2.0 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

IN THIS SECTION:

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the City of Santa Cruz (City), which is the lead agency for the project. This document, which includes responses to comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), together with the DEIR dated January 2014, constitutes the Final EIR (FEIR) for the project. For ease of reference, this document is referred to as the Final EIR.

This summary provides a brief description of the proposed project, known areas of controversy or concern, project alternatives, all potentially significant impacts identified during the course of this environmental analysis, and issues to be resolved. This summary is intended as an overview and should be used in conjunction with a thorough reading of the EIR. The text of this report, including figures, tables and appendices, serves as the basis for this summary.

Changes to Draft EIR impacts and/or mitigation measures are shown below in <u>underlined</u> type for new text and ~~strikeout~~ type for deleted text.

2.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addresses the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed La Bahia Hotel project. The proposed project consists of construction of a 165-room hotel after demolition of the existing 44-unit La Bahia apartment complex, except for a portion of the existing bell tower building. Hotel amenities include meeting and banquet space, a restaurant, retail space, a day spa, and a swimming pool. Access to the project will be provided by a check-in entrance on Beach Street, an entrance/exit on Westbrook Street, and an exit onto Main Street. A total of 210 parking spaces are provided, including 49 valet spaces, within a parking garage that is partially underground. A full description of all project components is provided in the PROJECT DESCRIPTION (3.0) of this EIR.

2.2 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY OR CONCERN

The City of Santa Cruz, as the Lead Agency, has identified areas of concern based on preparation of the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP), which are included in Appendices A and B, respectively. In response to the NOP, letters of comment were received from one public agency (FEMA) and two individuals, which are included, along with the NOP, in

Appendix B. An agency and public scoping also was held on September 9, 2013, to take public comments on the proper scope of the EIR's analyses and project alternatives.

Comments on the NOP and received at the scoping meeting raised the following concerns, some of which may be areas of controversy. No additional areas of controversy or concern were raised in the comment letters on the Draft EIR.

- Impacts of demolition on historic resources;
- Concerns about impacts to the visual character of the immediate area, including size, height, scale and mass;
- Traffic and parking impacts;
- Hotel access;
- Impacts on water supply;
- Use of a Planned Development (PD) Permit for the project;
- Potential construction in a floodplain;
- Consistency with the City's Climate Action Plan; and
- Inclusion of an alternative with building heights without a PD permit to allow additional height.

2.3 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe and evaluate a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the project that could attain most of the basic objectives of a proposed project while substantially lessening at least one significant effect of the proposed project. Consistent with these requirements, the following alternatives are evaluated in the CEQA CONSIDERATIONS section (5.0) of the Draft EIR

- No Project Alternative Required by CEQA
- Alternative 1 – Full Preservation of La Bahia
- Alternative 2 – Partial Preservation of La Bahia
- Alternative 3 – Reduced Project Size and Height

Table 5-3 in the CEQA CONSIDERATIONS (5.0) section of this EIR presents a comparison of project impacts between the proposed project and the alternatives. Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative, would eliminate the identified significant impacts, but would not attain any of the project objectives. Of the other alternatives, Alternatives 1 and 2 would eliminate significant unavoidable historical resource impacts associated with demolition, but none of the alternatives would reduce significant unavoidable traffic impacts to less than significant levels, although all alternatives would result in substantial reductions in traffic. Alternative 1 eliminates the significant historical resource impacts associated with potential damage to retained structures due to demolition of structures. None of the alternatives would eliminate other significant impacts, although the severity would decrease or increase for some impacts as shown on Table 5-3. Of the alternatives considered, Alternative 2 would best achieve project objectives. Of the

alternatives analyzed, Alternative 2 is also considered the environmentally superior alternative, as it would result in elimination of one significant impact and reduction in the severity of most other significant impacts.

2.4 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS & MITIGATION

All impacts identified in the subsequent environmental analyses are summarized in this section. This summary groups impacts of similar ranking together, beginning with significant unavoidable impacts, followed by significant impacts that can be mitigated, followed by impacts not found to be significant. The discussions in the Initial Study of impacts that are not being addressed in detail in the text of the Draft EIR are intended to satisfy the requirement of CEQA Guidelines section 15128 that an EIR "shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and therefore were not discussed in detail in the EIR." The Initial Study is included in Appendix A of this EIR.

SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

The following impacts were found to be potentially significant, and while mitigation measures have been identified, the impact cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Historical Resources

Impact 4.2-1: Impacts to an Historical Resource, La Bahia, Due to Demolition. The project will result in demolition of most of the existing structures making up the La Bahia Apartment complex, ~~structures,~~ which is considered an historical resource under CEQA due to its local listing and eligibility for listing in the California and National registers. Demolition will result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.1-1a and 4.1-1b below will provide documentation of the La Bahia complex and potential salvage of historical materials prior to demolition, but will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level given the extent of proposed demolition.

Alternatives 1 and 2 would eliminate significant unavoidable historical resource impacts associated with demolition.

4.2-1a – *Documentation*. Require the project applicant to document the La Bahia Apartments complex and its setting. This documentation shall include drawings, photographs, and an historical narrative as outlined below, and developed in consultation with the City of Santa Cruz Planning and Community Development Department. The documentation shall be submitted to the Planning Department and to ensure its public accessibility, the documentation will be filed with the Santa Cruz Public Library and Special Collections Library at the University of California Santa Cruz.

- *Drawings*: Existing historic drawings of the La Bahia Apartments, if available, shall be photographed with large-format negatives or shall be photographically reproduced on Mylar. In the absence of existing drawings, full-measured drawings of the complex's plan, exterior elevations, and courtyard elevations should be prepared.
- *Photographs*: Photo-documentation of the La Bahia Apartments shall be prepared to Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) standards for archival photography. HABS standards require large-format black-and-white photography, with the original negatives having a minimum size of 4"x5". Digital photography, roll film, film packs, and electronic manipulation of images are not acceptable. A minimum of 12 photographs must be taken, detailing the site, building exteriors, and building interiors. Photographs must be identified and labeled using HABS standards. Color 35mm non-archival photographs of the historical building and grounds shall be taken to supplement the limited number of archival photographs required under the HABS standards described above. Photographs should include: overall views of the site; individual views of important building features; exterior elevations of each façade of the complex; views of interior courtyard spaces; and detailed views of specific materials or elements.
- *Historical Overview*: In consultation with the City of Santa Cruz Planning and Community Development Department, a qualified historian or architectural historian shall assemble historical background information relevant to La Bahia Apartments and its setting. Much of this information may be drawn from the Historical Resources Technical Report prepared by Architectural Resources Group (2013) for the La Bahia Hotel project. To ensure its public accessibility, the agreed-upon documentation would be filed with the Santa Cruz Public Library for inclusion in their local history collection, as well as with other local libraries and historical societies, as appropriate.

4.2-1b –*Salvage.* Require project applicant to set up a procedure to offer ~~any~~ building features or elements from the La Bahia Apartments that are not used as part of the project or kept by the owner for reuse on the project site or in other locations. The procedure shall be designed and implemented in consultation with the City of Santa Cruz Planning and Community Development Department to provide public information regarding availability of building features or materials for reuse. The focus would be on identifying building features or elements that ~~are~~ (1) are related to the character-defining features identified in the Architectural Resources Group evaluations and (2) can safely and feasibly be removed from the building. Salvage opportunities shall be considered in the following order: (1) on-site reuse opportunities, (2) off-site reuse opportunities, and (3) public display opportunities. Allow demolition to proceed only after any significant historic features or materials have been identified and kept by the owner or offered for salvage, and their removal completed.

Transportation and Traffic

Impact 4.3-1: Circulation System Impacts. The project will result in an increase in daily and peak hour trips, but would not cause existing or planned intersections to operate at an

unacceptable Level of Service (LOS), and would not adversely affect non-auto modes of transportation. However, project trips would contribute to the existing ~~unacceptable~~ LOS of D at the Mission Street/Bay Street and E at the Highway 1/Highway 9 intersections, both of which are unacceptable levels of service according to Caltrans standards.

