvage." Facilities include three structures comprised of an office, a storage shed, and dismantling canopy totaling 2,670 square feet. An eight-foot tall fence encompasses the yard and two storm drain interceptors for surface runoff are located at the northeastern and southeastern corners of the property. Dismantled vehicles are parked and stacked around the property.

Parcel A Improvements

The project entails a Use Permit to allow the dismantling activities on the parcel and a General Development Plan for the overall use. No changes, improvements or structures are proposed on the property.

Parcels B & C

Parcels B and C are 4.51 acres and 5.0 acres respectively. Dismantling operations are conducted by "Pick-n-Pull" on a single yard covering both parcels. Facilities include the 3,360 square foot office building and a 1,728 square foot dismantling canopy on Parcel B and a 572 square foot sales office and 64 square foot entrance kiosk on Parcel C. There is also a dismantling area with a vehicle crusher and concrete pads. Storm drain interceptors and detention basins for surface runoff are installed in two areas of the yard. Crushed vehicles are stacked and vehicles for self-service dismantling line the yard. An eight-foot tall fence rings the perimeter of the yard.

Parcel B/C Improvements

The project entails a Use Permit to allow the dismantling activities on the parcels and a General Development Plan detailing the overall use. Proposed improvements on the parcels include:

1. Installation of a well, 212,000 gallon water tank, 5,000 gallon water tank, pressure tank, and booster pump on Parcel C;
2. Installation of a fire suppression water system to service the entire industrial park;
3. Installation of a separate domestic water system; and
4. Basic site improvements and maintenance related to drainage facilities.

Parcel D

Parcel D encompasses 70.08 acres and surrounds the other three parcels. Approximately 39.28 acres of the Parcel D is zoned for light industrial uses with the remainder zoned for agriculture or conservation. The proposed project entails a Use Permit for vehicle dismantling and a General Development Plan for overall combined activities on the parcel. Proposed activities include six (6) vehicle dismantling yards, continuing agricultural operations on two portions of the parcel, and the two (2) existing "Dolan" residences, which are currently vacant. No changes or improvements are proposed for the residential or agricultural activities. A 90-120 foot Pacific Gas and Electric Company easement crosses a portion of the property and contains high voltage power lines. Existing uses and acreage on the property are devoted to the following:

- 26.90 acres in agriculture,
- 13.75 acres cultivated under electrical power lines,

- 17.25 acres for six (6) auto dismantling and vehicle storage yards,
 - 5.68 acres for roads,
 - 3.4 acres for wetlands/marsh,
 - 2.6 acres for the two vacant residences,
 - 0.5 acres for a railway right-of-way
- 70.08 Total

Parcel D contains six separate yards with dismantling activities occurring on four of the yards.

Yard #1: Yard #1 contains an existing office trailer, dismantling canopy and storage containers.

Yard #2: Yard #2 is currently used for vehicle impound storage. There is a dismantling canopy. Although this yard had been approved as a dismantling facility under the previous permit, the building permits for the facilities were never finalized and the facility has not been used. It also contains a storm drain interceptor and detention basin.

Yard #3: Yard #3 contains an existing office trailer, dismantling canopy, storage trailer and sheds, storage containers, and a 5,000 gallon water tank.

Yard #4: Yard #4 contains an existing office trailer, dismantling canopy, storage trailer and shed, and storage containers.

Yard #5: Yard #5 contains an existing office trailer, dismantling canopy, and septic system.

Yard #6: Yard #6 is currently used as storage for vehicles for Yard #3.

Parcel D Improvements

For the dismantling yards, the project proposes on:

1. Yard #1 to increase the usable acreage from 2.27 to 3.93 acres by filling in a portion of the yard that is currently unusable;
2. Yard #1 to extend an existing earthen berm along the perimeter to complete improvements for a stormwater control plan required under the previous permit and grading to improve the slope and drainage;
3. Yard #2 to increase the usable acreage from 4.34 to 5.26 acres by excavating soil from a portion of the yard to be used on Yard #1 and improve drainage;
4. Yard #2 to finalize improvements and allow the previously permitted dismantling activities on the yard which is currently used as a vehicle impound area;
5. Yard #6 to create a new dismantling facility on the yard and would include an office trailer, concrete slab, dismantling canopy, and storage areas similar to other yards.

Project improvements include:

1. Installation of a new well, booster system, pressure tank, 212,000 gallon water tank;
2. Installation of a water system for fire suppression and agricultural irrigation;
3. Installation of a domestic water system and relocation of the 5,000 gallon water tanks;
4. Septic systems for domestic and employee use on Yards 2, 3, 4 and 6;
5. Grading for the water system and tank (approximately 2,830 cubic yards cut/2,200 cubic yards fill);
6. Grading for drainage improvements and to increase acreage on Yard #1 and Yard #2 (approximately 8,500 cubic yards cut/8,500 cubic yards fill);

**FIGURE 1.
OVERALL SITE PLAN**

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES:**Setting**

Dolan Industrial Park is located at 516 Dolan Road northerly of the intersection of Via Tanques Road and Dolan Road in the Moss Landing area of northern Monterey County (Figure 2). Dolan Road, a well-used county arterial road, runs east-west to the south of the Park and connects up to Highway 1 at Moss Landing. A Union Pacific Railroad line runs north-south along the eastern boundary of the park. Access to the site is provided from Via Tanques Road, a public road which turns into a private access road for the four parcels. Via Tanques Road also provides access to a gated entrance for an adjacent parcel owned by Duke Energy.

Dolan Industrial Park consists of three smaller parcels (Parcels A, B and C) ranging in size from 4.5 to 7.5 acres surrounded by the larger 70.08 acre parcel (Parcel D). Surrounding land uses include agriculture, Duke Energy Plant facilities, rural residential uses, open space and wetland areas part of the Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve.

Dolan Industrial Park is located adjacent to Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve on the northwest and Parson's Slough, an arm of Elkhorn Slough, on the northeast. The Industrial Park is located on a marine terrace between Elkhorn Slough and Parson's Slough. The access road is located on the crest of the terrace with the terrain sloping down on both sides to the west and east. The average cross slope of the dismantling yards on the west-facing side range from 2% for Parcels B and C to 5% for yards #3, #4, and #5 (Parcel D). On the west-facing side beyond the dismantling yards, the land slopes down with an approximate 20% grade across the existing agricultural land to the wetland areas of Elkhorn Slough. On the east-facing side the average cross slope ranges from 5% for Parcel A to 12% and steeper for yards #1, #2 and #6 (Parcel D). On the east-facing side, the yards slope down unevenly to the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way and Parson's Slough beyond because of previous grading, areas of previous cut and fill, drainage channels and gullies.

Elkhorn Slough which is adjacent to the subject properties contains sensitive wetland habitat. Dolan Industrial Park itself is completely developed and disturbed by the current and past industrial activities. Vegetation is minimal except for non-native cypress trees that partially line the perimeter of the yards. Parcel D contains approximately 40.65 acres in cultivation. Undeveloped and uncultivated areas include several gullies and a buffer area on the perimeter of Parcel D.

**FIGURE 2.
VICINITY MAP**

III. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LOCAL AND STATE PLANS AND MANDATED LAWS

Use the list below to indicate plans applicable to the project and verify their consistency or non-consistency with project implementation.

