

MAJOR TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT STUDY

TASK 11 DRAFT

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING TECHNICAL REPORT

Prepared By

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Submitted to

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

April 1, 1998

-

ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING TECHNICAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Major Transportation Investment Study	1-1
1.2 Project Location	1-2
1.3 Project Alternatives	1-2
1.4 Purpose of this Report	1-4
1.5 Summary of Environmental Screening	1-5
1.6 Remainder of the Report	1-5
2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING METHODOLOGY	2-1
2.1 Land Use and Socioeconomic	2-1
2.2 Cultural Resources	2-1
2.3 Noise and Vibration	2-1
2.4 Visual Impacts	2-2
2.5 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	2-2
2.6 Public Safety	2-2
2.7 Air Quality	2-3
2.8 Biological and Natural Resources	2-3
2.9 Potential Contaminants	2-3
2.10 Energy	2-4
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	3-1
3.1 Land Use and Socioeconomic	3-1
3.2 Cultural Resources	3-22
3.3 Noise and Vibration	3-27
3.4 Visual Resources	3-42
3.5 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	3-49
3.6 Public Safety	3-51
3.7 Air Quality	3-53
3.8 Biological Resources	3-56
3.9 Natural Resources and Hazards	3-71
3.10 Potential Contaminants	3-73
3.11 Energy	3-91

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
4.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF MTIS ALTERNATIVES	4-1
4.1 Land Use and Socioeconomic	4-1
4.2 Cultural Resources	4-12
4.3 Noise and Vibration	4-21
4.4 Visual Resources	4-33
4.5 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	4-55
4.6 Public Safety	4-65
4.7 Air Quality	4-70
4.8 Biological Resources	4-79
4.9 Natural Resources and Hazards	4-91
4.10 Potential Contaminants	4-95
4.11 Energy	4-102
5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES	5-1
5.1 Comparison of Build Alternatives	5-1
5.2 Comparison of Build Alternatives Impact on the Environment	5-1
5.3 Conclusions of the Environmental Screening Exercise	5-2
6.0 FUTURE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS REQUIRED	6-1
6.1 Land Use and Socioeconomic	6-2
6.2 Cultural Resources	6-2
6.3 Noise And Vibration	6-3
6.4 Visual Impacts	6-3
6.5 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space	6-3
6.6 Public Safety	6-4
6.7 Air Quality	6-4
6.8 Biological and Natural Resources	6-4
6.9 Potential Contaminants	6-5
6.10 Energy	6-5
6.11 Construction Period Impacts	6-6

APPENDICES

A	References
B	Caltrans Environmental Process Flow Chart
C	Format and Contents of a DEIS/DEIR

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
3-1 Corridor Study Area Community Boundaries	3-2
3-2 Existing Land Uses	3-3, 3-4, and 3-5
3-3 Rail Alignment through the Pogonip Open Space Preserve	3-9
3-4 Santa Cruz Historic Properties	3-26
3-5 Noise and Vibration Measurement Locations, Area Base Map A	3-34
3-6 Noise and Vibration Measurement Locations, Area Base Map B	3-35
3-7 Noise and Vibration Measurement Locations, Area Base Map C	3-36
3-8 Train Vibration Levels	3-41
3-9 Existing Biological Resources	3-58, 3-59, and 3-60
3-10 Potential Contaminated Sites Panel Overview Map	3-74
3-11 Potential Contamination Site Map Panel #1	3-75
3-12 Potential Contamination Site Map Panel #2	3-76
3-13 Potential Contamination Site Map Panel #3	3-77
3-14 Potential Contamination Site Map Panel #4	3-78
3-15 Potential Contamination Site Map Panel #5	3-79
3-16 Potential Contamination Site Map Panel #6	3-80
3-17 Potential Contamination Site Map Panel #7	3-81
Photograph 1 Manresa State Beach Looking North	3-43
Photograph 2 SP/UP Bridge Across Soquel Creek in Capitola	3-43
Photograph 3 Trestle Bridge over Bush Gulch in Rio Del Mar	3-44
Photograph 4 Aptos Golf Course from Highway 1	3-44
Photograph 5 Agricultural Lands near Watsonville	3-45
Photograph 6 Onion Fields off San Andreas Road	3-45
Photograph 7 Santa Cruz Boardwalk and Beach	3-46
Photograph 8 Development south of Manresa State Beach	3-46
Photograph 9 Railroad Trestle over San Lorenzo River in Santa Cruz	3-48
Photograph 10 Railroad Trestle over Soquel Creek	3-48
4-0 Noise Impact Criteria	4-22
4-1 Photo Illustration of DMU adjacent to Harvey West Park	4-42
4-2 Rendering of COG/DMU entering the Pogonip	4-43
4-3 Rendering of COG/DMU in Pogonip on Viaduct Structure	4-44
4-4 Rendering of COG/DMU in Pogonip on Trestle Structure	4-45
4-5 Photo Illustration of COG/DMU at the top of the Pogonip	4-46
4-6 Photo Illustration of COG/DMU adjacent to Spring Street	4-47
4-7 Photo Illustration of COG/DMU adjacent to Hagar Drive	4-48
4-8 Photo Illustration of DMU on Front Street	4-51
4-9 Photo Illustration of Busway, west of Capitola	4-52
4-10 Photo Illustration of Busway, west of Capitola	4-53

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1-1 Comparison of Build Alternatives	1-6
3-1 Social Characteristics of Project Study Area by Community	3-6
3-2 Historic Properties in Study Area	3-25
3-3 Definitions of Acoustical Terms	3-28
3-4 Typical Sound Levels in the Environment and Industry	3-29
3-5 Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environment	3-32
3-6 Results of Short-Term Noise Measurements	3-37
3-7 Representative Vibration Spectra for Train Passages	3-40
3-8 Railroad Crossing in Project Corridor	3-52
3-9 Major Criteria Pollutants	3-54
3-10 Federal and State Air Quality Standards	3-55
3-11 Sensitive Species	3-68
3-12 Potential Contaminant Sites Identified By Federal and State Databases	3-84
4-1 Land Use Categories and Metrics for Transit Noise Impact Criteria	4-23
4-2 FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria	4-25
4-3 Ground-Borne Vibration and Noise Impact Criteria	4-26
4-4 Noise Measurement Locations Showing Existing and Project-Generated L _{dn} and Impact Category	4-30
4-5 Impacts to Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, Alternative 3	4-57
4-6 Impacts to Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, Alternative 4	4-59
4-7 Impacts to Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, Alternative 5	4-61
4-8 Impacts to Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, Alternative 6	4-63
4-9 Impacts to Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, Alternative 7	4-64
4-10 Railroad Crossings in Project Corridor	4-66
4-11 Estimated Year 2015 Emissions of ROG	4-74
4-12 Estimated Year 2015 Emissions of Nox	4-75
4-13 Estimated Year 2015 Emissions of PM	4-76
4-14 Estimated Year 2015 Emissions of CO	4-77
4-15 Summary of Emissions Changes from Baseline	4-78
4-16 Hazardous Materials Assessment, Potential Contaminant Sites Identified by Federal & State Databases	4-97
4-17 Annual Direct Energy Consumed	4-104
4-18 Indirect Energy Analysis	4-108
5-1 Comparison of Build Alternatives	5-3
5-2 Comparison (Rating) of Build Alternatives	5-6