None of the project alternatives would reduce significant unavoidable traffic impacts, although a reduction in traffic would result with all alternatives.

Mitigation Measures

The identified improvements for the Highway 1/Highway 9-River Street and Bay Street/Mission Street intersections are required under existing conditions, and are planned to be improved through the City's Traffic Impact Program. The proposed project will be required to pay the City's Traffic Impact Fee, which will go toward funding the identified projects, and thus will mitigate the project's contribution to existing impacted intersections. However, until the improvements are implemented, both intersections will continue to operate at an unacceptable level of service. The Bay/Mission intersection would operate at an unacceptable in the near-term, but will operate at an acceptable level when the improvement is completed. However, even with improvements, the Highway 1/Highway 9-River Street intersection will continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS in the long-term.

Cumulative Impacts-Traffic

The project's incremental effects related to certain cumulative ~~certain~~ traffic impacts are cumulatively considerable. The proposed project will contribute to significant cumulative traffic impacts at five locations, all of which can be improved to an acceptable LOS except at three intersections: Highway 1/Highway 9-River Street, Bay Street/Mission Street (Route 1), and Ocean Street/Water Street. Improvements have been identified for these intersections in the City's Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program. The project will be required to pay the City's traffic impact fee, however, since the identified intersections would continue to operate at deficient levels of service even with the identified improvements, the project's contribution to the cumulative traffic impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

Additionally, the project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts along segments of state Highway 1. Highway 1 operations are projected to continue to remain at unacceptable levels, and funding constraints and controversy over proposed Highway 1 HOV lanes may delay or affect implementation of improvements under consideration by Caltrans for Highway 1. Thus, cumulative traffic increases along Highway 1 is a significant cumulative impact, and the proposed project's incremental contribution to the increases would be cumulatively considerable.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The following impacts were found to be potentially significant, but could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of identified mitigation measures should the City's decision-makers impose the measures on the project at the time of final action on the project.

Historical Resources

Impact 4.2-2: Impacts to Retained La Bahia Due to Construction Activities. The proposed demolition of much of the La Bahia Apartments complex, including removal of building foundations, could adversely affect the retained historical bell tower and building due to damage to the exterior of the retained building.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.2-2a and 4.2-2b below will reduce impacts to the retained La Bahia historical resource associated with the demolition and excavation to a less-than-significant level.

4.2-2a. Require installation of protective barriers to protect the bell tower and the north and east walls of the retained La Bahia apartments from potential damage caused by demolition activities. An historic preservation architect, meeting the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, Professional Qualifications Standards*, shall prepare designs and specifications for protective barriers required to protect the bell tower and the north and east walls of the retained La Bahia apartments. In removing the portions of the complex proposed for demolition, materials original to the portion of the complex that is remaining shall be retained in place wherever feasible.

4-2-2b. Require a pre-demolition review and inspection by a registered structural engineer with a minimum of five years of experience in the rehabilitation and restoration of historic buildings, to determine the existing relationship of the foundations of the various buildings of the La Bahia Apartments complex. Any required test excavations would be performed only in the presence of the structural engineer. The structural engineer would prepare a report of findings, recommendations and any related design modifications necessary to retain the structural integrity of the bell tower and southeastern apartment units and to ensure that construction of the other project components will not affect the foundation or structural integrity of the retained portion of the building.

In consultation with an historic preservation architect meeting the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, Professional Qualifications Standards* and the project geotechnical engineer, the structural engineer shall determine whether the soil excavations and construction of new foundations have the potential to result in settlement or damage to the retained building that would require underpinning and/or shoring. If underpinning and/or shoring is determined to be necessary, appropriate designs shall be implemented upon approval from the City of Santa Cruz Planning and Community Development Department.

Impact 4.2-3: Rehabilitation of Retained Bell Tower & Building. The proposed project could result in a substantial adverse change in an historical resource due to alteration of the La Bahia bell tower and southeast portion of the building to be retained in a manner that could endanger the property's historical significance.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-3a, 4.2-3-b and 4.2-3-c below will reduce potential impacts associated with rehabilitation of the bell tower and southeast apartment units to a less-than-significant level.