General Plan/Area Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality Mgmt. Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Specific Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Plans	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water Quality Control Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Local Coastal Program-LUP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP): The 2000 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region (AQMP) prepared by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) addresses the attainment and maintenance of state and federal ambient air quality standards within the North Central Coast Air Basin (NCCAB). The project is for an ongoing use with no substantial intensification of use. Proposed road improvements will reduce the amount of dust generated by vehicles. Measures applied to this project will provide AQMP consistency related to short-term construction activity. Project consistency with the AQMP is evaluated in more detail in Section IV-3 (Air Quality). **CONSISTENT**

Water Quality Control Plan: Monterey County is included in the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board – Region 3 (Regional Board), which extends from Santa Clara County to northern Ventura County. The Regional Board regulates the sources of water quality related problems which could result in actual or potential impairment or degradation of beneficial uses or degradations of water quality. The Regional Board regulates both point and non-point source discharge activities through control actions that are set forth for implementation by the State Water Resources Control Board, by other agencies with water quality or related authority, and by the Regional Board. The Monterey County Water Resources Agency has reviewed the project relative to runoff and drainage for the area. Monterey County Environmental Health Division has reviewed the project relative to water use and waste treatment. Vehicle dismantling activities are regulated and inspected by both the Monterey County Environmental Health Division and the Regional Board to ensure that activities comply with State and local laws. **CONSISTENT**

Local Coastal Program/LUP - The project is consistent with the North County Land Use Plan, Local Coastal Program, which designates the site as suitable for auto dismantling. The North County Land Use Plan designates Dolan Industrial Park as a Special Treatment Area where continued operation of the auto dismantling activities is not prohibited. It specifies that renewal of the use permits for auto dismantling “*will be based on the merits of the specific proposal and feasible mitigation measures to offset any adverse impacts of continued operation.*” A Land Use Plan Map Change was approved February 19, 1992 (PC06607) which adjusted the land use designations so that the whole of parcels A, B and C were designated Light Industrial (“LI”) and only parcel D is designated Agricultural Conservation (“AC”) and Resource Conservation (“RC”) in addition to Light Industrial (“LI”). Changes were not incorporated into the Zoning Map, but the proposed dismantling yards are allowed because the Land Use Plan designations supersede. **CONSISTENT**

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED AND DETERMINATION

A. FACTORS

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, as discussed within the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | | |

Some proposed applications that are not exempt from CEQA review may have little or no potential for adverse environmental impact related to most of the topics in the Environmental Checklist; and/or potential impacts may involve only a few limited subject areas. These types of projects are generally minor in scope, located in a non-sensitive environment, and are easily identifiable and without public controversy. For the environmental issue areas where there is no potential for significant environmental impact (and not checked above), the following finding can be made using the project description, environmental setting, or other information as supporting evidence.

☐ Check here if this finding is not applicable

FINDING: For the above referenced topics that are not checked off, there is no potential for significant environmental impact to occur from either construction, operation or maintenance of the proposed project and no further discussion in the Environmental Checklist is necessary.

EVIDENCE: Agricultural Resources. In addition to the industrial activities at Dolan Industrial Park, agricultural activities occur in the project area on a portion of Parcel D. Cultivated areas on the 70.08 acre parcel include 26.9 acres on the northern portion of the property and 13.75 acres under the electrical power lines on the southern portion of the property. No agriculture occurs on any of the other parcels. The projects do not propose any changes to the cultivated areas and do not impact continued cultivation or agricultural resources. (Project Description; Reference #1, 2, 3, 4)

Air Quality. The current proposals continue the existing uses with minimal new development, which is limited to access road improvements, installation of a new water system, completion and maintenance of the drainage improvements and facilities. It includes grading for the water system and tank and grading for drainage improvements. Grading does not exceed Air District standards or thresholds. In addition, the access road which currently is only partially paved will be paved as part of the project and required mitigation (see Section VI-15, Transportation/Traffic). This will reduce the amount of particulate matter generated by the project. Because construction activities are temporary and consistent with the AQMP and overall activities will not lead to an increase in particulate matter, the projects have no significant impact. (Project Description; Reference #1, 2, 3, 6, 7)

Cultural Resources. No cultural or historical resources will be impacted. An archaeological survey prepared by Archaeological Consulting dated September 15, 1994 found no evidence of cultural resources on the property. (Project Description; Reference #1, 2, 3, 5,9)

Mineral Resources. The project site does not have any significant mineral resources. (Project Description; Reference #1, 2, 3)

Noise. The project does not contribute excessive noise to the area. Noise is primarily generated from truck and car traffic and occasional machinery noise, such as the crusher. General operations occur during daylight business hours, including weekends. Vehicle dismantling is done manually. The proposed uses and activities are existing and do not create any additional noise impacts. Additional noise from construction traffic and activity will be temporary and take place during daylight hours and will be no different from other normal construction work and in accordance with Monterey County noise standards. Surrounding land uses are primarily large agricultural parcels. Two vacant residences are located on one of the subject parcels (Parcel D), approximately 1,000 feet from the nearest yard. Except for the houses which are a sizable distance from operations, no other sensitive receptors are within a ¼ mile of the project. (Project Description; Reference #1, 2, 3, 14)

Population/Housing. The project does not affect population or housing. Two existing vacant residences on Parcel D will remain. No other residences are located on the subject parcels. The project does not add any population or create or destroy any housing. (Project Description; Reference #1, 14)

Public Services. The project consists of existing uses and activities. It does not require any additional public services, public facilities or any significant physical alterations as a result of required public services. (Project Description; Reference #1)

Recreation. The project does not create any additional need for recreation facilities nor does it disturb any existing facilities. (Project Description; Reference #1)

B. 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 (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____ Signature	_____ June 1, 2005 Date
_____ Eric Lee Printed Name	_____ Associate Planner Title

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a

V. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take into account the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a

previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - 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 significance.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. AESTHETICS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Source: 1,2,3,5,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Source: 1,2,3,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Source: 1,2,3,5,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Source: 1,2,3,5,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

Dolan Industrial Park is located on a marine terrace situated approximately 70 feet above Elkhorn Slough to the north and northwest. To the south of the park runs Dolan Road in an east-westerly direction. Dolan Industrial Park is roughly divided into two parts bisected by the access road. The northwestern-facing yards are comprised of Parcel B, Parcel C and Yards #3, #4 and #5 on Parcel D. They are located on a well-screened gentle slope oriented to Elkhorn Slough. The southeastern-facing yards are comprised of Parcel A and Yards #1, #2 and #6 on Parcel D. Yards #1 and #2 are located on more exposed steeper slopes looking out towards Dolan Road.

The site is located adjacent to and within public view of Elkhorn Slough. The proximity to Elkhorn Slough places it in a visually sensitive area according to the North County Land Use Plan (Policy 2.2.2.1). Development in this area is allowed provided it meets certain visual criteria outlined in the Coastal Implementation Plan, Part 2 (§20.144.030.B). Existing Cypress trees on the north and western sides screen Parcel B and Parcel C and portions of Parcel D. However, other portions of the site are visible from areas along Dolan Road to the south, as well as from public roads on the hills to the east. Relevant criteria from the Land Use Plan which serve as thresholds of significance include minimizing visibility by using appropriate design and colors, screening with landscaping, and controlling location, height and size of development, and minimizing tree removal.

