

November 1, 2016

Ryan Bane, Senior Planner
City of Santa Cruz Planning and Community Development Department
809 Center Street, Rm. 206
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: 1930 Ocean Street Extension, APNs 008-004-02, and -01

Scoping Comments for the Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Bane:

The Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association (OSENSA) thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) scope of work for the 1930 Ocean Street Extension (OSE) project. OSENSA is a neighborhood association of over 50 residents of Ocean Street Extension. OSENSA objects to any amendment to the General Plan designation and/or the rezoning of parcels to increase density on this rural street straddling the City/County border. Such a decision is inconsistent with the City's General Plan, Municipal Code, and flies in the face of basic land use principles. OSENSA will continue to vigorously oppose any re-designations/rezoning of this parcel absent major infrastructure improvements and environmental mitigation efforts and will seek support from all City residents opposing the City Planning Department's proposed move to increased density in City neighborhoods without considering the environmental impact, ensuring adequate infrastructure improvement and maintaining consistency with current land use planning established in the 2030 General Plan.

This project proposes the development of 40 condominium units and requires a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Tentative Condominium Plan, Design Permit, and Planned Development (PD).

In your Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report dated October 7, 2016, you indicate that six topics will be addressed in the EIR: air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, traffic, and public utilities—water supply. Below we have provided scoping comments first on these topics and then, in the following section, we have provided comments on the additional topics that we believe must be addressed to fully vet the potential

significant environmental impacts of this project. Those topics are: aesthetics; agriculture and forest resources; biological resources; and hazards and hazardous materials and cultural significance.

I. Proposed Topics to be Covered in the EIR

A. Air Quality and Greenhouse House Gas Emissions (GHG)

OSENA agrees that a thorough analysis of both short-term (i.e. construction) and long-term air quality and greenhouse gas emissions must be provided. Included in this analysis, must be the adjacency of crematorium emissions, including particulate emissions (e.g., ash) as well as arsenic, hexavalent chromium (VI), polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxan and dibenzofuran (PCDD/F) emissions (some of which are potentially bio-accumulating). The North Central Coast Air Basin is in "non-attainment" status because it exceeds air quality standards for ozone and inhaled particulate matter. The City's General Plan notes that the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District and local agencies are concerned with reducing the emission of CFCs and greenhouse gasses. The General Plan has a goal to achieve clean air (Goal HZ2), including an objective to meet air quality standards for the region. How will this car-based development comply with these objectives and policies? With tandem parking and the current usage of available parking by existing usage especially including cemetery memorial services, how will the additional driving due to the constant moving of cars be accounted for?

With respect to emissions from the crematory: While the scope of the EIR indicates that the air contaminant issues related to the operation of the adjacent crematory needs to be evaluated, the crematory's current location adjacent to the proposed residential development has to be considered. There is an existing entitlement to re-locate the crematory to the west side of OSE, which has not yet been exercised. Given this, the conditions that exist at the time the EIR is performed are those that are relevant since the City has no authority to require the crematory to move. Moreover, the issues related to mercury emissions have not been resolved. There is no proof that any changes have been implemented in cremation procedures with the crematory in its present location, nor are there sufficient safeguards in place presently to protect the future residents from all toxic emissions and particulate matter. Any EIR must evaluate the environmental and public health impact of all emissions from the crematory retorts. In addition to the cremations, the retorts periodically emit substantial black smoke particulate matter for a period of time, the health effect of which needs thorough analysis in the EIR and comment by the MBAPCD. (See photos)

B. Geology and Soils

(a-i-iv) The initial study fails to note a serious hazard, one that OSENA has pointed out previously, which must be addressed in the EIR. Namely, three known landslides have occurred on the western flank of Graham Hill Road (1999, 2001, and 2016). Given the project's close proximity to Graham Hill Road, the variance included in the project to allow residences to be located within 10 feet of a 30 percent slope, and the fact that the increase in density will put even more people in harm's way, a geology report must be prepared to fully evaluate this potential hazard. General Plan policy HZ6.2 (Discourage development on unstable slopes) and supporting policy HZ6.2.1 (Require engineering geology reports when... excavation and grading have the potential for exposure to slope instability or the potential to create unstable slope or soils conditions) support the requirement to provide a geology report.

