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NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Gilroy has undertaken environmental review for the proposed Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan, and intends to adopt a mitigated negative declaration. The City of Gilroy invites all interested persons and agencies to comment on the proposed mitigated negative declaration.

Lead Agency: City of Gilroy

Project Location: The project location consists of 160 contiguous acres within and surrounding downtown Gilroy. The site extends from Leavesley Road/Welburn Avenue intersection in the north to Luchessa Avenue in the south. The eastern boundary is generally the alley on the east side of Railroad Street, and the western boundary is the alley between Eigleberry and Church streets, with a portion extending westward to Dowdy Street between Sixth Street and Seventh Street.

Project Description: The Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan provides guidance for implementing development within the planning area. The specific plan includes an implementation action plan that identifies specific improvement projects, their priority, and who is responsible for implementation. The specific plan furthers the objectives of the general plan by providing a more detailed planning document for development of specific sites and streetscape improvements.

The specific plan is essentially a redevelopment project, to be implemented over the course of 20 or more years. The specific plan could result in the addition of 1,576 multi-family dwelling units, and approximately 994,495 square feet of non-residential structures and could provide housing for 5,358 persons.

The specific plan divides the downtown into the following six districts: Downtown Historic, Downtown Expansion, Civic/Cultural Arts, Transitional, Cannery, and Gateway.

Public Review Period: September 12, 2005 through October 11, 2005

Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is Available for Public Review at these Locations:

- City of Gilroy Community Development Department
  Contact: Gregg Polubinsky
  7351 Rosanna Street, Gilroy, CA  95020
  408-846-0440

- Gilroy Public Library
  Contact: Reference Librarian
  7387 Rosanna Street, Gilroy, CA  95020
  408-842-8208

Address Where Written Comments May be Sent: Gregg Polubinsky
City of Gilroy Community Development Department
7351 Rosanna Street
Gilroy, CA  95020
Public Hearing:
Planning Commission Hearing
Date: Thursday, October 20, 2005
Time: 6:00 p.m.
Location: City of Gilroy City Hall, Council Chambers,
7351 Rosanna Street, Gilroy, CA 95020

City Council Hearing
Date: Monday, November 7, 2005
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Location: City of Gilroy City Hall, Council Chambers,
7351 Rosanna Street, Gilroy, CA 95020
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

City of Gilroy
7351 Rosanna St.
Gilroy, CA 95020

City File Number:

Project Description:
Name of Project: Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan
Nature of Project: Infill and redevelopment plan to guide the character and growth of the six identified downtown districts.

Project Location:
Location: 160 contiguous acres within and surrounding downtown Gilroy. The site extends from Leavesley Road/Welburn Avenue intersection in the north to Luchessa Avenue in the south. The eastern boundary is generally the alley on the east side of Railroad Street, and the western boundary is the alley between Eigleberry and Church streets, with a portion extending westward to Dowdy Street between Sixth Street and Seventh Street.

Assessor's Parcel Number: Not applicable.

Entity or Person(s) Undertaking Project:
Name: City of Gilroy
Address: 7351 Rosanna Street, Gilroy, CA 95020
Staff Planner: Gregg Polubinsky, gpolubinsky@ci.gilroy.ca.us

Initial Study:
An initial study of this project was undertaken and prepared for the purpose of ascertaining whether this project might have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of this study is attached.
Findings & Reasons:

The initial study identified potentially significant effects on the environment. However, this project has been mitigated (see Mitigation Measures below which avoid or mitigate the effects) to a point where no significant effects will occur. On the basis of the whole record, there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment. The following reasons will support these findings:

- The proposal is a logical component of the existing land use of this area.
- Identified adverse impacts are proposed to be mitigated on-site and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program have been prepared.
- The proposed project is consistent with the adopted goals and policies of the General Plan of the City of Gilroy.
- City staff independently reviewed the Initial Study, and this Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the City of Gilroy.
- With the application of the following Mitigation Measures the proposed project will not have any significant impacts on the environment.
- The Gilroy Planning Division is the custodian of the documents and other material that constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based.

Air Quality

The following mitigation measure shall be incorporated into grading plans for projects located within the Specific Plan area.

AQ-1. Developers shall specify in project plans the implementation of the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities for any proposed development. The measures shall be implemented as necessary to adequately control dust, subject to the review and approval by the City of Gilroy Engineering Division:

The following measures shall be implemented at all construction sites:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites; and
- Sweep streets immediately (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
The following measures shall be implemented at all construction sites greater than four acres in area:

- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more);
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph;
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; and
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

The following measures are strongly encouraged at construction sites that are large in area, located near sensitive receptors or which for any other reason may warrant additional emission reductions:

- Install wheel washers for all existing trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site;
- Install wind breaks, or plant trees/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas;
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour; and
- Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time.

**Cultural Resources**

CR-1. For projects proposing changes to a known historic resource or any structure 50 years or older, the City of Gilroy shall ensure that the City’s Historic Neighborhood and Historic Site guidelines are followed as a component of the environmental review (CEQA) process for that proposed project. Any significant impact to a historic structure would be considered a significant adverse environmental impact according to CEQA and would require preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR).

CR-2. Due to the possibility that significant buried cultural resources might be found during construction, the following language shall be included on any permits issued for the Specific Plan area, including, but not limited to building permits for future development, subject to the review and approval of the Gilroy Planning Division (pursuant to Gilroy General Plan Policy 5.07):

> If archaeological resources are discovered during construction, work shall be halted within 50 meters (165 feet) of the find until a qualified professional archaeologist can evaluate it. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated and implemented.
CR-3. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the City shall ensure that the language is included in all permits in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e), subject to the review and approval of the City of Gilroy Planning Division:

If human remains are found during construction there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the coroner of Santa Clara County is contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD may then make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance if: a) the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission; b) the descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or c) the landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HZ-1. Prior to issuance of a demolition permit for any structures within the project area, the structure(s) shall be evaluated for occurrence of asbestos, lead, and/or other hazardous materials. The City of Gilroy Hazardous Materials Program would perform oversight of cleanup and investigation of hazardous materials and hazardous waste contamination.

HZ-2. The contaminated site, located at Sixth Street and Monterey Street and that is included on the CORTESE and CalSites lists, shall be remediated to the satisfaction of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control by the property owner and/or applicant, prior to the issuance of any building permits associated with redevelopment of the site. Prior to remediation it is likely that a Phase I and/or Phase II environmental site assessment would be required.
Noise (Construction Activity)

N-1. The City of Gilroy Community Development Department shall review development applications to determine if the specific project operations or construction activities could result in ground-borne noise or vibration. If ground-borne noise or vibration is determined to be possible, the city shall require the potential impacts to be studied and mitigated through the environmental review process (CEQA), prior to the approval of entitlements.

N-2. The following measures shall be incorporated into project plans for development within the Specific Plan area to mitigate construction noise, subject to the review and approval of the City of Gilroy Engineering and Building divisions: (Modified Gilroy General Plan EIR mitigation measure 4.7-B):

   a. Limit construction activity to weekdays between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, and Saturday between 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM, with no construction on Sundays or City holidays;

   b. Require that all internal combustion engine-driven equipment are equipped with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment; and

   c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area.

Traffic

T-1. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Church Street/Sixth Street intersection. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

   a. Signalize the intersection;

   b. Re-strip all four approaches to include a separate left-turn pocket and shared through/right-turn lane;

   c. Remove parking on both sides of the street on each approach to the intersection; and

   d. Modify signal phasing to include protected left-turn phasing on all approaches.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the LOS to decline to an unacceptable level shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.
T-2. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Leavesley Road intersection. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Make improvements to the northbound right-turn receiving lane such that this movement could be restored to free-running operation. Such improvements could include (1) installing flexible land delineators along the wide solid white line that separates the receiving lane from the other lanes on Leavesley Road, or (2) extending a raised curb a short distance eastbound to clearly delineate the right-turn receiving lane from the from the other two eastbound lanes on Leavesley Road. These improvements would provide physical barriers that prevent drivers on eastbound Leavesley Road from merging into the receiving lane too early.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-3. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Murray Avenue/Leavesley Road intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second westbound left-turn pocket on Leavesley Road at Murray Avenue. This would require a second southbound lane on Murray Avenue, south of Leavesley Road.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-4. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Church Street/First Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Extend the existing northbound left-turn pocket on Church Street to 300 feet as shown in the City of Gilroy Traffic Circulation Master Plan. This would require removing parking on the east side of Church Street for about 400 feet south of the intersection.
This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the exceedance shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.

T-5. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/First Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Extend the existing northbound left-turn lane on Monterey Street by 40 feet. This may require modifications to the existing raised, median island on Monterey Street between First and Third streets. To reduce the occurrence of the eastbound queue blocking the Eigleberry Street/First Street intersection, a “Keep Clear” pavement legend could be installed at that intersection. These improvements would be an interim step to the ultimate improvements shown in the City of Gilroy Traffic Circulation Master Plan.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-6. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Sixth Street intersection as development occurs. Once the City determines that directional signs would assist with circulation in this area, the City shall require the first development resulting in the need for these signs to implement the strategic placement of directional signs at downtown gateways to divert traffic bound for downtown parking facilities away from Monterey Street and onto Eigleberry Street.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-7. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Seventh Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:
a. Lengthen the existing southbound left-turn pocket by 90 feet. This improvement would require modifications to the existing raised median island on Monterey Street between Sixth and Sevenths streets; OR

b. Add a second southbound left-turn pocket. This improvement may not be feasible because it would require widening the road and adding a second eastbound lane on Seventh Street.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-8. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Tenth Street intersection as development occurs. The first major project proposed in the downtown that would generate more than 100 peak-hour trips shall be responsible for conducting a supplemental engineering study to identify, in more detail, the improvements necessary along the Tenth Street corridor to accommodate the recommended mitigation measures. In general, the anticipated improvements are as follows:

a. Add a second 150-foot northbound left-turn pocket to accommodate the projected maximum northbound left-turn queue;

b. Add a second southbound left-turn lane to accommodate the projected maximum vehicle queue in the southbound left-turn movement; both lanes should be at least 175 feet long; and

c. Lengthen the existing turn pocket should be lengthened by 75 feet to accommodate the projected maximum westbound left-turn queue.

This improvement would require widening the railroad crossing and widening Tenth Street between Monterey and the railroad tracks. The improvements at the Monterey Street/Tenth intersection should be coordinated with those recommended below at the Alexander/Tenth intersection. According to traffic collision data summarized in the City of Gilroy Traffic Collision Analysis Study, the intersection of Monterey Street and Tenth Street exhibits a higher-than-expected number of accidents. Additionally, the City has indicated that the intersection currently meets warrants for protected left-turn phasing on the Tenth Street approaches. The improvement that has been recommended at this location to address these conditions is the conversion of the traffic signal operation to protected left-turn phasing on all approaches.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.
T-9. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Alexander Street/Tenth Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

a. Lengthen the southbound left-turn pocket by 70 feet to accommodate the projected maximum vehicle queues during the peak hour. This can be accomplished by restriping the north leg of the intersection.

b. Lengthen the eastbound left-turn lane by 105 feet to accommodate the projected maximum vehicle queue in the eastbound left-turn movement. This can be accomplished by restriping the west leg of the intersection. However, this would require that the existing westbound left-turn pocket into the former Indian Motorcycle facility be eliminated. The improvements at the Alexander/Tenth intersection should be coordinated with those recommended above at the Monterey/Tenth intersection.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-10. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Chestnut Street/Tenth Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Extend the southbound left-turn pockets to provide 275 feet of storage space in order to accommodate the projected maximum vehicle queues in the southbound left-turn movement. This can be accomplished by restriping the north leg of the intersection.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-11. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Luchessa Avenue intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:
Add a second 100-foot eastbound left-turn pocket to accommodate the projected maximum eastbound left-turn queue. This improvement would require widening the west leg of Luchessa Avenue. This improvement makes up a portion of the ultimate improvement package shown in the City of Gilroy Traffic Circulation Master Plan for this intersection.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the exceedance shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement agreement with from the City.