The development does not obstruct any views because of the topography and terrain, but it is visible from public areas. Although dismantling activities are allowed in this location under the Land Use Plan, views of site contrast greatly with the surrounding agricultural fields and adjacent wetlands and slough. Mitigation measures and conditions of approval related to aesthetics for the previous 1995 permits largely addressed visual issues and included:

- Painting all buildings an earthtone color;

- Landscaping to provide maximum screening with native vegetation;
- Installing 8-foot tall fencing around the dismantling yards;
- Limiting the height of stacked cars.

Although the applicants generally complied with these requirements, evaluation of current conditions reveals a number of continuing issues. Visual impacts of the proposed projects that need to be addressed in order to minimize visibility consist of:

- Visibility of dismantling yards from Dolan Road and from Elkhorn Slough because of insufficient screening or gaps in the screening vegetation. This includes the western sides Parcel A and Yard 5, eastern sides of Yard 1 and Yard 2, and the southern side Yard 6.
- Off-site glare from the stored and dismantled vehicles.
- Potential visibility of stacked cars.
- Potential visibility of new structures.
- In addition, Yards #1 and #2 on Parcel D have exposed eastern facing slopes that require grading in order to create a more level viewing plane which can be better screened.

CONCLUSION

Aesthetic Impact 1(a) – Less than significant with mitigation. The project site is visible from public viewing areas, including Elkhorn Slough, Dolan Road and other public roads in the region. The project is located in an area valued for its open spaces, rural agriculture and views of Elkhorn Slough. Although the proposed development does not obstruct any views, it does contrast with and impact the natural and agricultural setting. Mitigation to screen the dismantling yards and facilities from public view, grading on Yard #1 and #2 to reduce the slope exposure, limit the height of stacked cars, and use earthtone colors for any new structures reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Screening includes trees along the access road to screen Parcel A on the west side outside of the parcel's boundaries, but in the event it is not feasible to plant trees in this location, mitigation includes painting the fence a natural earthtone color.

Aesthetic Impact 1(b) – No Impact. The proposed projects are not located within a designated state scenic highway and do not impact any scenic resources.

Aesthetic Impact 1(c) – Less than significant with mitigation. Dismantling activities have historically occurred on the project site and no new development or activities are currently proposed that would substantially alter the visual quality of the site. Previous permits included requirements related to fencing, screening, storage, and structures that improved the visual quality. Mitigation consistent with previous mitigation includes tree screening, limiting the height of stacked cars, and use of earthtone colors for any structures ensure that the visual impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

Aesthetic Impact 1(d) – Less than significant with mitigation. The proposed projects do not propose any additional exterior lighting. Existing dismantling operations operate during regular daylight business hours and any exterior lighting is limited to the minimum necessary for security. Plans for any new exterior lighting are subject to County regulations that require exterior lighting to be unobtrusive and minimal, which ensure that the impact would be less than significant. However, the dismantling yards are not fully screened and several are located on

south and southeast facing slopes which are visible from public viewing areas. As a result the glare from the stored and dismantled vehicles is substantial and visible from a distance. Mitigation to reduce impacts to a less than significant level includes fully screening and maintaining the exposed outside perimeter of all of the dismantling yards with a row of trees and limiting the height of stacked vehicles.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure #1 (Screening): In order to minimize impacts to scenic vistas, to reduce off-site glare and to maintain the visual quality of the site, each dismantling facilities on each parcel shall be screened from public view. Each owner/applicant shall implement measures including but not limited to the following screening measures for their respective parcel within six (6) months of permit approval. The owners shall provide the necessary financial guarantees to the County of Monterey to ensure completion of the work.

- For **Parcel A**, the applicant shall plant and maintain a solid row of trees along the entire northern and eastern perimeters of the property. Trees shall also be planted along the exposed western side fronting on the access road to screen the fence from the point where Parcel A extends northwards beyond Parcel B. In the event that trees cannot be planted to screen the west-facing fence along the access road, the fence shall be painted a neutral earthtone color.
- For **Parcel B** and **Parcel C**, the applicant shall maintain the existing row of perimeter trees and fill in any gaps in the treeline.
- For **Parcel D**, the applicant shall plant a solid row of trees consistent with the Landscape and Fencing Plan prepared by Tunstall Engineering around the entire outside perimeter of Yards 1 to 6. In addition, the applicant shall plant a row of trees along the border between Yard 6 and Yard 2. The water tanks shall also be fully screened.
- Newly planted trees shall consist of appropriate drought-tolerant California native trees, a minimum of 5 gallons in size. They shall be irrigated or watered as needed until established.
- All existing and planted trees, including the existing cypress trees lining the access road, and other screening vegetation shall be maintained in a healthy growing condition.
- Fallen, removed, or unhealthy trees shall be replaced to fill in any gaps or openings in the treeline, as needed or as determined necessary by the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. Replacement shall occur within one (1) month of the tree loss and shall consist of the same tree species as those being replaced or as otherwise approved by the Director of Planning and Building Inspection.

Monitoring Action #1A: Within one (1) month of permit approval, the owners of **Parcel A** and **Parcel D** shall submit a screening/landscaping plan for their respective parcels to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval. The plan shall screen the dismantling facilities on each parcel to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. The screening/landscaping plan shall be prepared by a qualified landscape designer/architect and shall include verification by a qualified landscape designer/architect that the landscaping plan meets County requirements for the use of native, drought-tolerant species. The plan shall show the location of the screening trees and vegetation. The plan shall be in sufficient detail to identify the location, species, and size of the proposed landscaping materials, irrigation schedule, and shall

be accompanied by a nursery or contractor's estimate of the cost of installation of the plan and ongoing maintenance.

Monitoring Action #1B: Within two (2) months of permit approval, each owner (**Parcel A, B, C, and D**) shall provide a performance security to meet the screening and landscaping costs for installation, on-going maintenance, and replacement of trees for their respective parcels to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval. The submittal of the security shall be accompanied by a qualified consultant's estimate of the cost of the installation, replacement, and maintenance subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. The amount shall be 100% of the estimated cost for Faithful Performance and 50% of the estimated cost for Labor and Material. The owner may offer to provide this performance security entirely through an irrevocable letter of credit or by a combination of an irrevocable letter of credit and a performance bond. If an owner chooses to offer a performance bond to meet a portion of this requirement, it must provide at least fifty percent (50%) of the required performance security in the form of an irrevocable letter of credit and the balance by the bond.

Monitoring Action #1C: In the event that screening with trees or vegetation along the access road is determined to be infeasible, within three (3) months of permit approval, the owner of **Parcel A** shall paint the west-facing fence along the access road a natural, earthtone color. The applicant shall submit color samples to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval and evidence of completion.

Monitoring Action #1D: Within six (6) months of permit approval, all screening trees and vegetation shall be installed, consistent with the approved screening/landscaping plan. The applicants (**Parcel A and D**) shall submit evidence of completion to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval.

Monitoring Action #1E: Annually for the duration of the permit, each owner (**Parcel A, B, C, and D**) shall submit an inspection report of the screening trees and vegetation by a qualified arborist or registered forester to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval. The arborist or forester shall evaluate the condition and health of the trees and vegetation and certify that any necessary maintenance or replacement of trees has been completed for the respective parcels.