Analysis should be given to the project's compliance with Municipal Code 24.14.030 (Slope Regulations) and, in particular, subsection 1.h. which states, "No new lot shall be created which will require the house to be sited within twenty feet of a thirty percent slope." Given that a Tentative Condominium Plan (i.e. a subdivision map creating new lots) is included in the project, how can this project comply with this requirement? Notwithstanding this issue, do the eastern most buildings in the subject development meet the minimum ten-foot slope setback required by Code Section 24.14.030(1)(g)?

A neighbor in Tanner Heights indicated at the scoping meeting held on October 26, 2016 that the Graham Hill roadbed in this location contains a substantial amount of fill. If true, this fill is not retained and could exacerbate the landslide/mudflow issue noted above. The EIR and geology report should evaluate the accuracy of this account and address the issue as needed.

The geology report should also evaluate the liquefaction potential of the southern third of the project site as identified in the geotechnical report (per the initial study).

Has the stability of the ephemeral stream/gully located on the northern parcel been evaluated? Currently, slope stability appears to be provided by chunks of cement. Will this be remediated and retained with engineered retaining walls, as needed?

(b, d) A surveyed slope map should be provided in order to clearly establish the project site's topography. In particular, a slope map will inform the discussion regarding erosion potential. Santa Margarita sandstone is highly erodible and that erosion potential is amplified when slopes are present. The EIR should evaluate the potential impacts of erosion downstream from this project, including impacts on the existing stormwater management system and the impacts to the San Lorenzo River, which supports steelhead and Coho salmon. Site runoff must be evaluated to ensure that it does not cause erosion. A grading and erosion control plan must be evaluated to determine whether or not grading volumes have been minimized and how erosion will be controlled both during construction and throughout the life of the project.

C. Hydrology and Water Quality

(b) The parcel appears to be mapped as Groundwater Recharge. Municipal Code 24.14.090 (Groundwater Recharge Areas) states, "Development within groundwater recharge areas...shall be planned to minimize adverse environmental impacts. Structures and other impervious surfaces in the R-1, R-L and R-M zoning districts shall not cover more than 55 percent of the project site." Does the project comply with this Code section intended to protect groundwater recharge areas?

Further, EQ Element Policy 2.3.2 states, "Within undeveloped groundwater recharge areas, new parcel divisions shall be limited to one unit per 10 acres and new uses that would pollute the groundwater shall be prohibited" (source Appendix G City of Santa Cruz General Plan / Local Coastal Plan Policies that Relate to City Creeks and Wetlands).

(d, e) The project proposes to add a substantial amount of impervious area to a now vacant site. The runoff generated by the project will increase substantially. Crossing Street neighbors have stated and all longtime OSENA members have observed that, even in moderate rainfall during saturated conditions, the stormwater system becomes overwhelmed and flooding occurs. (See photos) To reduce the risk and severity of the project's runoff causing downstream flooding, careful analysis of the stormwater management plan must occur to ensure that the project complies with both local and State standards. Quantitative analysis of, at a minimum, the two and ten year storms, with analysis of the downstream path (both its capacity and condition) and provision of safe overflow must be provided. Given the increased severity of storm events predicted with climate change, it is reasonable to consider 50 year storm. The quantitative analysis must account for any "run-on" the site receives, but in particular, run-on from Graham Hill Road. Moreover, the repeated

failures of the Graham Hill Road stormwater runoff system that have resulted in landslides on the western flank of Graham Hill Road need to be evaluated to determine what impact this flawed system will have on the proposed development, given its proximity to the 30% slope and road. Additionally, the grade of the access driveway to the project on Ocean Street Extension will potentially increase the concentration of runoff into the street creating a driving safety hazard that needs to be analyzed and mitigated.

On-site retention must use actual site conditions to evaluate the infiltration rate and the site's ability to retain stormwater. Given the noted soil variability found in the borings, additional borings are likely needed to provide an overall understanding of the site's infiltration rate and its ability to retain stormwater. The perched groundwater found at three feet must be considered and the wet area that precluded geotechnical field exploration must be evaluated.