T-12. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Leavesley Road intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second northbound left-turn lane and a second southbound left-turn lane. Implementation of these improvements would restore intersection operations to LOS C during both peak hours.

These improvements not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-13. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Murray Avenue/Leavesley Road intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second westbound left-turn pocket on Leavesley Road. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS C during the PM peak hour.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-14. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Church Street/First Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:
Add a second westbound through lane, strip a second westbound lane on First Street west of Church Street, and remove parking on the north side of First Street west of Church Street. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS C during the PM peak hour.

These improvements are not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-15. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/First Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second eastbound left-turn pocket on First Street at Monterey Street. This improvement may require First Street to be widened at the intersection. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS C during the PM peak hour.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the LOS to decline to an unacceptable level shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.

T-16. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Church Street/Sixth Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Install a traffic signal at this intersection. Restripe all four approaches to the intersection to include a separate left-turn pocket and a shared through/right-turn lane. Remove parking on both sides of the street on each approach to the intersection. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the LOS to decline to an unacceptable level shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.
T-17. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Sixth Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Restripe the east and west approaches (Sixth Street) to include separate left-turn pockets and shared through/right-turn lanes and eliminate curbside parking on Sixth Street near the intersection. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour.

These improvements are not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

T-18. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Luchessa Avenue intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second northbound left-turn lane, a free-running eastbound right-turn lane on Luchessa Avenue, and a southbound receiving lane on Monterey Street to accommodate the eastbound free right turn. These improvements would require widening Luchessa Avenue west of Monterey Street and widening Monterey Street south of Luchessa Avenue. Implementation of these improvements would restore intersection operations to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the LOS to decline to an unacceptable level shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.

T-19. The City of Gilroy shall monitor the parking situation in the downtown. When determined by the city to be the appropriate time, the city shall develop a parking management plan that would include enforcement of parking hours and time limits. This program could begin within the downtown core area and expand to adjacent blocks as parking demand increases. The general effect of this parking demand program would be to ensure that on-street parking spaces are available during normal business hours for routine customer use, and encourage vehicles parking for longer periods to use off-street parking lots. The first stage of implementation should be on the following streets segments:
a. Monterey Street between Third and Eighth;
b. Eigleberry Street between Fourth and Sixth;
c. Fifth Street between Eigleberry and Monterey;
d. Sixth Street between Eigleberry and Monterey; and
e. Martin Street between Monterey and the railroad tracks.

These are areas that currently exhibit parking occupancy rates of 70 percent or more of the existing supply. These areas likely would be the first to develop parking problems in the near term as future development and reuse of vacant buildings occurs in the downtown. From this first stage area, the scope of the program should be expanded outward as future development growth and parking conditions dictate.

T-20. Adequate parking shall be provided in the Specific Plan area. The city shall determine the appropriate measures to accomplish this. Twenty-two potential sites, totaling approximately 20 acres, were identified in the parking study, which could be considered for future off-street parking facilities. Measures may include, but not be limited to the followings:

a. Provide one parking space per unit on-site for new residential developments within the downtown and be located such that 0.75 parking spaces per unit are available for use either on-street or in off-street public lots within the immediate vicinity (1-2 blocks) of the development.

b. Provide adequate employee parking in private, off-street parking lots for new commercial developments. These developments shall work closely with the city to ensure that adequate customer parking is available within the immediate vicinity (1-2 blocks) of the development;

c. Identify and construct new off-street public parking facilities such as (1) developing parking lots east of Monterey Street behind the existing buildings and west of the railroad right-of-way, (2) acquire underutilized properties that have good street access for new public surface parking lots, and (3) designate some off-street parking facilities as long-term parking lots to accommodate the parking needs of employees and residents.
Date Prepared: September 6, 2005
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Date Adopted by City Council:
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Planning Division Manager
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## A. Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Lead Agency Contact Person and Phone Number** | Gregg Polubinsky, Planner II  
Community Development Department  
Planning Division  
City of Gilroy  
(408) 846-0440 |
| **Date Prepared** | September 2005 |
| **Study Prepared by** | EMC Planning Group Inc.  
301 Lighthouse Avenue, Suite C  
Monterey, CA  93940  
Teri Wissler Adam, Principal  
Megan Tolbert, Associate Planner |
| **Project Location** | 160 contiguous acres within and surrounding downtown Gilroy. The site extends from Leavesley Road/Welburn Avenue intersection in the north to Luchessa Avenue in the south. The eastern boundary is generally the alley on the east side of Railroad Street, and the western boundary is the alley between Eigleberry and Church streets, with a portion extending westward to Dowdy Street between Sixth Street and Seventh Street. |
| **Project Sponsor Name and Address** | City of Gilroy  
7351 Rosanna Street  
Gilroy, CA  95020 |
| **General Plan Designation** | Downtown Commercial, General Services Commercial, Medium Density Residential, and Public/Quasi-Public Facility |
| **Zoning** | Single Family Residential (R1), Two Family Residential (R2), Medium Density Residential (R3), High Density Residential (R4), Professional Office (PO), Neighborhood Commercial (C1), Central District Commercial (C2), Shopping Center Commercial (C3), Commercial Industrial (CM), Limited Industrial (M1), Park/Public Facility (PF) |

### Environmental Analysis Methodology

Article 12 of the State CEQA Guidelines presents several “Special Situations” that include unique requirements for environmental evaluation. Section 15183 in Article 12 discusses “Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan, or Zoning”. Subsection (a) states, “CEQA
mandates that projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. This streamlines the review of such projects and reduces the need to prepare repetitive environmental studies.”

The proposed project is consistent with the development density established by Gilroy General Plan policies for the project site. The Gilroy General Plan EIR was certified prior to adoption of the general plan in June 2002. Therefore, the environmental analysis in this initial study was conducted to determine if there are project-specific significant effects that are peculiar to the project or its site.

Setting

Location. The project site is located in the City of Gilroy, which is in southern Santa Clara County along the U.S. Highway 101 corridor. Gilroy is nestled on the Santa Clara Valley floor between the Diablo Mountain Range to the east and the Santa Cruz Mountain Range to the west, and is considered the southern extent of the San Francisco Bay Area and Silicon Valley region. Figure 1, Regional Location, presents the regional context of the project site.

The project area encompasses over 160 acres of the City’s downtown core spanning from the Leavesley Road /Welburn Avenue on the north end to Luchessa Avenue on the south; and from the alley between Eigleberry and Church streets on the west to the alley on the east side of Railroad Street on the east. The site extends west to Dowdy Street to include the Civic Center area located between Sixth and Seventh streets. Figure 2, Project Vicinity, presents the project area within the context of the City of Gilroy.

Land Use Designations. The General Plan land use designations of the site include: Downtown Commercial, General Services Commercial, Medium Density Residential, and Public/Quasi-Public Facility. Surrounding land use designations include primarily Low Density Residential as well as General Services Commercial (northwest and southeast of project area), General Industrial (northeast of project site), Medium Density Residential (east of Third Street), and Educational Facility (South Valley Middle School east of project area). Figure 3, General Plan Land Use Designations, presents the General Plan Land Use Map with the project boundary delineated. Surrounding land uses are also identified on Figure 3.

Existing Environment. The project site is relatively flat with an elevation of approximately 200 feet above mean sea level (USGS Gilroy, Calif. Quadrangle, 1981). Miller Slough is the only drainage feature that meanders through the project area by the northern end of the Cannery District near the railroad tracks between Third and Fourth streets (Note: Districts are discussed below under ‘Description of Project’). Miller Slough has been heavily manipulated for the purpose of flood control and to eliminate any dynamic movement that drainages usually experience. The site is devoid of any natural vegetation or features due to its current developed urban state, although it does contain street trees and other ornamental landscaping. The existing urban uses include, but are not limited to, residences, commercial businesses (e.g., antique shops, vehicle repair, restaurants, gas stations), civic uses (e.g., library, city hall, police department), railroad tracks and a commuter train station, places of worship, and city parking lots. The project area in its current state is also improved with a full grid-pattern street network, curbs and sidewalks, crosswalks, on-street parking, and other features. There is currently a total of 1,657 parking spaces in the project area (Specific Plan, pg 138). Figure 4, Aerial Photo, presents an aerial photo of the project site and surrounding environment.
Figure 1

Project Location

Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan Initial Study
This side intentionally left blank.
Figure 2
Project Vicinity

Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan Initial Study

Source: EMC Planning Group Inc. 2005
This side intentionally left blank.
Figure 3

General Plan Land Use Designations

Source: City of Gilroy 2002 and EMC Planning Group Inc. 2005

Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan Initial Study
This side intentionally left blank.
Figure 4
Aerial Photograph
Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan Initial Study

Source: City of Gilroy 2004 and Orthophotos 2000 and EMC Planning Group 2005
This side intentionally left blank.
Description of Project

Purpose. The proposed Downtown Gilroy Specific Plan (hereinafter “Specific Plan” or “proposed project”) provides guidance for implementing development within the planning area. The draft Specific Plan is available for public review by contacting the Gilroy Planning Division. The Specific Plan includes an implementation action plan which identifies specific improvement projects, their priority, and who is responsible for implementation (pg 155). The proposed specific plan furthers the objectives of the City of Gilroy General Plan (hereinafter “General Plan”) by providing a more detailed planning document for development of specific sites and streetscape improvements. The Gilroy Zoning Ordinance sets forth site specific standards and regulations that govern the size, shape, and type of use that would occur in accordance with the proposed project.

The proposed project is considered an infill and redevelopment project intended to be built out over the course of 20 or more years. The project could result in the addition of 1,576 multi-family dwelling units, and approximately 994,495 square feet of non-residential structures. Based on a multiplier of 3.40 persons per household in the City of Gilroy per the 2005 Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) figures (Hing Wong, pers. comm., June 15, 2005), the proposed project could provide housing for 5,358 persons.

Districts. The proposed project divides the project area (downtown) into six districts, whereas, “Each district has a particular vision for future development [and] land use and development standards, as well as design guidelines, will give direction for each area of the Downtown to help each section achieve the future state envisioned by the community” (Specific Plan, pg 3). The six districts include the Downtown Historic, Downtown Expansion, Civic/Cultural Arts, Transitional, Cannery, and Gateway districts.