4.2-3a. Require that post-demolition treatment of the west and north walls be undertaken with the assistance of an historic preservation architect and be completed in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* with an independent review by a qualified historic preservation architect at the time that detailed building plans are prepared. The Applicant shall have architectural elevations and plans prepared, in consultation with the historic preservation architect, that specify the locations and type of proposed repair or removal of building features for the retained tower and building, and specify proposed replacement materials. These architectural drawings also shall indicate how the proposed structural and seismic upgrades will be accomplished consistent with the Standards.

4.2-3b. Retain the existing window openings on the La Bahia bell tower and southeast apartment units, except in cases where the current opening can be demonstrated to be a non-historic alteration to the building.

4.2-3c. The ~~proposed~~ project shall be revised to include, if feasible as determined by the City of Santa Cruz, the repair and retention of any remaining wood windows on the bell tower and southeast apartment units. Non-historic metal windows shall be replaced with ~~wood~~ windows similar in size and proportion, in keeping with original condition of building and to differentiate the historic building from the new construction~~, which will feature aluminum windows~~. New windows shall be differentiated from the historic windows at the bell tower and retained building.

Impact 4.2-4: Effects of New Building on Retained Bell Tower & Building. The proposed new building project could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the retained tower and building due to height and massing of new construction in relation to the retained features.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.2-4a and 4.2-b below will reduce impacts of new building features on the retained bell tower and southeast apartment units to a less-than-significant level. An illustration as provided in the ARG report is shown on page 4.2-23.

4.2-4a. Modify the design of the new building at the northeast corner of Beach and Main Streets in order to reduce the prominence and the appearance of massing of the building's third story through measures such as the following and architectural detailing with confirmation through a photosimulation and review by a historic preservation architect prior to issuance of building permits:

- Replace the solid, partial-height wall that serves as the southern and eastern edges of the main ballroom balcony with a wood and/or metal balustrade.

- Move the ~~western and~~ southern edges of the balcony proposed at the southwest corner of this building inward so that it ~~they~~ no longer extends beyond the footprint of the first and second stories.
- Increase the setback of the southern wall of the third floor in order to align the wall with the southern wall of the "connector" that extends between the building and the retained bell tower building. (This entails an increase in the third-floor setback of approximately three feet.)
- Shift the pergola at the third floor balcony northward so that there is at least three feet of clearance between the southern edge of the pergola and the balustrade extending along the southern edge of the balcony.
- Install new landscaping along Beach Street that is similar to the existing palm trees and that will not rise above the level of the bell tower.

4.2-4b. Reduce a portion of the southernmost bay of the new construction along Westbrook Street to three stories ~~(up to two rooms)~~ on the southeast corner of the fourth floor, as shown on the illustration in the Draft EIR text, to reduce massing near the historic Bell Tower ~~(removal of up to two rooms)~~.

Impact 4.2-5: Impacts to Historical Structures Due to Construction-Vibration. Project excavation may result in groundborne vibration and potential damage to on- and off-site historic structures.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.2-5a and 4.2-5b below will reduce impacts of construction-related vibration to a less-than-significant level.

4.2-5a. Implement the following measures to protect historic structures that are within 50 feet of project, including onsite structures to be retained, during construction activities that result in vibration, (e.g., the installation of vibro-displacement stone columns).

- Prior to demolition, a historic preservation architect and a structural engineer shall document existing baseline conditions of those historic resources identified in Draft EIR Table 4.2-1 that are identified as being potentially adversely affected by construction-vibration, (i.e., structures within 50 feet of construction activities that could exceed 0.1 in/sec PPV). The pre-construction survey would consist of documentation of structures by means of photograph and/or video, and a floor level survey of the ground floor of structures by a qualified engineer. This documentation shall be submitted to the City Planning Director prior to commencement of any vibro-displacement stone columns work.
- Establish damage criterion of, 0.1 in/sec PPV for continuous sources for historic structures potentially affected by vibration. A qualified and licensed structural engineer may be retained to assess whether the potentially affected structures could withstand this level of high vibration. If such a determination is made by the structural engineer, then a higher limit may be permissible.
- The historical architect and structural engineer shall develop a plan to be implemented during construction that sets forth the type and location of

measures to protect onsite and offsite structures, as may be required, during construction, including shoring of buildings or walls or other measures to provide temporary reinforcement of vibration-sensitive structures.