(f) Given the steep slopes, erosion potential of the underlying soils of the site, and the proposed construction of 40 new residences, water quality impacts warrant careful consideration. In addition to construction impacts, new residents may improperly dispose of household waste, cleaners and other household products, and animal waste. Disturbance of the subject parcel's soils may mobilize likely contaminants from the crematorium such as mercury, arsenic, hexavalent chromium (VI), and/or polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxin and dibenzofuran (PCDD/F). The addition of 96 parking spaces for cars and their attendant oil/gas/antifreeze and other petrochemicals also raises concerns about water quality throughout the life of this project. This issue is particularly significant given the site's proximity to the San Lorenzo River and the fact the City of Santa Cruz Water District's water intake is located where runoff from the project will outlet. Given the significance of the project's location, the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) should be provided for evaluation to ensure compliance with the Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin (Central Coast Regional Water Control Board). Given the large size of the project, does the project comply with both the impact to resources as well as flood control regulations?

Has a Phase 2 Environmental Assessment been completed to evaluate whether or not there are in fact contaminants from the crematory operations present in the soil that could become mobilized through project grading or expose construction workers and residents to contamination?

D. Traffic

Traffic is a serious issue for this project. (See Photos) The traffic study must consider/evaluate the following (a-f):

1. The background traffic data used for the project must be updated to include current trip counts and recent development, including the currently under construction 11-unit residential development and memory care facility on Jewell Street. Traffic counts must account for seasonal differences. For example, the previous analysis used traffic counts from a single winter day (March 9, 2007). Warm weather traffic counts are likely to be significantly higher given the increase in traffic from tourists/visitors. Additionally, traffic has substantially increased on Graham Hill Road since the adoption of the traffic flow app WAZE and any study needs to take into consideration peak traffic during both commute times and warm weather weekend traffic.
2. The project's impact on the Highway 1 and 17 on-ramps/off-ramps must be evaluated. In particular, the northbound on-ramp to Highway 1 requires careful analysis given that stacking during peak times can result in gridlock at the Highway 17/Ocean Street intersection and creates unsafe conditions for bikers when drivers enter the bike lane to pass cars waiting to turn.
3. In addition to PM peak analysis, the traffic study must include AM analysis. Entering Graham Hill Road from OSE during peak morning traffic is already difficult and can require long waits for breaks in the Graham Hill traffic. Graham Hill is the major route for San Lorenzo Valley traffic entering Santa Cruz. AM peak usage appears to be more concentrated than PM peak usage.
4. Intersection function and safety must be evaluated, including:
 - a. Graham Hill (GH) traffic speeds must use actual speeds, not posted speeds.
 - b. The effect the lengthening of the left hand turn pocket on Graham Hill Road both on northbound traffic (is there room for a longer turn pocket?) and how that will affect the geometry of the road alignment for southbound traffic, including impacts to bicycle traffic (drivers regularly enter the shoulder to get around cars waiting to turn left onto OSE). How will bicyclists navigate this tricky left hand turn onto OSE which requires them to cross the northbound GH traffic to reach the relative safety of the turn pocket? What is the risk of being rear-

ended for drivers waiting in the left turn pocket?

- c. Analysis of the breaking distances required for southbound GH drivers entering OSE must be provided as well as analysis of sight distance for those drivers turning right onto OSE. The topography in this location makes it impossible for drivers to see southbound vehicles on OSE. The acute angle of the turn, requires driver to cross into oncoming southbound OSE traffic to complete the turn onto OSE. Will the project's additional trips exacerbate this dangerous situation?
 - d. Traffic accident data for the intersection since 2000 should be considered as there is significant accident history there. The cemetery sidewalk at the intersection of OSE and GH has been breached frequently by vehicles unable to navigate the turn ending up in the cemetery. With the current traffic flow and design, there is a dangerous condition of public property creating substantial danger to pedestrians and cyclists at that curve. The impact of any proposed re-design of the intersection has to take this risk into consideration, including the excessive speed at which vehicles enter the intersection and veer into the bike path. Moreover, if the project design is based in any part on increasing alternative transportation such as walking, cycling or public transit then the risk to the increased pedestrian traffic/bike traffic through the narrow OSE exit lane onto GH adjacent to a utility switch box and onto the sidewalk site of these frequent accidents has to be evaluated and remedied. Should the public utility switch box be relocated to allow adequate space for the increase in pedestrian and cyclists through the intersection?
 - e. Removal/reduction of islands and the pine tree which afford a certain level of protection to southbound OSE drivers stopped at the stop sign, may increase the seriousness of any future accidents and any increased risk mitigated.
 - f. Increased light from the exterior and interior residences and vehicles at the development may impair driver's vision navigating the curved intersection of OSE and GH. The impact of additional light sources needs to be evaluated for traffic safety concerns.
5. This project proposes a 40-unit development on a rural road with no existing street improvements whatsoever. The lack of roadway infrastructure, in