Desirable Land Uses. Desirable land uses within each of the Specific Plan districts is as follows:

1. Downtown Historic District

   Non Residential:
   - Retail (coffee, books, art gallery)
   - Restaurants (excluding drive-thru)
   - Entertainment (cinema, playhouse)
   - Offices (all types, above ground floor)

   Residential:
   - Residential (apartments above ground floor)

2. Expansion District

   Non Residential:
   - Retail (coffee, books, art gallery)
   - Offices (all types, at ground floor)
   - Lodging (B&B or inn) Restaurants (excluding drive-thrus)
   - Entertainment Uses (cinema, playhouse)
   - Service Commercial (video, dry cleaning, small appliance repair)

   Residential:
   - Residential (apartments above ground floor)
3. Civic Center District

Non Residential:
- Civic (city hall, city offices)
- Limited Retail (coffee, bakery, newsstand)
- Cultural (library, museum, cultural arts center)
- Professional Offices (legal, accounting, architecture)

Residential:
- Residential (apartments, townhomes, live/work units above/behind ground floor) (Residential allowed only between Eigleberry Street and Church Street)

4. Transitional District

Non Residential:
- Professional Offices (legal, financial, medical, dental)
- Lodging (B&B or small inn)
- Service Commercial (pharmacy, video, dry cleaning)

Residential:
- Residential (stand alone, duplex, townhomes, condos and/or apartments)

5. Cannery District

Non Residential:
- Offices (all types)
- Light Assembly/Artisan
- Service Commercial (video, dry cleaning)
- Research & Development (small incubator businesses)

Residential:
- Residential (stand alone, duplexes, townhomes, condos, lofts, live/work space, and/or apartments)

6. Gateway District

Non Residential:
- Offices (all types)
- Lodging (hotel or inn)
- Service Commercial (auto related, service and repair, home improvements)

Residential:
- Residential (stand alone, duplexes, townhomes, condos, lofts, live/work space, and/or apartments)
Figure 5, Proposed Project Districts, presents the location of each district within the context of the project area and existing street network. Table 1, District Development Potential and Densities, presents the buildout figures for residential (dwelling units per acre—du) and non-residential uses (floor area ratio—FAR) that could occur in each district with implementation of the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Development Potential (Additional Uses Compared to Existing Conditions)</th>
<th>Density (expressed as FAR or du/acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Residential (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>Residential (dwelling units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Historic</td>
<td>72,739</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>281,494</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center/ Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7,322</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>141,266</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannery</td>
<td>225,909</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>265,765</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>994,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,576</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Gilroy and EMC Planning Group Inc.

**Design Guidelines.** The Specific Plan includes design guidelines for signs, mixed-use projects, utility service components of buildings/structures, facades (building elements and articulation), and other building design principles (color, materials, massing, scale), lighting, landscape and hardscape, parking lots, and site planning considerations. These design guidelines provide specific recommendations that serve to implement the aesthetic intent of the proposed project.

**Beautification.** The project includes streetscape beautification and other public improvements to public rights-of-way, sidewalks, and public open spaces. Improvements are also planned in the Gateway District to provide an attractive welcome to the downtown core. Figure 6, Proposed Urban Design Concepts, presents the streetscape improvements planned within downtown core area.

**Street Network.** The project proposes several street improvements including sidewalks and bike lanes. Monterey Street, from Luchessa Street to Eleventh Street and from First Street to Leavesley...
Road, would be improved with sidewalks on both sides and landscaped parkways between the sidewalks and the street. Monterey Street, from Eleventh Street to Eight Street and from First Street to Third Street, would be improved with sidewalks and parallel parking on both sides. Some improvements may also be implemented in the downtown core along Monterey Road, which include diagonal parking and elimination of medians. Eigleberry Street would be improved from First Street to Tenth Street with parallel parking on the west side of the street and diagonal parking on the east side of the street. Railroad Street from Old Gilroy Street to Lewis Street, would be improved with widened sidewalks and parallel parking on both sides, as well as a Class III bike route.

**Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required**

- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) – NPDES General Construction Permit
- Santa Clara Valley Water District – Ordinance 83-2 (Permit for work within 50 feet of a drainage channel)
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control
Specific Plan Boundary
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Gateway District

Source: RRM Design 2005 and EMC Planning Group Inc. 2005
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Proposed Urban Design Concepts
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Source: RRM Design Group 2005 and EMC Planning Group 2005
B. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Population/Housing
- Agriculture
- Hydrology/Water quality
- Public Services
- Air quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Transportation/Traffic
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Cultural Resources
- Noise
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Geology/Soils

C. 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 (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) 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.

Gregg Poblubinsky, Planner II August 2005

D. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Notes

1. A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited 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 is 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 a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well a project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once it has been determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers 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 Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-Than-Significant Impact.” The mitigation measures are described, along with a brief explanation of 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 are used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document or negative declaration. [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)] In this case, a brief discussion would identify the following:

a. “Earlier Analysis Used” identifies and states where such document is available for review.

b. “Impact Adequately Addressed” identifies which effects from the checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal
standards, and states whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c. “Mitigation Measures”—For effects that are “Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” mitigation measures are described which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, etc.) are incorporated. Each reference to a previously prepared or outside document, where appropriate, includes a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. “Supporting Information Sources”—A source list is attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted are cited in the discussion.

8. This is the format recommended in the CEQA Guidelines as amended October 1998.

9. The explanation of each issue identifies:
   
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 significant.
## 1. Aesthetics

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or degrade the existing visual character in the Hecker Pass Specific Plan Area (GP Policy 1.07) or the hillside areas (GP Policy 1.16, GP Policy 12.04)? (1,3,5,6)</td>
<td>❑❑❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources viewed from Hecker Pass Highway or Pacheco Pass Highway (GP Policy 6.01, GP Policy 12.04)? (1,3,5,6)</td>
<td>❑❑❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially damage scenic resources viewed from Uvas Park Drive, Santa Teresa Boulevard, or Miller Avenue from First Street to Mesa Road (GP Policy 6.02)? (1,3,5,6)</td>
<td>❑❑❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially damage scenic resources (farmland and surrounding hills) viewed from Highway 101 (GP Policy 6.03, Action 1-H)? (1,3,5,6)</td>
<td>❑❑❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in unattractive entrances at the principal gateways to the City (north and south Monterey Street, Highway 152/Hecker Pass Highway, Highway 152/Pacheco Pass, north and south Santa Teresa Boulevard, and at the Highway 101 interchanges at Masten, Buena Vista, Leavesley, and Tenth Street) (GP Policy 1.10 and Action 1-H)? (1,3,5)</td>
<td>❑❑❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (1,3,5)</td>
<td>❑❑❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Include or require a wall or fence higher than seven feet above the existing grade at the property line? (1,3,5,9)</td>
<td>❑❑❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

a-d. The project site is not located near, visible from, nor provides visual access to Hecker Pass Highway, hillside areas, Pacheco Pass Highway, Uvas Park Drive, Santa Teresa Boulevard, Miller Avenue, or Highway 101.

e. The proposed project is intended to guide redevelopment of the downtown area, which includes enhancement of the attractiveness and community identity presented at the City’s gateways. The Specific Plan includes an implementation action plan that presents improvement projects, who’s responsible, and in what timeframe it is anticipated to be complete. According to the implementation action plan (page 155), the City of Gilroy Engineering and Planning Division in collaboration with the Downtown Merchants Association are currently in the process of developing a Downtown Gateway/Entry Monument Master Plan and design sketches that illustrate the gateway improvements. The gateway features would be constructed at First Street and Monterey Road and also in the southern end of downtown at Tenth Street and Monterey Road. Both of these gateway improvements are set at the highest priority, which indicates implementation within two years. The gateway improvements shall be consistent with General Plan Policy 1.06 (Community Design) Downtown (page 4-21), policy 1.10 (Community Design) Gateways (page 4-22), and Action 1.H Gateway Landscaping (pg 4-43). Therefore, the proposed project would not result in unattractive entrances to the city’s principle gateways.

f. The project site is currently developed with dense urban patterns and is surrounded by urban development that creates light and glare. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in light or glare above the existing conditions. Furthermore, the project shall comply with adopted City of Gilroy policies and standards that address minimizing light and glare impacts, including general plan policies 19.13, 19.14, 19.15, and action 19.G.

g. Noise sensitive land uses include residential dwellings, hospitals, churches, libraries, schools, and retirement homes. Due to the highly developed nature of the project area, it is possible that future proposed projects within the Specific Plan area would be subject to noise levels in excess of established thresholds (see General Plan figure 8-3 Permissible Maximum Outdoor and Indoor Noise Levels) and may warrant the construction of sound walls. However, the proposed project is a Specific Plan and by nature does not present the level of detail necessary to determine whether a wall or fence seven feet above the existing grade is proposed or may be required for sound attenuation. Compliance with Gilroy Zoning Ordinance, section 34, and consideration of setbacks and natural buffers for future proposed development projects within the project area, consistent with General Plan policies 26.05 would ensure that walls or fences higher than seven feet above the existing grade at the property line, would not occur with implementation of the Specific Plan.
2. Agriculture Resources

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Convert prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to an urban use (projects requiring a legislative act, such as zoning changes, annexation to the City, urban service area amendments, etc)? (1,22)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with a Williamson Act contract? (1,22)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use? (1,22)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ❑ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a-c. The project site and the area surrounding the project site are not used as farmland or for agricultural production. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses. None of the project site is identified as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance as presented on the *Santa Clara County Important Farmlands Map* (Department of Conservation 2002).
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Conflict with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Clean Air Plan (BAAQMD CAP)? (1,5,6,20,21)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? BAAQMD indicates that any project that would individually have a significant air quality impact would also be considered to have a significant cumulative air quality impact. (1,5,6,20,21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (1,5,6,20,21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors (residential areas, schools, hospitals, nursing homes) to substantial pollutant concentrations (CO and PM₁₀), as determined in b. above? (1,5,6,20,21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (1,3,5,20,21)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a. The General Plan population projections are inconsistent with the regional clean air plan population projections. The Gilroy City Council adopted a statement of overriding considerations when certifying the general plan EIR and adopting the Gilroy 2020 General Plan. Contained within the General Plan are 29 policies and implementing actions, as well as four mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts. State CEQA Guidelines section 15183 "mandates that projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan, or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site." The proposed project is consistent with the development densities in the Gilroy 2020 General Plan, as well as the previous general plan, which was consistent with the regional clean air plan. In
addition, there is nothing peculiar to the proposed project or its site that would warrant further analysis.

b,c. For specific plans, project air quality impacts are based on consistency with the CAP (BAAQMD 1999, section 3.9, pg 55). The most recent Clean Air Plan (CAP) published by the BAAQMD is the Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan and Triennial Assessment (December 2000). As discussed in Section 3(a) above, the proposed project is consistent with the development densities in the Gilroy 2020 General Plan, as well as the previous general plan, which was consistent with the regional clean air plan. And, environmental review has been completed with regard to any inconsistencies between the population projections of the current General Plan and the CAP (i.e., adoption of statement of overriding considerations). This project provides for higher density, infill development in a transit-oriented environment (TOD). According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, land use design is one of the most important considerations for reducing air pollutants. Automobiles are the greatest cause of air pollution within the air basin, and infill development within proximity to the CalTrain station, bike lanes and racks, sidewalks and pedestrian oriented streets, rear-situated parking, and access to goods and services both public (e.g., library, schools) and commercial (e.g., cafes, shopping) greatly enhances the opportunity for the City to provide housing with the least amount of air quality impacts.