- Conduct monitoring by a qualified vibration monitoring consultant or engineering firm during installation of the vibro-displacement stone columns to monitor construction vibration. The consultant shall use a seismograph containing three channels that record in three mutually perpendicular axes. The frequency response shall be from 2 to 250 Hz, which is a minimum sampling rate of 1,000 samples per second per channel.
- If in the opinion of the structural engineer, in consultation with the historic preservation architect, substantial adverse impacts to historic resources related to construction activities are identified during construction, the monitoring team shall develop corrective actions to be implemented during construction. If, at any time, monitoring indicates maximum vibration levels approaching or exceeding damage thresholds, construction will immediately cease and subsequent corrective action, as outlined below, shall be taken. If the stop work threshold is exceeded, evaluate the condition of the building for damage. If no damage is indicated, consult with structural engineer and/or architectural historian to assess whether higher thresholds are possible and adjust, as appropriate. If damage occurs, determine if any other construction approaches are feasible to reduce vibration. If none are available, examine the severity of the damage to determine if damage is minor and repair is feasible. If repair is feasible, continue with construction, but monitor vibration and damage closely to ensure that damage remains repairable. Consider whether a lower stop work threshold is feasible. If damage approaches becoming unrepairable and vibration levels have approached or exceeded the stop work threshold repeatedly, consider new feasible and reasonable alternative approaches to construction.
- Conduct post-construction surveying of structures ~~would be performed~~ to identify (and repair if necessary) any damage from construction activities. Any damage would be documented by photography, video, or other means, and costs of repairs would be paid by the Applicant. Progress reports of the results of vibration monitoring would be provided to the lead agency in charge within an expeditious amount of time following vibro-displacement. A final report documenting results, damage, excessive vibration or other impacts would be provided to the lead agency.

4.2-5b. Implement a training program for construction workers to be conducted by the historic preservation architect to provide direction on how to exercise care when working around and operating equipment near the retained La Bahia structures.

Geology and Soils

Impact 4.6-1 Exposure to Seismic Hazards. The project site will be exposed to strong ground-shaking during a major earthquake on any of the nearby faults, resulting in the exposure of people and/or structures to strong seismic shaking and liquefaction.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 below will reduce impacts of exposure to seismic hazards, including liquefaction, and other soil constraints to a less-than-significant level.

4.6-1: Require implementation of all recommendations set forth in the "Geotechnical Investigation and Geology Report for La Bahia Hotel" prepared by Pacific Crest Engineering (January 2008), as updated by the Dees & Associates (October 5, 2013) "Update to Geotechnical Investigation by Pacific Crest Engineering, Inc., dated January 28, 2008" and December 3, 2013 review, including foundation and structural design recommendations. These recommendations include, but are not limited to, use of vibro-displacement stone columns to mitigate exposure to liquefaction, and construction of a building foundation system that consists of structural mat foundation or grid of reinforced spread footings for structures located over stone columns.

Noise (Initial Study)

Impact IS-1 Exposure to Noise. The project interior and outdoor areas would be exposed to noise levels associated with the beach area, including traffic, Boardwalk and occasional train noise.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measure IS-1 below will reduce impacts of exposure to noise to a less-than-significant level.

IS-1: Require preparation of an acoustical study with building permit submittal and require building plans to incorporate any recommended building or window design measures, if needed to achieve interior noise levels (attributable to exterior sources) of 45 decibels in any habitable room, measured in either the day-night average sound level, as established by state law.

LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The following impacts were found to be less-than-significant. Mitigation measures are not required.

Aesthetics

Impact 4.1-1: Scenic Views. The proposed project will be visible from several designated public scenic viewpoints, but the proposed structure will not eliminate or substantially adversely affect a scenic view.