light of the proposed development, including the increase in density, needs to be evaluated for increased public safety risks. As such, the EIR should provide analysis of the adequacy of the proposed OSE road section, which includes a sidewalk on the western side, parking, and two 10-foot wide traffic lanes within a 40-foot wide right-of-way. Does this road section comply with the City's road improvement standards for arterial roadways supporting this level of density? Does it comply with General Plan Policies CD4.2.3 and M3.2.9 which require undergrounding utilities when major road improvements or reconstruction is proposed and policy M3.3.1 (Enhance neighborhood livability through the design of road and transit improvements).

No provision for bikes has been made for bicyclists despite the City's General Plan having numerous policies supporting the provision and enhancement of bicycle usage and infrastructure (e.g. General Plan Policies M1.4.1 Assure that...street design will support pedestrian and bike improvements... and M2.3.1 Design for and accommodate multiple transportation modes; M2.3.3 Incorporate pedestrian, bicycle...in the design of...road projects; M4.2.3 Facilitate bicycling connections to all travel modes; and M4.3.1 Promote development of bike lanes on arterial and collector streets....).

Will 10-foot traffic lanes accommodate two-way traffic (and bicyclists) when farm vehicles, propane trucks, overflow parking from memorial services, and casket delivery trucks are present? With the SC Memorial Park, a public facility that has frequent large crowds and commercial deliveries, there should be analysis of road safety and improvements during the peak usages of both parcels fronting OSE.

Has the new road section accounted for the location of a PGE gas main which is located in the vicinity? Can grading and construction of the road improvements be done without affecting this now dated and fragile main? Has P.G.& E. provided comments on this project relative to the feasibility of construction near the gas main?

6. Parking demand: The parking that is proposed to be formalized on the western side of OSE is already in heavy use by Santa Cruz Memorial during large services, bikers and runners who stage their activities there, utility and construction workers who stop there for lunch, and others. In addition, OSENA is concerned about the tandem parking exception's effect on this on-street parking area. Tandem parking is impractical for day-to-day use which

may result in residents parking on OSE, potentially resulting in parking issues and the overcrowding of narrow roadways around the development, including Crossing St. As OSE slopes down after passing the project the roadway narrows and these existing conditions creates an impaired line of sight for vehicles and a danger currently exists for the lack of road width for passing cars or bikes/pedestrians. How will the project parking and roadway improvements create or mitigate these existing issues?

7. Current trips include those generated by the approximately 49 residences on OSE and an unknown number of Paradise Park residents. The trips generated by the project will add substantially to the overall trip total. Consider whether or not the traffic report accurately calculates the project trip generation relative to the project floor plans, absence of alternative transportation, and likely demographics of future residents of the project? Does the trip generation account for the frequent closures of Highway 9 resulting in the only exit from the 400 residences in the Paradise Park neighborhood to be through OSE?
8. Emergency Access for the project specifically, and the neighborhood generally, must be evaluated. Does the project's proposed driveway conform to the fire department's slope requirements? If not, how will fire protection be provided? Given the site's slopes, its adjacency to a heavily wooded area, its location in a wildland fire hazard area, and the fact that the development itself would become fuel for a wildfire, adequate fire suppression and firefighting equipment access is essential.