The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin air pollutant attainment status is classified “Moderate Non-attainment” for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, “Non-attainment” for the state and federal one-hour ozone standard, and “Non-attainment” for the state PM10 threshold. The pedestrian-friendly TOD intent of the specific plan would serve to reduce potential air quality impacts and would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant or exacerbate an existing or projected air quality violation. Gilroy’s downtown area possesses function and aesthetic advantages, which favor pedestrian activity, including narrow lots, eclectic and varied land uses and a consistent human scale. The proposed project aims to enhance this existing, pedestrian framework. For example, the project strives to create a 24-hour atmosphere with residential and office uses above retail shops which will increase pedestrian traffic, safety, and consumer dollars. The plan also includes pocket parks or plazas to create additional downtown open spaces that may function as gathering areas, and community event space. Other considerations include façade improvements, signage, public restrooms, maintenance and enhancement of existing alleyways, additional lighting (streets, storefronts, and parking areas), redesigned streetscapes, higher density and mixed use projects, landscaping and public art, shared parking, and downtown shuttles.

d. The proposed project site is located adjacent to existing residences and includes many existing residential uses. Residences are considered sensitive receptors. The increased emissions created during construction of areas within the project site could expose these sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations, potentially resulting in an adverse impact on the health of the residents. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would substantially lessen the impact to a less than significant level.

**MITIGATION MEASURE**

The following mitigation measure shall be incorporated into grading plans for projects located within the Specific Plan area.

**AQ-1.** Developers shall specify in project plans the implementation of the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities for any proposed development. The
measures shall be implemented as necessary to adequately control dust, subject to the review and approval by the City of Gilroy Engineering Division:

The following measures shall be implemented at all construction sites:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily;
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard;
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites; and
- Sweep streets immediately (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

The following measures shall be implemented at all construction sites greater than four acres in area:

- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more);
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph;
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; and
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

The following measures are strongly encouraged at construction sites that are large in area, located near sensitive receptors or which for any other reason may warrant additional emission reductions:

- Install wheel washers for all existing trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site;
- Install wind breaks, or plant trees/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas;
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour; and
- Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time.
e. The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (table 4, pg 17) identifies types of operations that are potential odor sources (BAAQMD 1999). The land use designations in the Specific Plan area allow for uses that are typically not odor-generating. The enforcement division of the BAAQMD handles odor complaints. They BAAQMD keeps a record of odor complaints, and if warranted, will investigate the odor to determine the source and if its associated with any potentially hazardous air pollutants. If the odor is indicative of a hazardous air pollutant, the BAAQMD may require the facility to obtain the appropriate permits and mitigate the problem. The potential for the proposed project to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people is minimal.
## 4. Biological Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (1,3,5,6,7,29,30,31)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? (1,3,5,6,7,29,30,31)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? (1,3,5,6,7,29,30,31)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? (1,3,5,6,7,29,30,31)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (1,3,5,6,7,29,30,31)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? (1,3,5,6,7,29,30,31)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

a-d. The proposed project is located in a developed, urban area that contains ornamental vegetation. The site is not a known or potential corridor for wildlife and does contain any known wetland areas. Miller Slough, which meanders through the Cannery District of the proposed project, experiences seasonal flows that travel southeast into the Pajaro River, finally discharging into the Monterey Bay. There are no known candidate, sensitive, or special status species known to occur in Miller Slough within or near the project area. However, the steelhead trout (*Onchorhyncus mykiss*) in the South-Central Coast Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU) of the Pajaro River (located southeast of the project area), are considered a threatened fish species. In addition, the Monterey Bay is designated as a federally protected National Marine Sanctuary for the purpose of resource protection, research, education, and public use. Therefore, it is important that pollutants transported from the project area, especially the Cannery District, during operation and construction activities do not have negative cumulative effects on habitat or water quality of Miller Slough and its downstream path including the steelhead of the Pajaro River, and the quality of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Standard project conditions, as discussed in Section 8 Hydrology and Water Quality, would substantially reduce any potential adverse environmental impacts with regard to water quality to a less than significant level. It should be noted that direct impacts of the proposed project would not affect any known candidate, sensitive, or special status species to a level of significance.

e,f. The proposed project would not conflict with any policies that serve to protect biological resources. There are no conservation plans that apply to the project site or adjacent properties.
5. **Cultural Resources**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in section 15064.5? (1,3,5,6,9,19)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5? (1,3,5,6,7,9,19)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (1,3,5,6,7,9,19)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a. The occurrence of historic resources in the City of Gilroy is relatively high and generally clustered in areas where habitation has been concentrated from early settlement. The City has made efforts in the past to identify significant historic sites and neighborhoods and to designate certain structures, properties and neighborhoods as locally historic. Many of these historic sites occur within the project area including along Monterey Street and in downtown Gilroy (General Plan EIR, page 4.14-2), such as Old City Hall, the CalTrain transit station, and the Strand Theater. The City of Gilroy zoning map designates the area along Monterey Road between Fourth Street and Eighth Street as a Historic Neighborhood as well as a small portion of the site and immediately west of the site between Fourth Street and Sixth Street on the western side of Monterey Road as a Historic Neighborhood. Impacts to historic resources may occur if a structure or site that holds architectural or cultural qualities unique and cherished by the community is altered or eliminated. The City has zoning code and General Plan policies that are intended to reduce any potential adverse impacts to historic resources to a level considered less than significant. Section 27 of the City of Gilroy Zoning Ordinance addresses historic sites and historic neighborhoods. General Plan policies that address historic resources and would reduce any potential impacts to historic resources to a less than significant level include policy 1.06, 3.24, 3.30, 5.01, 5.02, 5.03, 5.04, 5.05, 5.06, 8.04, 8.05 and implementing actions 5.A, 5.B, 5.C, 5.D, 5.E, 5.F, 5.G, and 5.H. Any proposal to make a major exterior change to a significant historic structure requires a recommendation from the Historic Heritage Committee and must receive Planning Commission approval. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, a “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.” Future development projects within the Specific Plan area that may propose changes to an identified historic structure, or any structure 45 years or older, could result in a significant adverse environmental impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would be required.
MITIGATION MEASURE

CR-1. For projects proposing changes to a known historic resource or any structure 50 years or older, the City of Gilroy shall ensure that the City's Historic Neighborhood and Historic Site guidelines are followed as a component of the environmental review (CEQA) process for that proposed project. Any significant impact to a historic structure would be considered a significant adverse environmental impact according to CEQA and would require preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR).

b,c. The Ohlone, or Costanoan, are the local Native Americans that inhabited Gilroy (and the greater Bay Area) from approximately 500 A.D. (Gilroy General Plan EIR, page 4.14-1). Due to the historic cultural significance of the region, it is possible that artifacts, human remains, or other resources may be unearthed or discovered throughout the project site, especially during grading, excavations, etc. during construction activities. The Gilroy General Plan includes policy 5.07, 16.02, and implementing action 5.1 which serve to reduce potential impacts to cultural resources. To substantially reduce the potential adverse impact to a level considered less than significant, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

MITIGATION MEASURES

CR-2. Due to the possibility that significant buried cultural resources might be found during construction, the following language shall be included on any permits issued for the Specific Plan area, including, but not limited to building permits for future development, subject to the review and approval of the Gilroy Planning Division (pursuant to Gilroy General Plan Policy 5.07):

If archaeological resources are discovered during construction, work shall be halted within 50 meters (165 feet) of the find until a qualified professional archaeologist can evaluate it. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated and implemented.

CR-3. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the City shall ensure that the language is included in all permits in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e), subject to the review and approval of the City of Gilroy Planning Division:

If human remains are found during construction there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the coroner of Santa Clara County is contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendent (MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD may then make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further disturbance if: a) the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a MLD or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within
24 hours after being notified by the commission; b) the descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or c) the landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.
6. **Geology and Soils**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. (1) 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (1,5,6,7,23)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Strong seismic ground shaking? (1,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (1,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Landslides? (1,3)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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? (1,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property? (1,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

a. (1) There are no earthquake fault zones, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, in the Gilroy Planning Area.

(2,3) Seismic events can result in soil failure causing damage to structures and creating potential safety hazards to humans. The Gilroy Planning Area is within the highest seismic risk zone (Zone 4) designated in the Uniform Building Code. The southern region of the project site south of Ninth Street has a Moderately High seismic hazard, and the area of the project site north of Ninth Street has a Moderate seismic hazard (General Plan EIR, figure 4.9-3).
region of the project site south of Ninth Street is considered to have a Moderate liquefaction hazard, and the northern portion to have a Very Low liquefaction hazard level (General Plan EIR, figure 4.9-1a). The City requires a soils report for all new development applications to assess potential geologic hazards and to determine if these hazards can be adequately mitigated (General Plan Action 25.E). Conformance with this policy as individual development applications are presented to the city would provide the information necessary to mitigate any site-specific seismic risks. The City, as a standard practice, would condition the development projects with the recommendations in the required soils report. Furthermore, General Plan policies and actions that mitigate the potential adverse environmental impact to a less than significant level include policies 10.12, 18.03, 18.05, 18.07, 25.02, 25.03, 25.08, 25.09, 27.04, and actions 25.B, 25.C, and 25.E as identified above.

(4) The project site is relatively flat and does not contain any sloping that could pose a potential landslide risk.

b. Development projects within the proposed Specific Plan area are anticipated to involve grading and ground disturbance during construction activities. The City requires preparation and implementation of an erosion and deposition control plan (General Plan Action 25.F) that would substantially reduce this potentially significant adverse environmental impact to a less than significant level.

c,d. See 6, a., (2,3) above.
7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (1,5,6,7,37)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (1,17,35)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands area adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (1,17,35)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a-c. The project does not propose to implement any uses that involve the use, release, or transport of hazardous materials. However, the proposed project aims to redevelop the downtown core of the City and could result in demolition of structures to make room for new structures and uses. Many structures built before 1980 may have asbestos containing materials. Others may contain lead paint or other hazardous materials. This could pose a potentially significant impact to children at schools located within one-quarter mile of the project site, including Eliot Elementary, Glen View Elementary, Jordan Elementary, South Valley Middle School, and Brownell Middle School. To reduce the potential risk to human health from exposure, inhalation, or accidental ingestion of such potential hazardous materials, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented.
MITIGATION MEASURE

HZ-1. Prior to issuance of a demolition permit for any structures within the project area, the structure(s) shall be evaluated for occurrence of asbestos, lead, and/or other hazardous materials. The City of Gilroy Hazardous Materials Program would perform oversight of cleanup and investigation of hazardous materials and hazardous waste contamination.

d. A property within the project site is currently listed on the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) CORTESE and CalSites lists (www.dtsc.ca.gov, project ID number 43490064). The property is located at the northern corner at the block bounded by Monterey Road, Sixth Street, Old Gilroy Road, and an alley lying between Railroad and Monterey streets. The site was formerly used by PG&E as a gas manufacturing plant from about 1872 through the 1930’s. Gas manufacturing plants burned coal or fuel oil to produce the gas used to light street lamps, and which resulted in residue waste and lamp black waste powder known to be toxic. The plant was closed in 1943 when this form of gas was replaced with natural gas (Lynn Nakimura, DTSC, pers. comm., June 19, 2005). According to DTSC, the site has been used for a parking lot since 1987. DTSC has identified the site as a BKLG, or Backlog Site. The BKLG identification refers to a confirmed release site on which DTSC is not currently working on, but will be worked on when staff resources come available. A potentially significant adverse environmental impact could result if the site is disturbed or redeveloped with sensitive uses such as residences, schools, playgrounds or other centers for children. To reduce this potentially significant impact to a less than significant level, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented.

