

ARANA GULCH MASTER PLAN FINAL EIR ADDENDUM

Prepared for
City of Santa Cruz

Prepared by
Amy Skewes-Cox, AICP
Environmental Planner

With
EcoSystems West
Natalie Macris
Vanessa Bulkacz
Fall Creek Engineering
Environmental Vision
Wordsmith Word Processing
Tom Camara

June 6, 2006

INTRODUCTION

This Addendum to the Final EIR is prepared to address typographical errors and inadvertent omissions from the Draft EIR (DEIR) and previously issued Final EIR (May 2006) on the Arana Gulch Master Plan. This Addendum, along with the previously issued proposed Final EIR (May 2006) and the Draft EIR (February 2006) on the Arana Gulch Master Plan, constitute the full Final EIR if the City of Santa Cruz certifies the Final EIR as complete and adequate under CEQA. Nothing in this Addendum changes any of the impact conclusions set forth in either the Draft EIR or the originally issued proposed Final EIR.

Any changes to the text of the Draft or Final EIR are shown with underlining, and any deleted text is shown with strikeouts (e.g. ~~strikeouts~~).

TYPROGRAPHICAL CHANGES FOR DRAFT AND FINAL EIR

Page 19 of the Final EIR, under Response A2-1, paragraph 6, is corrected as follows:

"Although, for purely CEQA purposes, the City has determined that the impact to tarplant habitat is significant and ~~avoidable~~ unavoidable, this legally conservative conclusion is not the same...."

Page 4.2-39 of the Draft EIR, under Mitigation Measure BIO-1(d), is corrected as follows to identify the updated code section:

"...Section 160~~24~~ of the Fish and Game Code and applicable permits shall be obtained prior to construction."

INADVERTENT OMISSIONS IN DRAFT EIR

Section 4.2 of the Draft EIR, Biological Resources, inadvertently did not include the following four significance criteria that are identified in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines, and these should be added to the bottom of page 4.2-37 of the Draft EIR:

"....or State habitat conservation plan.

- 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; or
- Substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species."

The following text is added under "Less-than-Significant Impacts" on page 4.2-38 of the Draft EIR:

"....Since potential impacts to the nests would be avoided, this would be a less-than-significant impact and no mitigation would be required.

The project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. The only potential fish species at the site would be steelhead in Arana Gulch Creek and no changes to the creek habitat are proposed. Erosion control measures are recommended in the Hydrology section of this Draft EIR to minimize erosion impacts from trail construction. No habitat would be substantially reduced to the point where a fish or wildlife population would drop below self-perpetuating levels on a statewide or regional basis, or cause a species to become threatened or endangered.

The project would not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, nor substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species except for the Santa Cruz tarplant which is addressed under Impact BIO-4 below."

Impact BIO-4 addresses potential impacts to the Santa Cruz tarplant and concludes that the impact to this species could be significant and unavoidable due to implementation of the paved multi-use trails. While mitigation measures have been recommended to protect Santa Cruz tarplant habitat, such measures would not avoid the significant environmental impact to tarplant habitat within the footprint of the paved multi-use trail.

The Draft EIR includes mitigation measures to reduce all potential impacts to biological resources to a less-than-significant level except for the impact to the Santa Cruz tarplant as discussed above. The Draft EIR identifies potential impacts to: 1) riparian habitat; 2) wetlands; 3) Santa Cruz tarplant; 4) sensitive habitats (i.e., wetlands, riparian areas, and habitats supporting species of concern due to human use and encroachment); 5) perennial bunchgrasses; 6) California red-legged frog; 7) avian species; 8) special-status roosting bats; and 9) monarch butterflies. All of the potential impacts identified included mitigation measures that would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant with the one exception of the Santa Cruz tarplant.