Mitigation Measure #2 (Visibility): In order to minimize visual impacts, vehicles shall not be stacked higher than eight (8) feet from the ground. All new structures including but not limited to water tanks, fences, trailers, canopies, shall be painted a natural, earthtone color subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building Inspection.

Monitoring Action #2A: Prior to issuance of any building permits or the installation of new or replacement structures, the applicant (**Parcel A, B, C and D**) shall submit color samples for the structures, including but not limited to water tanks, fences, trailers, canopies, to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval.

Monitoring Action #2B: Prior to final, occupancy or commencement of use, the applicant shall provide evidence to PBI that the structures have been painted as approved by PBI.

Monitoring Action #2C: Adhere to condition.

Mitigation Measure #3: In order to minimize visibility of Yard #1 and Yard #2, the owner of **Parcel D** shall grade Yards #1 and #2 to create a more level viewing plane and reduce the exposed slope within six (6) months of permit approval. Options may include excavating the steeper sides of the yards and/or raising the lower portions. Grading shall not create areas with slopes steeper than a 2:1 ratio.

Monitoring Action #3A: Within two (2) months of permit approval, the owner of **Parcel D** shall submit grading plans prepared by a qualified engineer which achieve a more uniform and continuous viewing plane on Yard #1 and #2 to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval.

Monitoring Action #3B: Within six (6) months of permit approval, the owner of **Parcel D** shall obtain the necessary grading permits and complete the grading work and submit verification of completion to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: See Sections II and IV.

3. AIR QUALITY

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

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: 1,2,3,6,7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 1,2,3,6,7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 1,2,3,6,7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in significant construction-related air quality impacts? (Source: 1,2,3,6,7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 1,2,3,6,7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 1,2,3,6,7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: See Sections II and IV.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source: 1,2,3,4,5,12,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Source: 1,2,3,4,5,12,13,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Source: 1,2,3,4,5,12,13,14,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3,4,5,12,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Source: 1,2,3,4,5,12,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3,4,5,12,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The proposed projects are located on parcels that have been heavily developed and disturbed with a history of industrial and agricultural activities. Parcels A, B and C are entirely developed with no native or natural habitat. The dismantling yards and agricultural fields cover most of Parcel D. Naturally vegetated areas only occur on Parcel D in the gullies and in buffer areas adjacent to Elkhorn Slough. Much of this area was previously disturbed as a result of dredging activities for freshwater ponds and agricultural land and excavation of fill for the bridge on Dolan Road over the railroad tracks. The project site is adjacent to and drains into the wetland and saltwater marsh areas of Elkhorn Slough to the northwest and Parsons Slough to the northeast. A stormwater management plan was implemented for the dismantling yards to control erosion and to filter out any harmful pollutants. Review of the facilities by Ken Tunstall, the designing engineer,

determined that the stormwater facilities are operating as designed. Communication with the Regional Water Quality Control Board confirmed that the dismantling yards are substantially in compliance with their stormwater discharge permits.

A biological assessment was originally performed by Jud Vandevere in 1994 for all four parcels and revealed no significant biological issues. None of the plants inventoried are rare, endangered or threatened. No adverse effects from the dismantling operations were noted and no biological measures were recommended or required as part of the initial study. A biological update conducted by Jud Vandevere in 2004.

CONCLUSION: Less than significant impact.

The biological assessment found that biological conditions had not changed from 1994. The survey indicated "no adverse impact on vegetation down slope from the yards." In addition, the stormwater facilities were functioning as designed, effectively treating runoff water, and stormwater runoff samples fall within water quality benchmarks set by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed projects continue the existing uses and further implement and maintain the stormwater runoff system. Any proposed grading occurs in already disturbed areas and is subject to erosion control measures. As a result the proposed projects have a less than significant impact.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5? (Source: 1,2,3,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? (Source: 1,2,3,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Source: 1,2,3,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Source: 1,2,3,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: See Sections II and IV.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
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? (Source: 1,2,3,5) Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Source: 1,2,3,5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Source: 1,2,3,5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides? (Source: 1,2,3,5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Source: 1,2,3,13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3,5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3,5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1,2,3,5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The Initial Study prepared by Linda Weiland in 1995 noted that previous excavation of areas by Caltrans for fill to use in construction of the bridge over the railway tracks on Dolan Road caused gully erosion and disrupted natural drainage. However, it concluded that there were "no signs of historical problems with erosion of soil from the parcel and deposition in the adjacent wetlands." Grading under the previous permits was also intended to create more gradual slopes and reduce hill-top erosion.

CONCLUSION: Less than significant impact.

The proposed projects involve minimal new grading or development and do not result in additional runoff or erosion. Recent investigations and inspections by County staff have uncovered no signs of substantial erosion. The biological assessment by Jud Vandever also identified no erosion problems. The stormwater facilities were evaluated by the designing engineer, Ken Tunstall, who determined that aside from minor maintenance and cleaning, the facilities were functioning as designed.

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Source: 1,2,3,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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:1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

Auto dismantling yards routinely handle and dispose of potentially hazardous chemicals and fluids associated with vehicles and vehicle parts. On the subject properties, all dismantling occurs under covered canopies on top of an impervious surface with secondary containment features in case of a spill. The handling, storage and disposal of these hazardous materials are subject to regulations and inspections by the Monterey County Division of Environmental Health and North County Fire Protection District. However, the existing and proposed facilities currently lack an adequate water system for fire suppression and domestic water use that are necessary to meet basic health and safety requirements and provide protection from potential hazards. Existing and additional facilities will be required to continue to comply with best management practices to minimize the potential risk.

CONCLUSION

Hazards Impact 7(a), (b) - Less than significant with mitigation. The subject parcels lack an adequate water system for fire suppression and domestic water use for their facilities. The Division of Environmental Health and the North County Fire District have determined that the existing conditions pose a potential on-going hazard that could result in adverse environmental impacts. Mitigation includes compliance with Fire requirements and best management practices, installation of a comprehensive water system, and performance guarantees to ensure the work is completed and adequately maintained. In addition, in order to minimize conflicts between the two proposed water systems, mitigation also requires that each system be designed to allow for connections between them to allow for mutual support. The measures ensure that potential impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Hazards Impact 7(c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) - No Impact. The projects are not located in close proximity to any schools, airstrips, airports, or on a hazardous material site and do not interfere with an emergency response plan. The subject parcels are located in an industrial, agricultural and open space area and do not expose people or residences to wildland fires.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure #4 (Best Management Practices): In order to minimize the risk to public safety, the owners/applicants (Parcel A, B, C and D) shall implement and comply with best management practices and with the following measures:

1. The owners shall develop roadways providing adequate Fire Department access subject to the approval by North County Fire Protection District, hereafter referred to as the AHJ (Agency Having Jurisdiction).
2. The owners of the affected parcels shall create a road agreement that will ensure maintenance of the required fire apparatus access.
3. The owners of the affected parcels shall develop a water company, corporation or association to create funds for the installation of a water system that will provide adequate fire flow, fire mains and hydrants for the buildings currently existing and proposed.
4. Each parcel owner shall record a notice stating that, *"Any future construction of buildings beyond those included in this approval will immediately initiate required fire flow."*