MITIGATION MEASURE

HZ-2. The contaminated site, located at Sixth Street and Monterey Street and that is included on the CORTESE and CalSites lists, shall be remediated to the satisfaction of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control by the property owner and/or applicant, prior to the issuance of any building permits associated with redevelopment of the site. Prior to remediation it is likely that a Phase I and/or Phase II environmental site assessment would be required.

e. The proposed project is not located within an adopted emergency response route, and would not alter access to the surrounding neighborhoods. The project would have no impact on adopted emergency response or evacuation plans.

f. The project site is not located in an area subject to wildland fire hazards.
8. **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water-quality standards or waste-discharge requirements?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete ground-water supplies or interfere substantially with ground-water recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., would the production rate of preexisting nearby wells drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 that would result in <em>substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site</em>?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 run-off in a manner that would result in <em>flooding on- or off-site</em>?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create or contribute run-off water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

a. The proposed project would result in construction of new structures within the project area, which would create additional impermeable surfaces, people, and vehicles that would result in the increase of urban pollutants such as oils, heavy metals, pesticides and fertilizers into the storm drain system.

Water quality is regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) through the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program, which was established by the Clean Water Act. The goal of the program is to control and reduce pollutants to water bodies from point and non-point discharges for both long term project activities and construction activities. The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues and enforces NPDES permits for discharges to water bodies in the portion of Santa Clara County that drains to the Monterey Bay.

Projects disturbing more than one acre of land during construction are required to file a notice of intent to be covered under the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated With Construction Activity for discharges of storm water associated with construction activities. The applicant must propose control measures that are consistent with this permit and consistent with recommendations and policies of the local agency and the RWQCB. Individual site, or small areas, within the project area would be redeveloped project by project over the course of about 20 years. Some sites may be less than, and some more than one acre. As previously stated, sites greater than one acre would be required to file the notice of intent with the RWQCB.

The State NPDES General Construction Permit requires development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that uses storm water “Best Management Practices” to control runoff, erosion and sedimentation from the site both during and after construction. The SWPPP has two major objectives: (1) to help identify the sources of sediments and other pollutants that affect the quality of storm water discharges; and (2) to describe and ensure the implementation of practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in storm water discharges.

Compliance with the requirements of the NPDES General Permit would substantially reduce the potential water quality impact to a less than significant level.

b. The City uses local groundwater of the Llagas Subbasin as its sole source of water supply. The City pays a groundwater user fee to the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD). The fee provides funding for operating costs associated with SCVWD's artificial recharge program and imported water program intended to offset aquifer overdraft and supplement basin recharge. The
artificial recharge program uses imported surface water (Federal Central Valley Project) via the San Felipe Water Project to supplement the natural recharge in the Llagas Subbasin. Imported water from the Central Valley via the San Felipe Project is needed to supplement local sources in order to meet future demands through year 2020.

The City of Gilroy’s municipal water system extracts water from the Llagas Subbasin via eight active groundwater wells scattered throughout the City. All wells are located on the valley floor and have a current supply capacity of approximately 15.5 million gallons per day (MGD) (10,700 gallons per minute [gpm]). The City’s water system has no current interconnections to any other water system. The City has planned for the construction of additional wells as demand increases.

In compliance with SB 610, the Water Supply Assessment Provisions of SB 610: Downtown Specific Plan Project (Carollo Engineers July 2005) was prepared for the proposed project, and approved by the City Council on August 1, 2005. SB 610 requires preparation and specific content of a water supply assessment for certain projects with a water demand of more than or equivalent to 500 dwelling units. The water supply assessment determined that the water demands of the proposed project were included in the projected citywide water demands in the city’s 2000 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), and in turn documented in the city’s Water System Master Plan. However, based on new information not available when the UWMP was prepared, the proposed project would demand approximately 120 afy of water more than accounted for in the UWMP. The SB 610 analysis states, “this assessment does not consider the increase in water demands to represent a significant impact on City-wide supply conditions, especially since the increase is largely offset by reductions of demands in other planning areas…” (Carollo Engineers, page 7). See Appendix A for the Water Supply Assessment Provisions of SB 610: Downtown Specific Plan Project (Carollo Engineers 2005).

The City has planned water capacity for the future development of the project area and therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not significantly deplete groundwater supplies.

c,d,g,h. The project area is currently developed with structures, roads, and drainage infrastructure. Any additional development, grading, or construction associated with implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant changes to the existing drainage pattern. Any impacts from development projects within the project area associated with alteration of site drainage and related erosion from site disturbance such as construction activities, would be substantially lessened to a less than significant level with implementation of General Plan policies 20.02, 25.11, and General Plan actions 20.B, 20.B, 25.E, and 25.F, as well as compliance with the NPDES permit requirements under the Clean Water Act. If future individual development projects within the project area are within 50 feet of Miller Slough, the developer would be required to comply SCVWD Ordinance 83-2 (or any replacement ordinance) permit requirements, administered by the Community Projects Review Unit, as a standard project condition. The project site is not in an area of flooding (Gilroy General Plan EIR, figure 4.10-2), and any increase in runoff due to decreased pervious surfaces on site has been accounted for in the City of Gilroy Storm Drainage System Master Plan (Carollo Engineers 2004).

e,f. Although the project area is primarily developed with urban uses, implementation of the proposed project may result in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces. Increased imperviousness of the site would increase the amount of water and polluted runoff that is conveyed to the City’s storm drainage system. The proposed project was accounted for in the
City of Gilroy Storm Drainage System Master Plan (Carollo Engineers 2004). The project area is located within the city limits and is planned for development. According to the 2004 Storm Drainage System Master Plan, the City has adequate capacity to accommodate the increased runoff from the project. Prior to approval of any development projects within the project area, the developer may be required to prepare and submit plans for storm drainage improvements consistent with the City of Gilroy Storm Drainage System Master Plan (Carollo Engineers 2004). Furthermore, the applicant would be required to pay storm drainage impact fees consistent with those identified in the City of Gilroy Utilities Traffic Facilities Fee Study (MuniFinancial 2004, pg 13). Finally, any construction activities within 50 feet of the Miller Slough drainage channel that runs through the project site would require permits from SCVWD pursuant to the district’s Ordinance 82-3 requirements.

i. The California Office of Emergency Services shows Andersen Dam and Reservoir located within approximately 10 miles of the project site. The Anderson dam-break inundation map indicates that most of the City of Gilroy would be flooded from a dam failure at Anderson reservoir. Flood flows released from failure of the dam would take approximately two hours to reach the project site. Each dam in California is inspected at least biannually by the State of California in accordance with state laws, regulations, and Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety under the FEMA National Dam Safety Program. Additional inspections are done in the case of an earthquake or other event that could jeopardize the integrity of a dam. These precautionary measures reduce the potential hazard from dam failure to an less than significant level.
9. Land Use and Planning

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community? (1,5)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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, zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (1,5)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a,b. The proposed project is intended to increase the attractiveness and identity of the downtown area, civic core, and city gateways identified as the project area. The proposed project was designed by the city with the intent to comply with all applicable goals and policies, and serves to address this area in need of redevelopment identified as an “area of special concern” in the City of Gilroy General Plan (page 3-24).
10. Mineral Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (24)</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a. According to the *Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Monterey Bay Production-Consumption Region* (Division of Mines and Geology 2000), the project area does not contain any known mineral resources.
11. Noise

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the general plan? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ✔ ❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ✔ ❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑ ✔ ❑ ❑</td>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a. The project area is urbanized and experiences train and vehicle noise, as well as other sources of noise. Noise generation and exposure to noise is generally of greatest concern for schools, hospitals and senior housing (General Plan, page 8-16, goal 26), which may or may not be implemented within the project area. The City has adopted permissible maximum outdoor and indoor noise levels for residential, commercial and industrial uses. It is possible that future uses within the project area would be subject to noise levels in excess of the City’s thresholds, especially along Monterey Street and near the railroad since they exceed some thresholds under existing conditions and are anticipated to exceed noise thresholds in some areas under general plan buildout (General Plan EIR, tables 4.7-4 and 4.7-6). The City may require the preparation of a noise impact study with future development applications for projects within the Specific Plan area. Based on the results of the noise impact study, the applicant’s project may be conditioned, consistent with General Plan policies 26.01, 26.02 and implementing actions 26.A, 26.B, 26.C, by requiring sound attenuation features to reduce noise exposure consistent with General Plan policies 26.03, 26.04, 26.05 and implementing action 26.D. Implementation of these policies would ensure that people within the specific plan area are not subjected to unacceptable noise levels.

b. Development within the Specific Plan area is not anticipated to result in project operations with excessive ground-borne noise or vibration. However, should future development plans include features that require construction techniques resulting in ground-borne noise or vibration, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented to ensure that any potential ground-borne noise or vibration impact is less than significant.
MITIGATION MEASURE

N-1. The City of Gilroy Community Development Department shall review development applications to determine if the specific project operations or construction activities could result in ground-borne noise or vibration. If ground-borne noise or vibration is determined to be possible, the city shall require the potential impacts to be studied and mitigated through the environmental review process (CEQA), prior to the approval of entitlements.

c. Construction activities associated with development projects in the project area would result in a temporary increase in noise levels above levels existing without the project. This could create a nuisance to persons within and adjacent to the project area. To reduce this impact to a less than significant level (consistent with City of Gilroy General Plan EIR mitigation measure 4.7-B), the following mitigation measure shall be implemented.

MITIGATION MEASURE

N-2. The following measures shall be incorporated into project plans for development within the Specific Plan area to mitigate construction noise, subject to the review and approval of the City of Gilroy Engineering and Building divisions: (Modified Gilroy General Plan EIR mitigation measure 4.7-B):

a. Limit construction activity to weekdays between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, and Saturday between 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM, with no construction on Sundays or City holidays;

b. Require that all internal combustion engine-driven equipment are equipped with mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment; and

c. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment as far as possible from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are near a construction project area.
12. Population and Housing

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (1,3,5,6,7)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a. The project could result in the addition of 1,576 residential units, potentially providing housing for approximately 5,358 persons over the course of 20 or more years. The population being induced from implementation of the proposed project is being evaluated for its impacts in this initial study. The mitigation measures in this initial study shall serve to mitigate any potential adverse environmental impacts incurred from the potential population increase. The proposed project is considered an infill and redevelopment project, which is the most efficient use of existing infrastructure and land resource, and may reduce the need for additional housing in areas that are more environmentally sensitive.

b. The proposed project would not result in the displacement of persons or homes.
13. Public Services

