



FILED

JUL 31 2017

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
300 FOREST AVENUE
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950
TELEPHONE (831) 648-3190 • FAX (831) 648-3184

STEPHEN L. VAGNINI
MONTEREY COUNTY CLERK
DEPUTY

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Project Title: Transient Use of Residential Property Code Amendment

Lead Agency/Owner/Applicant: City of Pacific Grove/

Project Location: Citywide

APN: Citywide

Permit Type: Zoning Code Amendment

Project Description: The proposed project is an amendment to the City's regulations regarding transient use of residential property.

Public Review Period: 07/31/2017 through 08/30/2017 at 5pm

Address Where Written Comments Should be Sent:

Terri C. Schaeffer, Program Manager

City of Pacific Grove, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950

E-mail: tschaeffer@cityofpacificgrove.org

City's website


at

<http://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/living/community-economic-development/planning/ceqa-california-environmental-quality-act>

Negative Declaration

Notice is hereby given that the project described above has been reviewed in accordance with the State of California Public Resources Code, the California Environmental Quality Act, the Pacific Grove General Plan, and Title 23 (Zoning) of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code. Based on this review, a Proposed Negative Declaration is hereby made on this project. The reason for this determination is that the project will not result in significant adverse impacts to the environment. The proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study are on file at the Community Development Department, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, California, 93950 (831) 648-3190 and on the City's website at: <http://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/living/community-economic-development/planning/ceqa-california-environmental-quality-act>

A public hearing on the proposed Code Amendment and Negative Declaration is tentatively scheduled to be held by the City Council on September 6, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. at Pacific Grove City Hall, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950.


Mark Brodeur, Director
Community and Economic Development Department

7/31/17
Date

POSTED 30 DAY



CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
300 FOREST AVENUE
PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA 93950
TELEPHONE (831) 648-3190 • FAX (831) 648-3184

Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Project Title: Transient Use of Residential Property Code Amendment

Lead Agency/Owner/Applicant: City of Pacific Grove/

Project Location: Citywide

APN: Citywide

Permit Type: Code Amendment

Project Description: The proposed project is an amendment to the City's regulations regarding transient use of residential property.

Public Review Period: 07/31/2017 through 08/30/2017 at 5pm

Address Where Written Comments Should be Sent:

Terri C. Schaeffer, Program Manager

City of Pacific Grove, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950

E-mail: tschaeffer@cityofpacificgrove.org

City's website at <http://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/living/community-economic-development/planning/ceqa-california-environmental-quality-act>

Negative Declaration

Notice is hereby given that the project described above has been reviewed in accordance with the State of California Public Resources Code, the California Environmental Quality Act, the Pacific Grove General Plan, and Title 7.40 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code. Based on this review, a Proposed Negative Declaration is hereby made on this project. The reason for this determination is that the project will not result in significant adverse impacts to the environment. The proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study are on file at the Community Development Department, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, California, 93950 (831) 648-3190 and on the City's website at: <http://www.cityofpacificgrove.org/living/community-economic-development/planning/ceqa-california-environmental-quality-act>

A public hearing on the proposed Code Amendment and Negative Declaration is tentatively scheduled to be held by the City Council on September 6, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. at Pacific Grove City Hall, 300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950.


Mark Brodeur, Director
Community and Economic Development Department

7/26/17
Date

City of Pacific Grove Initial Study / Environmental Checklist

I. PROJECT SUMMARY

1. **Project title:** Transient Use of Residential Property Zoning Amendment
2. **Lead agency name & address:** City of Pacific Grove
300 Forest Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
3. **Contact person & phone number:** Mark Brodeur, Community & Economic Development Director
831-648-3189
4. **Project location:** City of Pacific Grove (citywide)
(see Exhibit 1)
5. **Project sponsor's name & address:** City of Pacific Grove
300 Forest Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
6. **General Plan designation:** NA (citywide)
7. **Zoning:** NA (citywide)

8. Project Description:

The proposed project is an amendment to the City's zoning regulations (Pacific Grove Municipal Code [PGMC] Chapter 7.40) regarding transient use of residential property.

Background. In 2016, PGMC Chapter 7.40 and Chapter 23.64 were amended by Ordinance 16-007 to regulate transient use of residential property within residential zones, and require those sites to hold an annual license from the City. The transient use licensing program, coupled with enhanced enforcement, was intended to regulate and control this activity. The City Council requested a review of the Short Term Rental Program based on the Code amendments in one year. The proposed ordinance would amend PGMC Chapter 7.40 in order to make the program more effective in accomplishing the City's objectives.

Analysis of Potential Environmental Impacts of the Project. This Initial Study/Negative Declaration ("IS/ND") evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed revisions to the City's regulations for transient residential use. Certain aspects of the proposed amendments do not require environmental analysis under CEQA. For example:

- CEQA does not apply to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges by public agencies unless those charges would be used to fund capital projects (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15273). Therefore, establishment or changes to City administrative fees associated with issuance of permits or licenses for the short-term rental of existing housing units do not require CEQA review.
- Inspections to check for performance of an operation, or quality, health, or safety of a project are exempt from CEQA pursuant to Guidelines Sec. 15309.