5. All H-4 occupancies shall be restricted to a maximum of 1800 square feet with a canopy roof and one side wall per existing yard, to drain fluids from the vehicles under cover and provide cover for parts that retain fluid as recommended by the Division of Environmental Health until an approved water system is provided.
6. All H-4 occupancies shall have floor drainage as specified in Article 29 of the 2001 Uniform Fire Code, as approved by the AHJ and the Division of Environmental Health.
7. All yard owners shall maintain compliance with Article 34 of the Uniform Fire Code.
8. New dismantling areas and hazardous material/waste and impound areas shall be designated to be impervious, shall have secondary containment features and shall allow for the collection of any spills/runoff from dismantling/storage operations. Submit a design for the final dismantling/storage area and impound area improvements to the Division of Environmental Health and the AHJ for review and approval prior to issuance of a building or grading permit.
9. Existing dismantling areas and hazardous materials/waste storage and impound areas shall be improved as necessary to be impervious, shall have secondary containment features and shall allow for the collection of any runoff from dismantling operations. Submit an improvement design for the existing impound areas and dismantling areas to the Division of Environmental Health and the AHJ for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building or grading permit.

Monitoring Action #4A: Within three (3) months of permit approval, each applicant/owner shall submit evidence of compliance with item #3 (Road Agreement), item #4 (Water Company), and item #5 (Recorded Notice) to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Inspection Department and the North County Fire Marshall for review and approval.

Monitoring Action #4B: Every six (6) months for the first year after permit approval and then annually for the life of the permit, each applicant/owner shall submit documentation to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval that their parcel and their respective operators are in compliance with the abovementioned measures, as inspected and certified by the North County Fire District. Each owner shall pay the necessary fees to the Fire District for site visits and staff time related to inspections and compliance monitoring.

Monitoring Action #4C: Prior to building permit final or commencement of business for a new operator, the applicant/owner shall demonstrate compliance with the requirements to the satisfaction of the North County Fire Marshall and Director of Environmental Health.

Mitigation Measure #5 (Water System): In order to minimize risks to public health and safety, the owners/applicants (Parcel A, B, C and D) shall install a fire suppression and water system within six (6) months of permit approval. The system shall be designed to meet the requirements of the North County Fire District and Division of Environmental Health and shall be designed to allow for connections with other proposed or existing systems. Each owner shall provide the County of Monterey the necessary financial guarantees to ensure completion of the work and ongoing maintenance. Failure by any one owner to participate or to pay does not absolve the other owners from the requirement to comply.

Monitoring Action #5A: Within two (2) months of permit approval, each owner shall provide a performance security for an amount to meet the estimated fair-share cost for the installation and maintenance of the water system to the Director of Environmental Health and Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval. The submittal of the security shall be accompanied by an engineer's estimate of the cost of the improvements which shall be approved by the Directors. The amounts to be determined by the Directors shall be 100% of the estimated cost for Faithful Performance and 50% of the estimated cost for Labor and Material. The owner may offer to provide this performance security entirely through an irrevocable letter of credit or by a combination of an irrevocable letter of credit and a performance bond. If an owner chooses to offer a performance bond to meet a portion of this requirement, it must provide at least fifty percent (50%) of the required performance security in the form of an irrevocable letter of credit and the balance by the bond.

Monitoring Action #5B: Within six (6) months of permit approval, the applicants shall obtain all necessary permits and install an approved water system. The applicants shall submit documentation of the finalized permits to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection.

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Source: 1,2,3,5,8,13,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3,5,)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3,5,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: 1,2,3,5,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: 1,2,3,5,13,14,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Source: 1,2,3,5,12,13,14,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

Dismantling facilities are regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Monterey County Division of Environmental Health for compliance with discharge standards and for the protection of water quality. The Division of Environmental Health has reviewed the proposals which include new wells for the water systems and new septic systems and identified no significant impacts related to them. Communication with the Regional Water Quality Control Board confirmed that the existing dismantling yards are substantially in compliance with their stormwater discharge permits. The facilities will continue to be subject to state and local laws and implement best management practices.

A comprehensive stormwater management system was required and installed under previous permit requirements for the subject parcels. According to a review of the system by the designing engineer, Ken Tunstall, the system is functioning properly, but that minor maintenance and repairs are necessary to ensure compliance. The project (PLN030504) also proposes grading and additional dismantling facilities to be located on Yard #2 and Yard #6 which will contribute additional runoff to be managed. Mitigation includes an updated stormwater management plan with improvements incorporating the two new yards, yearly reports to ensure the maintenance of the stormwater system and compliance with RWQCB discharge permits. The measures reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

CONCLUSION

Water Impact 8(a), (e) – Less than significant with mitigation. Although the projects include industrial activities with the potential to adversely impact water quality or create additional runoff, the existing stormwater system and compliance with state and local discharge and water quality standards largely address these issues. Mitigation requiring adequate maintenance, compliance with stormwater permits, and an updated stormwater plan incorporating Yard #2 and Yard #6 on Parcel D reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Water Impact 8(b), (c), (d), (f) – Less than significant impact. Development of the new wells will provide for water storage for the fire suppression system and some additional amount for domestic use for employees. The proposals have been reviewed by the Division of Environmental Health which identified no significant impacts related to water use or intensification. Additional grading related to Yard #2 and Yard #6 does not substantially alter drainage patterns or the topography.

Water Impact 8(g), (h), (i), (j) – No Impact. The projects do not propose or affect any residences or structures that could be impacted by flooding or inundation and do not include any development within the 100 year flood zone.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure #6 (Stormwater Facilities): In order to minimize impacts to water quality, the owners/applicants (**Parcel A, B, C and D**) shall maintain adequate stormwater drainage facilities to address on-site and off-site impacts to the satisfaction of the Director of the Water Resources Agency and Director of Planning and Building Inspection and shall comply with the requirements of their stormwater permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

Monitoring Action #6A: Annually for the duration of the permit, each owner/applicant shall submit a report by a qualified engineer by September 1st of each year to the Directors of the Water Resources Agency and Planning and Building Inspection certifying that the stormwater drainage system and facilities for the respective parcel have been inspected. The engineer's report shall verify that any necessary repairs or maintenance work on the stormwater system have been completed to ensure that the system is working as designed and shall identify any changed conditions or circumstances that would warrant further improvements to the system.

Monitoring Action #6B: Annually for the duration of the permit, each owner/applicant shall provide documentation by September 1st of each year to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection certifying that each operator is in compliance with their stormwater permit and that each operator has submitted their annual report to RWQCB along with any necessary copies of water tests or current permits. In the event of a new operator, the parcel owner shall submit documentation that the new operator has obtained a stormwater discharge permit from RWQCB prior to the start of any operations.

Mitigation Measure #7 (Stormwater Plan): The owners of **Parcel D** shall submit an updated stormwater management plan to the Director of the Water Resources Agency and Director Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval. The plans shall be prepared by a

qualified engineer and include facilities and improvements that address changes from grading activities, erosion and sedimentation issues, and potential pollutants in stormwater runoff on proposed Yard #2 and Yard #6.