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or 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 following public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Fire protection? (1,5,6,7,16,17)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ✔ ❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Police protection? (1,5,6,7,16,17)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ✔ ❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Schools? (1,5)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ✔ ❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Parks? (1,5,14)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ✔ ❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other Public Facilities? (1,5,6,7,16,17)</td>
<td>❑ ❑ ✔ ❑</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a,b,e. The proposed project would not require any physical changes or new or altered facilities to fire, police or other public facilities to ensure adequate service. Fire department response travel time to all project areas is within the four-minute travel time threshold (Gilroy Fire Master Plan, pg 139-141). Applicants of future development projects within the plan area must have their application reviewed by the Building, Life and Safety Division for compliance with fire standards and the project conditioned to comply with those standards. The Gilroy Police Department is located in the Civic Center District of the project area, and emergency response would be within the Department’s threshold (Master Plan for Gilroy Police Facility 2004). The city is currently in the process of constructing a new, upgraded facility within the Civic Center District to meet the needs of General Plan buildout, which includes buildout of the proposed project. The Gilroy Library, funded and operated by the County of Santa Clara, is also within this Civic Center District, providing convenient access to all existing and future residents of the project area. The applicant of future development projects within the plan area is required to pay city-wide public safety impact fees. The payment of impact fees is considered full mitigation for any cumulative impact on these public services. The proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to fire, police protection, and other public facilities.

c. The Gilroy Unified School District (GUSD) provides public K-12 education to the existing and future residents of the project area. It is anticipated that the kindergarten through 12th grade student population will increase from about 9,700 (2003) to about 12,600 in 2027, which accounts for additional population associated with the project area. The GUSD student generation rates for multi-family dwellings are 0.20 for K-6, 0.05 for 7-8, and 0.08 for 9-12 grades (Gilroy General Plan EIR, pg 4.8-7). Over the course of buildout of the proposed project, which could take more than 20 years, approximately 315 elementary students, 78 middle school students, and 126 high school students (or a total of 519 students) could be added to the GUSD’s service population. GUSD school facilities are currently overcrowded and require the addition of modular classrooms (Specific Plan, pg 148). No middle school capacity is needed since it has been rectified by the opening of the Ascencion Solorsano Middle School, located off of Santa
Teresa Boulevard within Glen Loma Ranch, a couple years ago (Glen Loma Ranch Specific Plan EIR, 2005). Overcrowded High School conditions will be remedied with a new high school, Christopher High School, located on Day Road West (Gilroy Second High School EIR, 2005). Christopher High School has undergone environmental review and is in the design stage. It is the elementary schools that are of concern regarding overcrowding, and GUSD continues to augment existing elementary schools with portable classrooms to supplement this demand. GUSD is also in the process of designing a new elementary school site within Glen Loma Ranch that would assist with overcrowding in the existing elementary schools. Applicants of future development projects within the plan area are required to pay school district impact fees consistent with state law. State law prohibits a local agency from either denying approval of a land use project due to inadequate school facilities, or imposing school impact mitigation measures other than impact fees. The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (SB 50) sets the CEQA standard for full and complete school facilities mitigation. The proposed project would therefore, result in a less than significant impact on schools.

d. The City of Gilroy General Plan policy 16.01, Park Land Standard, states, “Maintain the City’s established standard of 5 acres of developed park land per thousand population.” However, the City of Gilroy Parks & Recreation System Master Plan (2004) acknowledges that the City cannot meet all of the community’s recreation needs by itself (pg. 57). The Gilroy Sport Park and other proposed parks will assist in meeting current and future park needs, but additional park acreage will be needed for future growth (pg 59). In 2004, the City calculated 107.59 acres of parkland owned and maintained by the City’s parks and recreation department. At General Plan buildout, it is anticipated that there will be about 409 acres of parkland, which meets the park acreage requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 population at the time of General Plan buildout (pg 59, table 12). Payment of impact fees for development projects within the project area would assist the city in their provision of park facilities and is considered full mitigation for any potential adverse impacts to parks.
14. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system? (1, 35, 36)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority for designated roads or highways? (1, 35, 36)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (1, 35, 36)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in inadequate emergency access? (1, 36)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in inadequate parking capacity? (1, 36)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with any City of Gilroy General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element policies? (1, 5)</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a,b. The Gilroy Downtown Specific Plan Transportation Circulation Analysis (August 3, 2005) was prepared for the City of Gilroy by Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. The report is included in Appendix B of this initial study. The following summarizes the findings of the traffic analysis.

The report analyzed 14 study intersections and three freeway segments for the following traffic scenarios during the AM (7:00 to 9:00) and PM (4:00 to 6:00) peak traffic hours:

- Existing Condition
- Background Condition (existing plus approved but not yet constructed projects)
- Project Condition (background plus project)
- Cumulative Condition (background plus project and proposed but not yet approved projects)

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

Under existing conditions, the study intersections and the study freeway segments all operate at acceptable levels of service. In addition, both of the unsignalized study intersections do not have traffic conditions that satisfy the peak-hour signal warrant under existing conditions. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended.
BACKGROUND CONDITIONS

Under background conditions, the study intersections and the study freeway segments would all continue to operate at acceptable levels of service. However, the PM peak-hour volumes at the Church Street/Sixth Street intersection are high enough to warrant installation of a traffic signal under background conditions, even though this intersection would operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) C. The peak-hour signal warrant sheets are contained in appendix D of the transportation circulation analysis in Appendix B of this initial study. The transportation circulation study recommends a traffic signal at Church Street and Sixth Street. The existing lane geometry could be maintained (a single shared left-/through/right-turn lane on each approach) and the signal could be operated with permitted left-turn phasing on all approaches. With implementation of this improvement under background conditions, the PM peak hour level of service would be improved from LOS C (21.6 seconds of delay) to LOS B (11.2 seconds of delay) and the AM peak hour level of service would degrade slightly from LOS A (9.8 seconds of delay) to LOS B (10.0 seconds of delay).

The City of Gilroy should monitor this intersection to determine when the traffic signal is required. An engineering analysis is recommended to evaluate the full set of traffic signal warrants. However, it is unlikely that this measure would be implemented prior to development beginning within the project area. Therefore, under the project conditions scenario presented below, it is assumed that this improvement has not yet been implemented.

PROJECT CONDITIONS

Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. estimated the magnitude of traffic produced by development within the project area, and the locations where that traffic would appear, using a three-step process: (1) trip generation, (2) trip distribution, and (3) trip assignment. In determining project trip generation, the magnitude of traffic drawn to and from the development is estimated for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. As part of the project trip distribution step, an estimate is made of the directions to and from which the project trips would travel. In the project trip assignment step, the project trips are assigned to specific streets and intersections in the study area. These procedures are detailed further in the transportation circulation analysis in Appendix B of this initial study.

Applying the appropriate trip general rates to the overall amount of new development projected under the proposed project indicates that the project would generate 2,038 trips during the AM peak hour and 3,962 trips during the PM peak hour. These project trips would be generated by new development throughout the project area. With buildout of the project area, the study intersections and the study freeway segments would all continue to operate at acceptable levels of service, with the exception of the Church Street/Sixth Street intersection, which would operate at unacceptable LOS F in the PM peak hour. This would be considered a significant adverse environmental impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-1. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Church Street/Sixth Street intersection. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:
a. Signalize the intersection;

b. Re-strip all four approaches to include a separate left-turn pocket and shared through/right-turn lane;

c. Remove parking on both sides of the street on each approach to the intersection; and

d. Modify signal phasing to include protected left-turn phasing on all approaches.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the LOS to decline to an unacceptable level shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.

The above analysis of project intersection level of service was supplemented with an analysis of intersection operations for selected unsignalized and signalized intersections. The intersection operations analysis is an important component of the process to evaluate traffic conditions at an intersection. Although calculated levels of service may appear adequate at some locations, traffic operations problems caused by inadequate storage space for vehicle queues could prevent the intersection from ever realizing the calculated level of service. When inadequate storage space becomes an issue, queues in one turn movement might spill into an adjacent lane and block traffic in that lane from proceeding through the intersection. Deficiencies were identified at several intersections. These deficiencies, along with mitigation measures to would reduce the impact to a less than significant level, are presented below.

Monterey Street/Leavesley Road. The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the northbound right-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn pocket for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

**MITIGATION MEASURE**

T-2. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Leavesley Road intersection. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Make improvements to the northbound right-turn receiving lane such that this movement could be restored to free-running operation. Such improvements could include (1) installing flexible land delineators along the wide solid white line that separates the receiving lane from the other lanes on Leavesley Road, or (2) extending a raised curb a short distance eastbound to clearly delineate the right-turn receiving lane from the from the other two eastbound lanes on Leavesley Road. These improvements would provide physical barriers that prevent drivers on eastbound Leavesley Road from merging into the receiving lane too early.

This improvement is not included in the City’s traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

Murray Avenue/Leavesley Road. The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the westbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn pocket for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.
MITIGATION MEASURE

T-3. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Murray Avenue/Leavesley Road intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second westbound left-turn pocket on Leavesley Road at Murray Avenue. This would require a second southbound lane on Murray Avenue, south of Leavesley Road.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

Church Street/First Street. The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the northbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-4. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Church Street/First Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Extend the existing northbound left-turn pocket on Church Street to 300 feet as shown in the City of Gilroy Traffic Circulation Master Plan. This would require removing parking on the east side of Church Street for about 400 feet south of the intersection.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the exceedance shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.

Monterey Street/First Street. The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the northbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour. In addition, the estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the eastbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-5. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/First Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:
Extend the existing northbound left-turn lane on Monterey Street by 40 feet. This may require modifications to the existing raised, median island on Monterey Street between First and Third streets. To reduce the occurrence of the eastbound queue blocking the Eigleberry Street/First Street intersection, a "Keep Clear" pavement legend could be installed at that intersection. These improvements would be an interim step to the ultimate improvements shown in the City of Gilroy Traffic Circulation Master Plan.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

**Monterey Street/Sixth Street.** The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the northbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

No physical improvements at the intersection are recommended under project conditions. This queuing condition would not cause a significant operational problem. In the downtown area, there are multiple signalized locations where the northbound left-turn movement can be made, so traffic will tend to balance among the alternative turn locations such that no single location is significantly worse than the others. Left-turn queues on Monterey Street at Sixth Street could be controlled by strategic placement of directional signs at downtown gateways. This would divert traffic bound for downtown parking facilities away from Monterey Street and onto Eigleberry Street.

**MITIGATION MEASURE**

T-6. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Sixth Street intersection as development occurs. Once the City determines that directional signs would assist with circulation in this area, the City shall require the first development resulting in the need for these signs to implement the strategic placement of directional signs at downtown gateways to divert traffic bound for downtown parking facilities away from Monterey Street and onto Eigleberry Street.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

**Monterey Street/Seventh Street.** The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the southbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

**MITIGATION MEASURE**

T-7. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Seventh Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:
a. Lengthen the existing southbound left-turn pocket by 90 feet. This improvement would require modifications to the existing raised median island on Monterey Street between Sixth and Sevenths streets; OR

b. Add a second southbound left-turn pocket. This improvement may not be feasible because it would require widening the road and adding a second eastbound lane on Seventh Street.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

Monterey Street/Tenth Street. The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the northbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour. In addition, the estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the southbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour. Also, the estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the westbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-8. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Tenth Street intersection as development occurs. The first major project proposed in the downtown that would generate more than 100 peak-hour trips shall be responsible for conducting a supplemental engineering study to identify, in more detail, the improvements necessary along the Tenth Street corridor to accommodate the recommended mitigation measures. In general, the anticipated improvements are as follows:

a. Add a second 150-foot northbound left-turn pocket to accommodate the projected maximum northbound left-turn queue;

b. Add a second southbound left-turn lane to accommodate the projected maximum vehicle queue in the southbound left-turn movement; both lanes should be at least 175 feet long; and

c. Lengthen the existing turn pocket should be lengthened by 75 feet to accommodate the projected maximum westbound left-turn queue.