Impact 4.1-: Scenic Resources. The proposed project will result in tree removal and demolition of a locally designated historic structure, but neither the trees nor the structure in its current condition are considered scenic resources.

Impact 4.1-3: Visual Effects on Surrounding Area. The proposed project will result in construction of a new building in a developed area, but it is of similar scale and mass as other structures in the area and will not result in a substantial degradation to the visual character of the surrounding area.

Impact 4.1-4: Creation of Light or Glare. The proposed project will not introduce substantial new sources of lighting or surfaces that would create glare.

Impact 4.1-5: Creation of Shadows. The proposed project buildings will cast shadows for limited times during the year that could somewhat affect adjacent uses, but due to the relatively short period of time, this is considered a *less-than-significant impact.*

Transportation and Traffic

Impact 4.3-2: Highway Impacts. The project will result in an increase in daily and peak hour trips, but would not result in a change to an unacceptable LOS along highway segments.

Impact 4.3-3: Project Circulation and Emergency Access. The project will not result in creation of hazards due to design of the circulation system or incompatible equipment or result in provision of inadequate emergency access.

Impact 4.3-4: Project Parking Supply. The project parking supply will be adequate to meet demand under City parking requirements.

Impact 4.3-5: Offsite Parking Impacts. The project will result in the removal of five on-street public parking spaces, but would not substantially decrease public parking in the Beach area.

Water Supply

Impact 4.4-1 Water Supply. The proposed hotel project will result in an increased demand for water supply in a system that, under existing conditions, has adequate supplies during normal years, but inadequate supplies during dry years. The additional demand during dry years would not be of a magnitude to affect the level of curtailment that might be in effect.

No mitigation measures are required, as a significant impact has not been identified. However, the following measures are recommended as Project Conditions of Approval to further reduce project water demand.

Recommended Condition of Approval: Require incorporation of high efficiency water and energy-saving plumbing fixtures and appliances (toilets, urinals, washing machines, etc.) that go beyond current plumbing codes to minimize indoor water use.

Recommended Condition of Approval: As part of the landscaping and irrigation plan, require that only weather-based (ET) controllers be used on automatic irrigation systems to insure that irrigation is at the highest rate of efficiency.

Recommended Condition of Approval: Require reuse of filter backwash water from the proposed swimming pool onsite as a way to further reduce demand, if feasible.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Impact 4.5-1 Emissions of Criteria Pollutants. Project construction and operations will result in emissions of criteria pollutants, but would not exceed adopted thresholds of significance.

No mitigation measures are required, as a significant impact has not been identified. Although mitigation measures are not warranted, implementation of dust suppression measures during construction, as recommended in the MBUAPCD's "CEQA Guidelines" and in the certified Beach and South of Laurel Comprehensive Area Plan EIR is recommended as a condition of approval to help prevent potential nuisances to nearby receptors due to fugitive dust.

Recommended Condition of Approval: Implement dust control measures during construction, including but not limited to:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Prohibit all grading activities during periods of high wind (i.e., over 15 mph);
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose materials;
- Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible after construction and grading;
- Cover inactive storage piles;
- Install wheel washers at the entrance to the construction site for all exiting trucks;
- Sweep streets if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site; and
- Post a publicly visible sign which specifies the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond to complaints and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the MBUAPCD shall be visible.

Impact 4.5-2 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions. Project construction and operations will result in GHG emissions, which are not considered significant.

NO IMPACTS

No impacts were identified for the following topics.

Land Use

Impact 4.7-1 Conflicts with Policies and Regulations. The proposed project will not conflict with policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and thus will not result in impacts related to consistency with local plans and policies.

2.5 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

CEQA Guidelines section 15123: "Issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects." This EIR has presented mitigation measures and project alternatives, and the City Council will consider the Final EIR when considering the proposed project. In considering whether to approve the project, the City Council will take into the consideration the environmental consequences of the project with mitigation measures and project alternatives, as well as other factors related to feasibility. "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors (State CEQA Guidelines, section 15364). Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or already owns the alternative site). No one of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives. The concept of feasibility also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. Moreover, feasibility under CEQA encompasses "desirability" to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.