Monitoring Action #7A: Within two (2) months of permit approval, the applicant shall submit an updated stormwater management plan which incorporates Yard #2 and Yard #6 prepared by a qualified engineer to the Directors of the Water Resources Agency and Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval.

Monitoring Action #7B: Prior to final of any building or grading permits or the commencement of any use related to Yard #2 or Yard #6, the applicant shall provide documentation from a qualified engineer certifying that drainage and stormwater improvements have been completed consistent with the approved stormwater management plan to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Physically divide an established community? (Source: 1,2,3,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Source: 1,2,3,4,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Source: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The North County Land Use Plan designates Dolan Industrial Park as a Special Treatment Area in order to not prohibit the auto dismantling activities that were in operation at the time the Local Coastal Program (LCP) was prepared. It specifies that renewal of the use permits for auto dismantling "will be based on the merits of the specific proposal and feasible mitigation measures to offset any adverse impacts of continued operation." The industrial park is zoned for light industrial uses with other portions of Parcel D zoned for agricultural preservation and resource conservation.

CONCLUSION: Less than significant impact.

The project is consistent with the land use plan and zoning designations which determined that the overall proposed use for vehicle dismantling is compatible with the surrounding area. Potential impacts or conflicts for specific resources are addressed in sections on Aesthetics, Hazards, Hydrology/Water, and Transportation.

10. MINERAL RESOURCES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: See Sections II and IV.

11. NOISE		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:					
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: See Sections II and IV.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING				
Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source:1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 1,2,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 1,2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: See Sections II and IV.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES				
Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: See Sections II and IV.

14. RECREATION		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION: See Sections II and IV.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: 1,2,3,5,10,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Source: 1,2,3,5,10,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Source: 1,2,3,5,10,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Source: 1,2,3,5,10,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access? (Source: 1,2,3, 5,10,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Source: 1,2,3, 5,10,11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC		Less Than Significant			
Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Source: 1,2,3,5,10,11)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION:

The subject properties are located off of Dolan Road, a minor county arterial, which connects up to Highway 1 approximately two miles to the west at Moss Landing. Access to the site from Dolan Road is provided by Via Tanques which turns into a private access road. Via Tanques also serves as a back entrance for a parcel that is owned by Duke Energy.

Dolan Road/Via Tanques Intersection

The project is for existing uses and is not expected to generate an increase in traffic. A traffic report was prepared by Engineering Consulting Services dated April 11, 1993 for the previous permits which were approved in 1995. At that time, Average Daily Traffic on Dolan Road was 2,500 trips and Via Tanques was 750 trips. PM peak hour turning counts for the Dolan Road and Via Tanques intersection were 15 trips entering and 55 trips leaving the parcels (70 total).

The numbers correspond to a recent traffic study for the current project, conducted by Pinnacle Engineering dated January 21, 2004. The study assessed the number and type of vehicle trips associated with the existing operations and evaluated traffic-related issues to identify any needed improvements. The Pinnacle report calculated average weekday traffic generated by Dolan Industrial Park at 759 trips with a PM peak hour count of 30 inbound and 54 outbound trips (84 total trips). The report also observed that more trips were generated on the weekend. Average weekend traffic (Saturday) totaled 960 trips with a total of 148 trips during the mid-day peak hour. However, overall thru-traffic on Dolan Road was about 30% less on the weekend. In addition, the study noted that the Annual Average Daily Traffic for Dolan Road according to County figures is approximately 5,000 vehicles which is double the 1993 figures. The increase is related to an overall rise in trips not attributable to the subject projects.

The report determined that traffic operations at the Dolan Road/Via Tanques intersection was operating within an acceptable Level of Service A. It also found that all existing traffic related to Dolan Industrial Park had already been evaluated in traffic studies for other projects in the area and that *"no improvements are required at the SR 1/Dolan Road intersection."* However, given the existing conditions and traffic volumes on Dolan Road, the report concluded that:

- Trees and vegetation should be trimmed to improve sight distance looking east on Dolan Road from Via Tanques to a minimum of 660 feet;
- Installation of an "Intersection Ahead" sign for westbound traffic on Dolan Road approaching Via Tanques should be installed; and
- Construction of a left-turn lane in the eastbound approach of Dolan Road at the Via Tanques intersection is warranted under existing guidelines.

Access Road/Circulation

The Pinnacle report also evaluated on-site access and general circulation issues. Via Tanques and the access road that provide entry to the subject parcels are characterized by several sharp bends and unevenly paved or unpaved sections. Since the 1995 permits, the access road was not fully improved and has not been adequately maintained. Recommended improvements to address deficiencies and hazards include:

- Regrading the 90 degree bend where the Union Pacific Railroad track cross Via Tanques to improve truck turning movements;
- Regrading the corner where Via Tanques intersects the access road to provide better "line of sight";
- Paving, striping and signing improvements for the access road to improve conditions and circulation; and
- Delineating the parking more clearly.

A Road Improvement and Parking Plan for the access road dated October 20, 2004 has been prepared by Tunstall Engineering and incorporates the recommendations to address traffic and circulation related impacts. However, the plan does not install pavement to the end of the access road or have a turnaround for Fire. These items have been added as mitigation.

CONCLUSION:

Transportation Impact 15(a), (d), (e), (f) – Less than significant with mitigation.

Although the proposed project is for existing uses and is not expected to generate increased traffic, a number of impacts related to circulation, parking, traffic and design hazards have been identified because of changed circumstances and inadequate maintenance of the access road, detailed in the Traffic Study by Pinnacle Engineering. Mitigation, which includes road and parking improvements for the access road, traffic and safety improvements on Dolan Road, and performance securities to ensure completion and adequate maintenance, reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Transportation Impact 15(b), (c), (g) – No Impact.

The proposed uses are not expected to generate increased traffic and the Traffic Study by Pinnacle Engineering concluded that overall operations at the Dolan Road/Via Tanques intersection are "*within acceptable limits (LOS A) during all peak hour time periods.*" It also added that the Level of Service at the Highway 1/Dolan Road intersection will continue to be within acceptable limits and that the existing traffic from the project site has already been factored in. The project does not impact any air traffic patterns and does not impact alternative transportation.

MITIGATION & MONITORING

Mitigation Measure #8 (Access Road Improvements): In order to provide adequate emergency access and parking and to reduce design hazards, within six (6) months of permit approval the owners/applicants (Parcels A, B, C and D) shall obtain all necessary permits and complete the access road and parking improvements, consistent with the Road Improvement Plans prepared by Tunstall Engineering printed October 20, 2004 for Dolan Industrial Park, or as otherwise revised and approved by Monterey County. In addition, improvements shall include paving the access road to the end of Parcel A and creating a turnaround to the satisfaction of the

North County Fire District. The final improvement plans shall be subject to the approval of the North County Fire District and the County of Monterey. The owners/applicants shall maintain the access road in a clean, safe and usable condition and shall immediately repair any defects, hazards, or significant deterioration, upon being apprised. Each owner shall provide the County of Monterey with any necessary financial guarantees to be determined by the Director of Planning and Building Inspection to ensure completion of the work and on-going maintenance. Failure by any one owner to participate or pay does not absolve the other owners from the requirement to comply.