OSE is a dead end street and is the only ingress/egress available to residents and could effectively become a choke point. There is no secondary access. When Highway 9 is blocked by construction, slides, or fallen trees, the residences of over 400 homes in the Paradise Park neighborhood must use OSE. Graham Hill Road is an arterial roadway providing emergency access to and from the San Lorenzo Valley. How will additional traffic generated by the project and the redesign of the intersection affect safe egress/ingress?

In the event of a catastrophe such as a wildfire in this high risk area, can OSE accommodate both emergency responders heading north on OSE in response to the emergency and residents of both OSE and Paradise Park fleeing south? How would the project improvements and traffic exacerbate this situation? Will the project comply with M3.2.3 (Ensure that street widths are adequate to safely serve emergency vehicles and freight trucks) and HZ1.2.5 (Continue

to ensure that new development design and circulation allow for adequate emergency access)? Has the County Office of Emergency Services reviewed this project for consistency with the 2015-2020 County Hazard Mitigation Plan? CalFire protects County residents on OSE; was the project routed for their comments?

9. How does the project comply with the General Plan, which calls for trip reductions, since it is not located along a city transit or commercial corridor and there is no apparent way in which the project has attempted to reduce vehicle trips? (LU4.1 Encourage a transition to higher densities along the city's transit and commercial corridors; and M31.1 Seek ways to reduce vehicle trip demand and reduce the number of peak hour vehicle trips.) Did not the City determine that higher density was to occur on major transit arteries with established roadway infrastructure and transit improvements as proposed by the Corridor Plan which does not include this parcel? What is the effect of proposing to allow infill density of this parcel outside the public process and design of the Corridor Planning Process?

E. Public Utilities—Water Supply

OSENA agrees that the project water demand should be evaluated relative to the recently updated water plans, demand projections, and water supply considerations. Conformance with General Plan Goal LU1.2 is required and the cumulative effects of recent and reasonably foreseeable development should be evaluated, particularly since the General Plan amendment and rezoning of the parcel were not contemplated at the time of the General Plan and water plans' adoption.

F. Land Use

(b) The project proposes to amend this 2.74 acre parcel's General Plan designation from Low Density Residential (L) to Low Medium Density Residential (LM) and rezone the parcel from single-family residential, with about 11 possible new lots, to multiple-residence – low density which would allow the proposed 40-unit development. This is almost a quadrupling in density at the urban edge where densities and intensity of use typically decrease as development approaches the City/County boundary. Ocean Street Extension is informal in character and charm, with no sidewalks or other formalized road improvements serving this, essentially, rural area. The proposed development is at odds with the existing pattern and character of development, and this topic warrants careful consideration in the EIR.

Related to this is the fact that Graham Hill Road provides a natural physical divide between multi-family and single-family zoning (the east side of OSE at GH is zoned single-family up to and including the subject property). This project effectively leapfrogs multi-family zoning over the R-1-10 single-family zone district. This conflicts with the existing pattern of development, puts development pressure on the agricultural lands located further north within the County's jurisdiction, and appears to be "spot zoning."

The City's General Plan has multiple policies supporting the goal of "Complete Neighborhoods" (e.g. policy LU4.2 Encourage land use changes that reduce the need for autos....). The intent of these policies is to protect the environment by reducing overall vehicle trips through developing residential uses where a variety of uses are present. Unlike along transit corridors within the City, the parcel is located at the City/County boundary where there are no schools, parks, grocery stores, libraries, medical offices or other shopping opportunities. The project appears to be a car-based development since there are no nearby bus stops and the proposed OSE road section has not accounted for bicycle traffic. Given this, the project should be evaluated for conformance with the General Plan policies written in support of the "Complete Neighborhoods" vision. What efforts has the applicant made to reduce the number of trips generated by the development (M31.1 Seek ways to reduce vehicle trip demand and reduce the number of peak hour vehicle trips.)?

The existing General Plan 2030, which was recently adopted, is an integrated document in which existing and anticipated development are considered relative to the various General Plan elements. When General Plan re-designations occur outside of the adoption of the General Plan, no comprehensive analysis or plan is made to account for infrastructure shortfalls or other consequences of the unanticipated development. Currently, analysis of the project's impacts extends only to nearby intersections with no regional evaluation of, for example, traffic impacts. Given this, what is the cumulative effect of amendments such as the one proposed for the subject parcel?