This improvement would require widening the railroad crossing and widening Tenth Street between Monterey and the railroad tracks. The improvements at the Monterey/Tenth intersection should be coordinated with those recommended below at the Alexander/Tenth intersection. According to traffic collision data summarized in the City of Gilroy Traffic Collision Analysis Study, the intersection of Monterey Street and Tenth Street exhibits a higher-than-expected number of accidents. Additionally, the City has indicated that the intersection currently meets warrants for protected left-turn phasing on the Tenth Street approaches. The improvement that has been recommended at this location to address these conditions is the conversion of the traffic signal operation to protected left-turn phasing on all approaches.
This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

Alexander Street/Tenth Street. The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the southbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour. In addition, the estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the eastbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-9. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Alexander Street/Tenth Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

a. Lengthen the southbound left-turn pocket by 70 feet to accommodate the projected maximum vehicle queues during the peak hour. This can be accomplished by restriping the north leg of the intersection.

b. Lengthen the eastbound left-turn lane by 105 feet to accommodate the projected maximum vehicle queue in the eastbound left-turn movement. This can be accomplished by restriping the west leg of the intersection. However, this would require that the existing westbound left-turn pocket into the former Indian Motorcycle facility be eliminated. The improvements at the Alexander/Tenth intersection should be coordinated with those recommended above at the Monterey/Tenth intersection.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

Chestnut Street/Tenth Street. The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the southbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-10. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Chestnut Street/Tenth Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Extend the southbound left-turn pockets to provide 275 feet of storage space in order to accommodate the projected maximum vehicle queues in the southbound left-turn movement. This can be accomplished by restriping the north leg of the intersection.
This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

**Monterey Street/Luchessa Avenue.** The estimated maximum peak-hour vehicle queues for the eastbound left-turn movement would exceed the available storage space in the turn lane for that movement under project conditions during the PM peak hour.

**MITIGATION MEASURE**

**T-11.** The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Luchessa Avenue intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an exceedance at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second 100-foot eastbound left-turn pocket to accommodate the projected maximum eastbound left-turn queue. This improvement would require widening the west leg of Luchessa Avenue. This improvement makes up a portion of the ultimate improvement package shown in the City of Gilroy Traffic Circulation Master Plan for this intersection.

This improvement is included in the City's traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the exceedance shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement agreement with the City.

A summary of the impacts and mitigation measures presented above is contained in Table 13 of the transportation circulation analysis contained in Appendix B of this initial study.

**CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS**

The cumulative conditions include the project conditions plus proposed, but not yet approved projects in the City of Gilroy. Table 15 of the transportation circulation analysis contained in Appendix B of this initial study lists those projects. Development under cumulative conditions would result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips. The transportation circulation analysis evaluated cumulative conditions both with, and without, the proposed project. Two of the study intersections would operate at unacceptable levels of service under cumulative without the proposed project. Seven of the study intersections would operate at unacceptable levels of service with the proposed project. Deficiencies were identified at these seven intersections. These deficiencies, along with mitigation measures to reduce the impact to a less than significant level, are presented below.

**Monterey Street/Leavesley Road.** This intersection would operate at LOS D in the AM and PM peak hours under cumulative conditions.

**MITIGATION MEASURE**

**T-12.** The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Leavesley Road intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:
Add a second northbound left-turn lane and a second southbound left-turn lane. Implementation of these improvements would restore intersection operations to LOS C during both peak hours.

These improvements not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

**Murray Avenue/Leavesley Road.** This intersection would operate at LOS D in the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions.

**MITIGATION MEASURE**

**T-13.** The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Murray Avenue/Leavesley Road intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second westbound left-turn pocket on Leavesley Road. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS C during the PM peak hour.

This improvement is not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

**Church Street/First Street.** This intersection would operate at LOS D in the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions.

**MITIGATION MEASURE**

**T-14.** The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Church Street/First Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second westbound through lane, strip a second westbound lane on First Street west of Church Street, and remove parking on the north side of First Street west of Church Street. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS C during the PM peak hour.

These improvements are not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

**Monterey Street/First Street.** This intersection would operate at LOS D in the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions.
MITIGATION MEASURE

T-15. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/First Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second eastbound left-turn pocket on First Street at Monterey Street. This improvement may require First Street to be widened at the intersection. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS C during the PM peak hour.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the LOS to decline to an unacceptable level shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.

Church Street/Sixth Street. This intersection would operate at LOS F in the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions. Traffic volumes levels at the intersection are high enough under cumulative conditions to warrant installation of a traffic signal at this location.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-16. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Church Street/Sixth Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Install a traffic signal at this intersection. Restripe all four approaches to the intersection to include a separate left-turn pocket and a shared through/right-turn lane. Remove parking on both sides of the street on each approach to the intersection. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour.

This improvement is included in the City’s traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the LOS to decline to an unacceptable level shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.

Monterey Street/Sixth Street. This intersection would operate at LOS D in the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-17. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Sixth Street intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:
Restripe the east and west approaches (Sixth Street) to include separate left-turn pockets and shared through/right-turn lanes and eliminate curbside parking on Sixth Street near the intersection. Implementation of this improvement would restore intersection operations to LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour.

These improvements are not included in the City's traffic impact fee program, therefore, would be developer funded if no other funding mechanism is in place. Potential funding sources are identified in the Specific Plan.

Monterey Street/Luchessa Avenue. This intersection would operate at LOS F in the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions.

MITIGATION MEASURE

T-18. The City of Gilroy shall require a traffic impact analysis for any proposed development project within the project area that is expected to have an effect on the Monterey Street/Luchessa Avenue intersection as development occurs. The first proposed development that would result in an unacceptable level of service at this intersection shall design, finance, and implement the following improvements:

Add a second northbound left-turn lane, a free-running eastbound right-turn lane on Luchessa Avenue, and a southbound receiving lane on Monterey Street to accommodate the eastbound free right turn. These improvements would require widening Luchessa Avenue west of Monterey Street and widening Monterey Street south of Luchessa Avenue. Implementation of these improvements would restore intersection operations to LOS C during the AM peak hour and LOS D during the PM peak hour.

This improvement is included in the City's traffic impact fee program. Developers within the project area shall pay into the traffic impact fee program. The first development to cause the LOS to decline to an unacceptable level shall finance and construct the improvement, subject to reimbursement from the City through the traffic impact fee program.

c. Implementation of the Specific Plan is not anticipated to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature. The mitigation measures presented above are designed to decrease possible traffic hazards associated with an increase in traffic in the downtown area.

d. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access.

e. Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. conducted a downtown parking study for the Specific Plan. The parking study is available for public review by contacting the Gilroy Planning Division. The parking inventory (2005) for downtown Gilroy consists of 2,052 total parking spaces. This includes 1,238 public parking spaces and approximately 814 spaces located in private off-street parking lots. Approximately 37 percent of the public parking spaces are located at the Gilroy Transit Center. The other 63 percent of the public spaces include 530 on-street public parking spaces and 241 spaces in off-street public parking lots (parking study, pg iii).

The parking study concluded that the proposed project would require approximately 1,000 new parking spaces. Inadequate parking capacity is considered a significant adverse environmental impact. The draft Specific Plan (June 30, 2005) includes direction for maximizing opportunities for alternative forms of transportation including pedestrian access, bicycles (including bike racks), and public transit (including bus shelters, a possible downtown trolley/shuttle loop, and
increased connections to Greyhound service). The plan includes a discussion on parking lot design and screening, and includes standards for parking requirements within each district. The standards include reducing or eliminating the parking requirements in lieu of paying a fee. The funds collected would go toward acquisition and development of public parking facilities in the downtown (Specific Plan section V, Districts, Land Use, and Development Standards). Parking structures are encouraged in places that would be determined to be appropriate. Design guidelines are proposed for parking structures. Underground or tuck-under parking is recommended for at least 80 percent of on-site future project parking.

In addition to these directives in the Specific Plan, the following mitigation measures would assist to ensure adequate parking capacity.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

**T-19.** The City of Gilroy shall monitor the parking situation in the downtown. When determined by the city to be the appropriate time, the city shall develop a parking management plan that would include enforcement of parking hours and time limits. This program could begin within the downtown core area and expand to adjacent blocks as parking demand increases. The general effect of this parking demand program would be to ensure that on-street parking spaces are available during normal business hours for routine customer use, and encourage vehicles parking for longer periods to use off-street parking lots. The first stage of implementation should be on the following streets segments

a. Monterey Street between Third and Eighth;

b. Eigleberry Street between Fourth and Sixth;

c. Fifth Street between Eigleberry and Monterey;

d. Sixth Street between Eigleberry and Monterey; and

e. Martin Street between Monterey and the railroad tracks.

These are areas that currently exhibit parking occupancy rates of 70 percent or more of the existing supply. These areas likely would be the first to develop parking problems in the near term as future development and reuse of vacant buildings occurs in the downtown. From this first stage area, the scope of the program should be expanded outward as future development growth and parking conditions dictate.

**T-20** Adequate parking shall be provided in the Specific Plan area. The city shall determine the appropriate measures to accomplish this. Twenty-two potential sites, totaling approximately 20 acres, were identified in the parking study, which could be considered for future off-street parking facilities. Measures may include, but not be limited to the followings:

a. Provide one parking space per unit on-site for new residential developments within the downtown and be located such that 0.75 parking spaces per unit are available for use either on-street or in off-street public lots within the immediate vicinity (1-2 blocks) of the development.

b. Provide adequate employee parking in private, off-street parking lots for new commercial developments. These developments shall work closely with the city to
ensure that adequate customer parking is available within the immediate vicinity (1-2 blocks) of the development;

c. Identify and construct new off-street public parking facilities such as (1) developing parking lots east of Monterey Street behind the existing buildings and west of the railroad right-of-way, (2) acquire underutilized properties that have good street access for new public surface parking lots, and (3) designate some off-street parking facilities as long-term parking lots to accommodate the parking needs of employees and residents.

f. The following is a discussion of bicycle circulation, pedestrian circulation, transit service, and other traffic circulation issues.

**Bicycle Circulation**

Currently there is a lack of designated bicycle facilities within the study area. There are no north-south roads in the study area that have designated bicycle facilities. Similarly, with the exception of on Leavesley Road and on Tenth Street, there currently are no east-west roadways with designated bicycle facilities.

The bicycle transportation plan contained in the general plan and the City of Gilroy Draft Trails Master Plan indicate that a variety of bicycle facilities are planned in the study area.

Even with these planned bicycle facilities, there would be a discontinuity of east-west bike lanes between Leavesley Road and Tenth Street. Within the Downtown Specific Plan area, the Bicycle Plan proposes east-west bike lanes on Leavesley Road, Seventh Street, and Tenth Street. However, none of the proposed lanes would cross Monterey Street. Moreover, the only planned north-south bike lane near the Downtown Specific Plan area would be on Church Street. This would provide adequate regional access to the Specific Plan area for bicyclists, but there would be a lack of north-south bike lanes within the Specific Plan area to accommodate local circulation of bicyclists within the Plan area.

**Recommended Bicycle Facility Improvements**

The following recommendations are made to promote non-auto modes of transportation in the City and to accommodate bicycle travel within the Downtown Specific Plan area:

**Implement General Plan Bicycle Network.** The planned bicycle facilities proposed in the general plan should be built along with the Downtown Specific Plan to accommodate bicycle travel in the Specific Plan area.