Monitoring Action #8A: Within two (2) months of permit approval each owner/applicant shall provide documentation in the form of a signed agreement with the County to complete the required improvements and an agreement among the property owners, such as a construction and maintenance agreement or reimbursement agreement, for each to contribute their fair share towards the improvements and the ongoing maintenance costs for the access road to the Director of Public Works and Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval.

Monitoring Action #8B: Within two (2) months of permit approval, each owner shall provide a performance-security to meet their estimated fair-share cost for construction of the access road and parking improvements, and on-going maintenance to the Director of Public Works and Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval. The submittal of the security shall be accompanied by an engineer's estimate of the cost of the improvements which shall be approved by the Director of Public Works and the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. The amounts to be determined by the Directors shall be 100% of the estimated cost for Faithful Performance and 50% of the estimated cost for Labor and Material. The owner may offer to provide this security entirely through an irrevocable letter of credit or by a combination of an irrevocable letter of credit and bonds. If an owner chooses to offer bonds to meet a portion of this requirement, they must provide at least fifty percent (50%) of the required security in the form of an irrevocable letter of credit and the balance by bonds.

Monitoring Action #8C: Within 6 months of permit approval, the applicants shall submit documentation to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval that the improvements have been completed consistent with the approved road improvement plans.

Monitoring Action #8D: Annually for the life of the permit, the applicants shall submit documentation to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval that a qualified engineer has inspected the access road and parking areas and that any necessary repairs, maintenance and/or additional improvements have been completed.

Mitigation Measure #9 (Traffic Improvements): In order to minimize traffic conflicts, reduce congestion, and improve traffic safety, the owners/applicants (Parcel A, B, C and D) shall complete the following improvements:

- Construct a left-turn channelization on eastbound Dolan Road at the intersection of Dolan Road and Via Tanques and obtain the necessary encroachment permits.
- Improve the sight distance on Via Tanques Road looking east on Dolan Road to a minimum of 660 feet by trimming the vegetation and maintaining the sight distance and obtain the necessary encroachment permits.

- Request the Department of Public Works to install an "Intersection Ahead" sign in the westbound direction on Dolan Road in advance of Via Tanques and reimburse the County of Monterey for installation costs.

Each owner shall provide the County of Monterey any necessary financial guarantees to ensure completion of the work. Failure by any one owner to participate or pay does not absolve the other owners from the requirement to complete the work.

Monitoring Action #9A: Within two (2) months of permit approval, each owner shall provide a performance security to meet the estimated fair-share cost for the left turn channelization construction and other improvements to the Director of Public Works and Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval. The submittal of the security shall be accompanied by an engineer's estimate of the cost of the improvements which shall be approved by the Director of Public Works and the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. The amounts to be determined by the Directors shall be 100% of the estimated cost for Faithful Performance and 50% of the estimated cost for Labor and Material. The owner may offer to provide this security entirely through an irrevocable letter of credit or by a combination of an irrevocable letter of credit and bonds. If an owner chooses to offer bonds to meet a portion of this requirement, they must provide at least fifty percent (50%) of the required security in the form of an irrevocable letter of credit and the balance by bonds.

Monitoring Action #9B: Within two (2) months of permit approval, the applicants shall:

- Submit to the Director of Public Works for review and approval engineered plans for the left turn channelization.
- Request the Department of Public Works to install the "Intersection Ahead" sign and reimburse the County for installation costs.
- Obtain any necessary encroachment permits from the Department of Public Works for the tree and vegetation trimming or obtain an agreement from the Department of Public Works to conduct the trimming.
- Each applicant shall also provide documentation in the form of a signed agreement with the County to complete the required improvements and an agreement among the property owners, such as a construction and maintenance agreement or reimbursement agreement, to construct the traffic improvements and for each to contribute their fair share towards the improvements to the Director of Public Works and Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval.

Monitoring Action #9C: Within 6 months of permit approval, the applicants shall submit documentation to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review and approval that the required improvements have been completed.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Source: 1,8,15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source: 1,2,3,13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

The proposed project includes installation of two separate domestic water systems to serve the dismantling yards along with the fire suppression system. New wells have been drilled to serve the water systems. Water quality and quantity tests conducted for the wells have proven adequate. Septic systems are also proposed for each of the dismantling yards. Existing septic systems are located on Parcel A, Parcel B, Parcel C, and Yard #5 of Parcel D. New systems will be installed on Yards #1, #2, #3, #4, and #6. Grading is minimal and all facilities are located in already disturbed areas within the dismantling yards and roadway. Proposed water and septic systems have been reviewed by and will continue to be regulated by the Monterey County Division of Environmental Health. Proposed dismantling facilities on Yard #2 and Yard #6 will be incorporated into the overall stormwater management system and may result in minor improvements to the site.

CONCLUSION

Utilities Impact 1(a), (b), (c), (d) – Less than significant impact.

Proposed septic systems and water systems will be regulated by the Monterey County Division of Environmental Health for compliance with health regulations. The systems require minimal grading and are located in already disturbed areas. Adequate water is available and an overall stormwater management system is already in place. Any improvements or expansion for proposed facilities on Yard #2 and Yard #6 are minor. The projects will therefore have a less than significant impact.

Utilities Impact 1(e), (f), (g) – No Impact.

The proposed projects have no adverse impact on wastewater treatment facilities, landfill capacity, or solid waste regulations. The projects will remain in compliance with applicable laws and regulations and benefits local landfills by diverting potential waste.

VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

NOTE: If there are significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated and no feasible project alternatives are available, then complete the mandatory findings of significance and attach to this initial study as an appendix. This is the first step for starting the environmental impact report (EIR) process.

Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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: 1,2,3,5,12,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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) (Source: 1,2,3,5,10,12,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Source: 1,2,3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion/Conclusion: Less than significant impact.

The proposed projects consist of vehicle dismantling activities which occur on properties located adjacent to sensitive habitat in the Elkhorn Slough area. Vehicles contain pollutants and hazardous materials that are potentially released during dismantling operations with potential

cumulative impacts to the environment. The subject dismantling facilities are regulated and inspected by the Monterey County Division of Environmental Health and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for compliance with local and state laws. The sites include canopies and containment features to prevent potential contamination and minimize the risk. In addition, an overall stormwater management plan has been implemented and further minimizes potential impacts. Any existing or expanded activities would remain consistent with these requirements and operations and have a less than significant impact.

VIII. FISH AND GAME ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FEES

Assessment of Fee:

For purposes of implementing Section 735.5 of Title 14, California Code of Regulations: If based on the record as a whole, the Planner determines that implementation of the project described herein, will result in changes to resources A-G listed below, then a **Fish and Game Document Filing Fee** must be assessed. Based upon analysis using the criteria A-G, and information contained in the record, state conclusions with evidence below.

- A) Riparian land, rivers, streams, water courses, and wetlands under state and federal jurisdiction.
- B) Native and non-native plant life and the soil required to sustain habitat for fish and wildlife;
- C) Rare and unique plant life and ecological communities dependent on plant life, and;
- D) Listed threatened and endangered plant and animals and the habitat in which they are believed to reside.
- E) All species of plant or animals listed as protected or identified for special management in the Fish and Game Code, the Public Resources Code, and the Water Code, or regulations adopted thereunder.
- F) All marine terrestrial species subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Fish and Game and the ecological communities in which they reside.
- G) All air and water resources the degradation of which will individually or cumulatively result in the loss of biological diversity among plants and animals residing in air or water.