Does the proposed project comply with the zone district site standards, including height, floor area ratio, lot coverage, stories, open space, and parking? Have all of the areas that are likely to be used as bedrooms, but not labeled as such, been accounted for in the calculation of parking, trip generation and water demand?

As noted previously, the proposed slope exception appears to be in conflict with Municipal Code 24.14.030(1)(h) which prohibits new lots (such as those being created by this land division) from being located within twenty feet of a thirty

percent slope. Even if this project removed the land division component (i.e. became an all rental project), the project does not appear to comply with the exceptions standards where a minimum ten-foot slope setback is required (Section 24.14.030(1)(g)). How will the project demonstrate compliance with these Code sections?

II. Additional topics that should be evaluated in the EIR

A. Aesthetics

(c) Graham Hill Road is a natural divide between the higher density development along Ocean and Jewell Streets and the lower density development along Ocean Street Extension. Currently, the OSE's zoning on the north side of GH is R-1-10 on the east side with the Santa Cruz Memorial property zoned Public Facility. The Santa Cruz Memorial property, a historic resource, has a rural/open feel because most of the property's 17.5 acres is devoted to graves. Continuing north, OSE dips down through a wooded area and, at Crossing Street, enters the County jurisdiction where the zoning changes to Residential Agriculture with a one-acre minimum on the east side of OSE and Commercial Agriculture on the west side. This reflects OSE's long history as the Italians Gardens agricultural area. Leap-frogging multi-family zoning over the existing single-family zoning to create an island of multi-family zoning would be grossly out of character with the area. Up-zoning the area to allow 40 units where about 11 units would have been possible, degrades the visual character as well as the quality of the site and its surroundings by introducing an incompatible development at the City/County boundary where, typically, the density and intensity of development decreases. This topic warrants careful consideration in the EIR.

Because of the parcel's slope, the proposed development will loom over OSE and Santa Cruz Memorial—the location of solemn memorial services and a designated historic property. This facility is used for long term public grieving and the paying of respect, such as when two SCPD officers laid in state for over a week in 2013. With the residential structures abutting this facility with little setback and building heights greater than 30 feet, the development will substantially interfere with the adjacent public use.

The mass and bulk of the project will only be amplified where there is no similar development in the vicinity. Because the project steps up the hill, the development will likely visually read as too massive and bulky for the site and context and block

the scenic view of the town and Pogonip from Graham Hill Road. The proposed architecture appears to have no relationship to surrounding historically significant architecture of the Memorial Park. To fully evaluate the impact of the development, photo-simulations should be provided from OSE at road grade and from Graham Hill, and the consistency of an increased density/ zoning change on the adjacent use as a Memorial Park should be evaluated.

One of the benefits of a Planned Development project is that clustering allows greater flexibility and creativity in the site plan. The project's site plan does not appear to have taken advantage of this flexibility as the main design principle seems to be maximization of units while minimizing open or recreational space. Will this project be compatible with the cemetery/memorial use across the street? How does this project comply with General Plan policy CD1.4.1 (Use planned development and other clustering techniques to protect resources and views and allow for siting that is sensitive to adjacent uses)?

(d) The proposed 40-unit development is anticipated to introduce a new source of substantial light which will adversely affect nighttime views in the area. Currently, this area has dark nighttime skies because of its location at the urban/rural edge. The City's General Plan recognizes light "spillage" as an issue in its Hazards, Safety, and Noise element and even has a goal (GOAL HZ5) for minimal light pollution. Supporting policy HZ5.1 states, "Reduce light pollution." Policy HZ5.1.3 further amplifies this goal with, "Consider appropriateness of lighting when reviewing proposed development..."(96). Quantitative analysis should be provided to evaluate the existing light conditions as compared to calculated light conditions.