**Develop Additional East-West Bike Lanes.** In addition to the bicycle facilities proposed in the general plan, it is recommend that additional east-west class II bike lanes be added within the study area. This could be accomplished by upgrading the proposed east-west bike routes (class III) to class II bike lanes. Good candidates for the upgrade to bike lanes include Third Street, I.O.O.F. Avenue, and Seventh Street west of Monterey Street. Bike lanes on Third Street would provide a good connection between the downtown area and the residential areas in the center of Gilroy. A bike lane on I.O.O.F. would connect the downtown area to the proposed bike lanes on Murray Avenue, which would connect to Leavesley Road and the north part of town. A continuous bike lane on Seventh Street would be particularly important because it would link the
Gilroy Transit Center with the planned bike lanes on Church Street, Hanna Street, Forest Street, and Chestnut Street.

**Develop Additional North-South Bike Lanes.** North-south bicycle circulation within the Downtown Specific Plan area could be accommodated by bike lanes on Eigleberry Street and on Railroad Avenue or Alexander Street. Angled parking should be replaced with parallel parking on streets where bike lanes will be installed.

**Exclude Bicycle Facilities on Monterey Street in the Downtown.** The traffic study recommends that Monterey Street not be designated as a bike route, as identified in the general plan. The narrow lanes and angle parking that is planned for Monterey Street in the downtown area would not create a suitable environment for bicycle travel. New north-south bike lanes on Eigleberry Street and/or Railroad Avenue (as recommended above) would offset any loss in bicycle circulation caused by the de-classification of Monterey Street as a bike route. This may require a general plan amendment.

**Install Bicycle Parking Facilities.** Bicycle racks and lockers should be installed where feasible in the downtown to accommodate employees and customers who bike to the downtown. Bicycle lockers should be considered in the automobile parking areas for use by employees. Bicycle racks should be conveniently located throughout the downtown for customer use.

**Share-Use Path Adjacent to Railroad Corridor.** The traffic study recommends that a share bicycle/pedestrian path be developed along the east side of the railroad tracks corridor to accommodate north-south bicycle circulation in the downtown. This path should be complimented with safety fencing along the railroad tracks to prevent bicyclists and pedestrians from crossing at uncontrolled locations.

**Pedestrian Circulation**

For the most part, sidewalks are found on both sides of the streets in the Downtown Specific Plan area. There are some locations where sidewalks are not available, mostly fronting unimproved lots. Sidewalks should be installed at these locations as development occurs.

The success of downtown businesses will, to some extent, rely on the ability of customers to get from their cars to the commercial uses in the downtown. Therefore, adequate pedestrian connections to future parking facilities will be necessary.

**Recommended Pedestrian Facility Improvements**

The following recommendations are made to provide safe and efficient pedestrian circulation within the Downtown Specific Plan area:

**Sidewalk Gap Closures.** Sidewalks should be built on any street segments that currently do not have sidewalks when the parcels fronting the gap are developed.

**Pedestrian Connections to Parking Facilities.** Most of the parking facilities that would serve businesses along Monterey would be located behind those businesses along Eigleberry Street or on the west side of the railroad tracks. It is recommended that direct connections between the future parking facilities and the sidewalks on Monterey Street be built. Wherever feasible, mid-block connections between Monterey Street and the parking facilities should be added so that
customers using the parking lots are not forced to walk around the block to access Monterey Street.

**Pedestrian Safety.** The future pedestrian facilities in the Specific Plan area (sidewalks and pedestrian paths) should be well lit to provide a safe environment for nighttime use. Crossing opportunities for pedestrians at the railroad tracks should be focused to controlled areas. This can be accomplished by installing fencing or walls along the railroad right-of-way that would force pedestrians to cross at the intersections where railroad crossing guards are available. Additionally, separate railroad crossing guards should be installed across the sidewalks to prevent pedestrians from walking onto the tracks when a train is coming. The existing railroad crossing locations in the downtown area should be maintained to promote adequate pedestrian circulation.

**Share-Use Path Adjacent to Railroad Corridor.** It is recommended that a share bicycle/pedestrian path be developed along the east side of the railroad tracks corridor to accommodate north-south pedestrian circulation in the downtown. This path should be complimented with safety fencing along the railroad tracks to prevent bicyclists and pedestrians from crossing at uncontrolled locations.

**Transit Service**

The northern portion of the Downtown Specific Plan area is well served by existing transit services. The Gilroy Transit Center is centrally located within the Specific Plan area. However, the southern portion of the Specific Plan area, south of Tenth Street is not served by any existing transit service.

**Transit Service Recommendations**

**Expanded Bus Routes.** The City of Gilroy should coordinate with the Valley Transportation Authority to determine the feasibility of implementing new or expanded bus routes that serve the southern portion of the Specific Plan area and to the future job centers at the south end of Monterey Street, near Travel Park Circle.

**Community Bussing.** The City of Gilroy and VTA are currently exploring the potential of adding local community bus service in Gilroy. It is recommended that the downtown area be included in any future community busing plans for the city.

**Other Traffic Circulation Issues**

The following recommendations have been included to address various traffic circulation issues within the Downtown Specific Plan area.

**Vehicular Circulation in the Core Downtown**

The vision of the Downtown Master Plan proposes a Monterey Street corridor that is much different than what is there today. By narrowing the streets, installing angle parking, widening the sidewalks, installing mid-block pedestrian crossings, and installing bulb outs at the intersection corners, Monterey Street will function more to accommodate local vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic bound for the shops and restaurants fronting Monterey Street. Because of this, it would be less desirable for use as a through route for traffic traveling between Leavesley Road and Tenth Street. Therefore, the through traffic that currently uses Monterey Street will shift to adjacent streets and alternate north-south routes.
Recommendations

**Eigleberry Street.** Eigleberry Street should be developed as a collector street to accommodate the traffic that is circulating within the downtown between Monterey Street and the parking facilities. By making north-south travel on Eigleberry more efficient, more Downtown related traffic would tend to use this as an alternative to Monterey Street for accessing parking facilities. New all-way stop control may be necessary at Third, Sixth, and Seventh Street in order to accomplish this. Directional signs also could be used to direct traffic to Eigleberry Street to access parking facilities. The signs could be installed on Monterey Street near Second Street, Third Street, Seventh Street, and Eight Street. This would tend to divert traffic bound for the downtown parking facilities off of Monterey Street before reaching the core downtown area.

**Church Street.** Improvements should be made to Church Street, to the extent feasible, to provide additional capacity in that corridor to accommodate the additional through traffic that might divert from Monterey Street.

**Chestnut Street.** With completion of the Chestnut Street bridge at Lewis Street, Chestnut Street would become a potential alternative to through traffic on Monterey Street.

**Freight Loading Zones.** With the future plans to narrow Monterey Street to a single lane in each direction, alternate accommodations for delivery trucks will be necessary. Loading zones should be installed on the side streets near Monterey Street so that trucks making deliveries to the businesses on Monterey do not stop on Monterey Street and block traffic.
15. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (1,5,6,7,10,13)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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? (1,5,6,7,10,13)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>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? (12)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (1,5,6,7,10,13)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? (1,5,6,7,10,13)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid-waste disposal needs? (1,5,6,7,10,13)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a,b,d-f. **Water Service.** The proposed project would be consistent with the development assumptions contained in the 2004 Water Master Plan. The project site and associated land use is within the boundaries studied and planned for in the 2004 Water Master Plan. The City of Gilroy has an adequate supply of water available to meet the total water demand of the proposed project. Section 8 Hydrology presents an expanded discussion of water supply.

**Wastewater Service.** The project site is within the boundaries studied and planned for in the 2004 Sewer Master Plan. Development of the project site was accounted for in preparation and
implementation of the 2004 Sewer Master Plan. The City of Gilroy, which is part of the South County Regional Wastewater Authority (SCRWA), has an adequate sewer capacity available to meet the total sewer demand of the proposed project. The downtown area is primarily serviced with older, six-inch diameter clay pipes, although the west and north of the project area the pipes tend to be newer and about eight inches in diameter. Any new development associated with the proposed project would tie into the existing system. The proposed project would not require new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

**Solid Waste.** Solid waste from the City of Gilroy is collected and disposed of by South Valley Disposal and Recycling. The waste has historically been sent to the Pacheco Pass Landfill, which was at 80 percent capacity in 2001. The landfill currently transfers much of their waste to Crazy Horse Landfill in Monterey County, which is expected to continue for the next 18 to 24 months. The Pacheco Pass Landfill is in the process of obtaining a permit to expand their existing facility (Freddy Lewis, telephone conversation with consultant, January 6, 2005). Development of the proposed project is expected to have a less than significant impact on solid waste services and facilities.

c. The proposed project does not propose construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project would construct storm water drainage facilities to connect to the cities existing infrastructure as planned for in the City’s storm drainage master plan.
16. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-Than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Does the project 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; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (1,5,6,7,19)</td>
<td>❑ ✔ ❑ ❑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the project 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.) (1,20,21,16,17)</td>
<td>❑ ✔ ❑ ❑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (1,37)</td>
<td>❑ ✔ ❑ ❑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

a. The proposed project would not have significant impacts on biological resources, habitat, or special status species. The proposed project may however, have potential significant impacts on historic structures within the project site from potential alternation, as well as the accidental discovery of unknown buried cultural resources. Mitigation is presented in Section 4, Biological Resources, to reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

b. The proposed project may have cumulatively considerable impacts with regard to air quality from construction emissions, water quality from storm water runoff, and population due to the potential availability of new housing stock. Mitigation is presented herein to reduce these cumulatively considerable impacts to a less than significant level. Cumulative impacts were also identified in transportation and traffic, as well as public service areas of police, fire, and schools. Mitigation measures presented, as well as the payment of impact fees, mitigates the project’s fair share of cumulative impacts. Therefore, impacts are not cumulatively considerable.

c. The proposed project would have the potential to cause adverse environmental impacts on human beings in the areas of air quality, hazardous materials, and water quality. Air quality may be affected by short-term construction emissions. Hazardous materials may pose an environmental impact if the former PG&E site is redeveloped prior to remediation. Water quality may have adverse impacts due to pollutants being discharged from the project site and entering the Miller Slough. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce impacts from short-term air quality, hazardous materials, and water quality to a less than significant level of impact.
E. Sources


3. Consultant knowledge of project area and site visit, May and June 2005.


37. California Department of Toxic Substances Website ([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov)).

38. California Department of Emergency Services Website ([www.oes.ca.gov](http://www.oes.ca.gov)).

All resources above indicated with bold text are available for review at the **City of Gilroy, 7351 Rosanna Street, Gilroy, (408) 846-0440** during normal business hours.

All documents listed above are available for review at EMC Planning Group Inc., 301 Lighthouse Avenue, Suite C, Monterey, California 93940, (831) 649-1799 during normal business hours.

**Persons Contacted**

Lynn Nakimura, Department of Toxic Substances Control, August 19, 2005

Doug Kolozsvari, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Specialist, June 28, 2005

Hing Wong, Association of Bay Area Governments, June 15, 2005

Gregg Polubinsky, City of Gilroy Community Development Department, Planning Division (staff planner assigned to this project), On-going