De minimis Fee Exemption: For purposes of implementing Section 735.5 of the California Code of Regulations: A *De Minimis Exemption* may be granted to the **Environmental Document Fee** if there is substantial evidence, based on the record as a whole, that there **will not** be changes to the above named resources V. A-G caused by implementation of the project. Using the above criteria, state conclusions with evidence below, and follow Planning and Building Inceptions Department Procedures for filing a de minimis exemption.

Conclusion: The projects **will** be required to pay the fee.

Evidence: Each project includes soil disturbance and industrial activities with runoff adjacent to wetlands and waterways that result in changes resources and natural habitat.

IX. REFERENCES

1. Project Application and Plans for PLN030498, PLN030501, PLN030504, PLN030510.
2. Monterey County. North County Land Use Plan, Local Coastal Program.
3. Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan, Part 2.
4. Monterey County Zoning Ordinance, Title 20.
5. Linda Weiland. April 3, 1995. Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Dolan Development Partners. Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection File Nos. PC94196, PC94195, PC94210, PC94223.
6. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. May 2001. 2000 *Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region*.
7. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. June 2004. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*.
8. Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin.
9. Archaeological Consulting. September 15, 1994. *Preliminary Cultural Reconnaissance Survey*.
10. Pinnacle Engineering. January 21, 2004. *Dolan Industrial Park (516 Dolan Road) Trip Generation Report*.
11. Engineering Consulting Services. April 11, 1993. *Dolan Industrial Park Traffic Study*.
12. Jud Vandever. February 26, 2004 letter regarding Dolan Development Partners, LTD. Project Plan. April 17, 2004 letter regarding Dolan Development Partners, LTD. Project Plan, Road Improvement. March 12, 2004 letter regarding Tunstall Engineering, Storm water, Pick-n-Pull Yards B&C. March 24, 2004 letter regarding Biological Concerns for Auto Dismantling Parcel A.
13. Kenneth Tunstall. March 15, 2004 letter regarding Field Review of Drainage System for Parcel B. March 17, 2004 letter regarding Field Review of Drainage System for Parcel C. March 23, 2004 letter regarding Field Review of Drainage System for Parcel D. March 24, 2004 letter regarding Field Review of Drainage System for Parcel A.
14. Site Visits by Project Planner on April 19, 2004, April 30, 2004, June 1, 2004.
15. Donnette Dunaway, Regional Water Quality Control Board. Personal Communication. July 8, 2004.

X. ATTACHMENTS

1. Project Plans PLN030498 (Parcel B/Pick-n-Pull)
2. Project Plans PLN030501 (Parcel C/Cutler)
3. Project Plans PLN030504 (Parcel D/Dolan Development Partners)
4. Project Plans PLN030510 (Parcel A/S&S Land Development)
5. Vicinity Map

**Addendum Pursuant to
the California Environmental Quality Act
Article 11, Section 15164**

**S&S Land Development Co/Pick-N-Pull Auto/Gerald & Deborah Cutler
Planning File No. PLN140713/PLN140677/PLN140714
*Coastal Development Permits***

1. Introduction

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was adopted for three Permits which allowed the ongoing use of auto wrecking yards and auto part sales at neighboring parcels located at 516 A, 516 B & 516 C Dolan Road, Moss Landing. The MND was circulated from June 6, 2005 to July 5, 2005. These Permits are presently being considered for 10-year extensions pursuant to the following current applications:

- Project# PLN140713 "S&S Land Development" - Parcel A - Assessor's Parcel Number 131-054-001-000 - Renewal of 2005 Permit PLN030510
- Project# PLN140677 "Pick-n-Pull Auto" - Parcel B - Assessor's Parcel Number 131-054-002-000 - Renewal of 2005 Permit PLN030498
- Project# PLN140714 "Gerard & Deborah Cutler" - Parcel C - Assessor's Parcel Number 131-054-003-000 - Renewal of 2005 Permit PLN030501

The 2005 entitlements were approved as Combined Development Permits which included Coastal Development Permits (for auto wrecking yards and auto part sales) as well as General Development Plans which also permitted infrastructure improvements at that time including water system connections and improvements, drainage improvements and a 212,000 gallon water tank. The infrastructure improvements have been subsequently implemented and the Extensions currently under consideration are only to allow ongoing vehicle dismantling and parts sales as were approved by the Coastal Development Permits in 2005. These Extensions would not allow for any new development, improvements or expansion of the previously-permitted uses.

This technical addendum has been prepared pursuant to Article 11, Section 15164 of the California Environmental Quality Act guidelines to make minor technical changes to the project analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, certified September 14, 2005, by the Monterey County Planning Commission, Resolution Nos. 05050, 05048 and 05049. None of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

2. Scope and Purpose of this Addendum

occurred, that there are no new significant environmental effects or increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects per Section 15162(a)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, and there is no new information of substantial importance that was not known at the time the previous MND/IS was adopted, per Section 15162(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Documents reviewed included the MND/IS prepared and adopted for PLN030510/PLN030498/PLN030501, and associated technical reports, plans, site visits, and applications submitted for the Permit Extensions. Based upon this review, it has been determined that the project will not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, will have no significant impact on long-term environmental goals, will have no significant cumulative effect upon the environment, and will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

Attachment: Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study for
PLN030510/PLN030498/PLN030501, certified September 14, 2005

Staff considers the 2005 Mitigated Negative Declaration to be of continued adequacy and relevance for the Extensions as proposed as the uses analyzed within the document will continue to be of the same type with no increase in intensity of use and no additional development proposed.

Issues that were analyzed in the 2005 Mitigated Negative Declaration include: aesthetics, agriculture and forest resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utility/service systems.

This addendum to the 2005 Mitigated Negative Declaration has been drafted in order to specifically address potential impacts resulting from greenhouse gas emissions, which were not commonly addressed in environmental review documents in 2005.

The Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is the state-wide, comprehensive planning agency that is responsible for making policy recommendations and coordinating land use planning efforts. The OPR also coordinates the state-level review of environmental documents pursuant to the CEQA. Currently, the OPR's stance on greenhouse gases (GHG) significance thresholds has been to allow each lead agency to determine their own level of significance. At this time, the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) has not finalized specific GHG thresholds of significance. However, construction-related air quality impact thresholds are addressed in the MBUAPCD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The short-term impacts of the proposed project are well under said threshold. On October 24, 2008, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) released their interim CEQA significance thresholds for GHG impacts dictating that a project would be considered less than significant if it meets minimum performance standards during construction and if the project, with mitigation, would emit no more than approximately 7,000 million metric tons of carbon dioxide per year during operation. This project's impact is well below this CARB threshold. There are presently no County-based thresholds for GHG emissions.

The only source of criteria air pollutant and GHG emissions for the proposed project would stem from the vehicles which travel to and from the site. The diesel motor which powered the on-site vehicle crusher was replaced several years ago by a 50 horse-power electric motor, effectively eliminating the primary on-site source of GHG emissions. Pollutant emissions resulting from heavy equipment use for construction will not result from the Extensions under consideration as no new construction will be permitted under the entitlements.

3. Conclusion

It has been determined that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent Initial Study or EIR have