B. Agricultural & Forest Resources

(e) The proposed increase in density at the City/County boundary would put pressure on the agricultural lands further north both on existing operations and in relationship to eventual pressure to convert those lands to housing. Farm trucks will be required to navigate the southern end of OSE with the formalized road improvements that leave little room for larger vehicles. Conflicts between project residents and farm-related traffic are likely. Although the County currently has strong policies protecting commercial agriculture, pressure from a creeping urban edge will inevitably increase with increasing densities. How is the proposed multi-family rezoning and increase in density resulting from the re-designation compatible with the existing agriculture uses nearby to the north? Additional analysis should be done to evaluate the potential impacts of the increased density at the urban edge. Has efforts been made to work with the County to ensure that lands

within the City's Planning Area are developed with appropriate uses as is required by General Plan policies LU1.2.2 and LU2.3.5?

C. Biological Resources

(a, f) The project is located within 900 feet of mapped Sandhills habitat which can support federally-protected species such as the Mount Hermon June Beetle. Did the Biology Report evaluate the potential for light emanating from the project to affect the June Beetle's mating habits in what is currently a dark, rural environment? Does the report note that a Habitat Conservation Program (HCP) was developed for the City's water treatment plant on Graham Hill Road to protect the June Beetle and associated species? The initial study indicates that surveys of the subject parcel were not done during flowering season. If that is case, how can the biologist be confident that no protected flowering species are present?

D. Hazards & Hazardous Materials

(g, h) According to the County Office of Emergency Services, Santa Cruz County ranks 9th among 413 western state counties for percentage of homes along the WUI and 14th in California for fire risk (Local Hazard Mitigation Plan 2015-2020). The project is located adjacent to a heavily wooded area and roughly across the river from the Pogonip, one of five areas targeted within the City as likely to have a wildland fire. With high winds, a wildland fire could easily cross the river and Highway 9. Is it prudent to increase densities in this high hazard area, exposing future residents to the risk and also providing additional fuel for future fires in the form of development itself? Has adequate analysis been given to the wildfire hazard risk associated with this parcel's location within the high hazard area? Will the project comply with the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan 2015-2020 which calls for appropriate road and secondary access improvement and creation program (C-8)? Has the project transportation engineer provided a wildfire or dam failure response analysis in a scenario where all of Paradise Park residents must exit the area using OSE? Careful consideration must be given to water supply for protecting this project, ingress/egress, and compliance with WUI policies. Secondary access should be provided.

E. Cultural Resources

This parcel is located in the historical Italian Gardens neighborhood of the City of Santa Cruz, which has been consistently farmed since the City's founding. Prior to that, this area was a gateway to the historical Powder Mill, and adjoining

community. Earlier than that it is possible that this parcel was occupied by Native Americans of the Ohlone tribe. As such there needs to be further analysis of the potential for archeological significance of the site, which may be adversely impacted by the significant grading and construction.

III. General Matters

A. Notice Concerns:

In addition to these scoping comments, OSENA questions whether there was adequate notice of this proposed EIR. According to one neighborhood resident, there was a standard sheet of paper posted for one day at the site on October 14, 2016, which disappeared in the rainstorm of that weekend. If City code requires public notice longer than one day, notice should be provided. Similarly, all residents within 300 feet of the project did not receive notice of the development. Additionally, the supporting documentation was not made available on the City's website until a few days prior to the comment period. This in no way is transparent government and should require extension of the comment period and Notice reposting. .

B. Supporting Documentation

OSENA hereby incorporates by this reference all documents and reports that were submitted to the City Planning Department on behalf of OSENA during the initial processing of the proposed development of this parcel in 2010, and also all documents related to the emissions and operation of the crematory in the permit application proceeding to the Santa Cruz Memorial Park crematory relocation. If the City requires re-submission of these documents that are already in your files, please inform OSENA.

IV. Conclusion

Clearly, a substantial amount of additional analysis and professional opinion and study is required to fully vet the potential environmental impacts of this project. OSENA thanks you for this opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIR and looks forward to reviewing the Draft EIR and providing additional comments as needed. OSENA requests notification of all project developments, including the issuance of the Draft EIR, Final EIR and any public hearings.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ocean Street Extension Neighborhood Association,
over 50 residents of the Ocean Street Extension