- City actions to enforce or revoke a license or other entitlement for use or enforcement of a law, general rule, standard, or objective, administered or adopted by the regulatory agency are exempt from CEQA review pursuant to Guidelines Sec. 15321.
- Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378, “Project” means the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. “Project” does not include “*Organizational or administrative activities of governments that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment.*” Therefore, some aspects of the proposed regulations represent administrative activities that are not subject to CEQA review.
- In evaluating potential economic or social effects of the proposed regulations, this IS/ND reflects CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15382, which states:

“Significant effect on the environment” means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant. (emphasis added)

Economic or social changes (such as a reduction in property values or effects on neighborhood social interactions) are not considered to be significant environmental impacts under CEQA unless those changes contribute to a significant physical impact. It is important to note that CEQA analysis represents one factor in the City Council’s decisions regarding transient use regulations; however, the Council may consider factors other than environmental impacts, such as economic or social impacts, in reaching its final decision.

Exhibit 2 summarizes the proposed changes to City regulations and the City’s determination as to whether these changes have the potential to result in physical environmental impacts, and therefore require environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA. Changes that could result in potential environmental impacts are analyzed in the Environmental Checklist and related discussion (Section II below), while those changes that are exempt from CEQA review for the reasons described above are not addressed further in this IS/ND.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:**

Various (citywide)

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**

California Coastal Commission

Exhibit 1 Project Location




Exhibit 2
Summary of Proposed Changes and Potential Environmental Impacts

Municipal Code Section	Proposed Changes	Do the Proposed Changes Have the Potential to Result in Physical Environmental Impacts?
7.40.010 Definitions	Eliminates the distinction between “Type A” and “Type B” short-term rentals based on whether the property owner resides at the site and the number of days per year the unit is available for short-term guests.	Yes. These definitions would be used in determining whether license caps and density limits are applicable and are analyzed in the Environmental Checklist in connection with Sec. 7.40.25 of the proposed ordinance.
7.40.020 Allowed Use	Subsection (b) Deletes an obsolete provision for the expiration date for licenses on March 31, 2017.	No. The proposed change would clarify administrative licensing requirements and would have no effect on the physical environment; therefore, no analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378)
	Subsection (c) Deletes a reference to different classes of licenses.	Yes. This change cross-references the definitions listed in Sec. 7.40.010 and is analyzed in the Environmental Checklist in connection with Sec. 7.40.25.
	Subsection (c) [formerly Subsection (d)] makes a clerical change in the name of an agreement.	No. The proposed change would make a clerical change to administrative licensing requirements and would have no effect on the physical environment; therefore, no analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378)
	Subsection (d) [formerly Subsection (e)] clarifies the review authority for inspection reports.	No. The proposed change would clarify administrative licensing requirements and would have no effect on the physical environment; therefore, no analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378)
	Subsection (e) [formerly (f)] amends notice requirements for license applications.	No. The proposed change would clarify administrative licensing requirements and would have no effect on the physical environment; therefore, no analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378)
7.40.025 License Caps & Density Limits	Subsection (a) eliminates the distinction between Type A and Type B licenses for purposes of the limit on the total number of licenses that may be issued.	Yes. These provisions are analyzed in the Environmental Checklist.
	Subsection (b) modifies the density limit for STR licenses.	Yes. These provisions are analyzed in the Environmental Checklist.
7.40.030 Limits on Transient Use	Deletes Subsection (h) regarding the maximum number of persons that may attend a gathering at a short-term rental property.	Yes. These provisions are analyzed in the Environmental Checklist.
7.40.060 Separate Properties	Deletes this section regarding separate STR licenses for each dwelling unit.	No. The proposed change would clarify administrative licensing requirements and would have no effect on the physical environment; therefore, no analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378)
7.40.060 Contents of Licenses (formerly	Subsection (b) eliminates the distinction between types of licenses	No. The proposed change would clarify administrative licensing requirements and would have no effect on the physical environment;

Exhibit 2
Summary of Proposed Changes and Potential Environmental Impacts

Municipal Code Section	Proposed Changes	Do the Proposed Changes Have the Potential to Result in Physical Environmental Impacts?
7.40.070)		therefore, no analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378)
7.40.070 Application - First License (formerly 7.40.080)	Subsection (b) clarifies license application requirements.	No. The proposed change would clarify administrative licensing requirements and would have no effect on the physical environment; therefore, no analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378)
7.40.110 Evidence of transient occupancy of residential property	Makes clerical revisions to procedural license requirements.	No. The proposed change would clarify administrative licensing requirements and would have no effect on the physical environment; therefore, no analysis is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378)
7.40.180 License denial or revocation	Makes clerical revisions to license denial or revocation procedures.	No. This provision would amend administrative license denial and revocation procedures and is exempt from CEQA review. (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15321)

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.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

Signature

Mark Brodeur

Printed name

Date

**Director of Community and Economic
Development**

Title

II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except 'No Impact' answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites 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 should be 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 must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must 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 With Mitigation Incorporated' applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from 'Potentially Significant Impact' to a 'Less Than Significant Impact.' The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain 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 may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are 'Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,' describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - 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 significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
I. AESTHETICS –Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
(a) Less Than Significant Impact. Exceptional scenic vistas are present in Pacific Grove. However, the City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects of the construction of new structures and remodeling of existing structures on these vistas. The proposed amendment would not change these requirements, nor would a change in the term of residential occupancy result in a substantial change to scenic vistas; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
(b) Less Than Significant Impact. Exceptional scenic resources are present in Pacific Grove. However, the City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects of the construction of new structures and remodeling of existing structures on these resources. The proposed amendment would not change these requirements, nor would a change in the term of residential occupancy result in a substantial change to scenic resources; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
(c) Less Than Significant Impact. Attractive visual character is a hallmark of Pacific Grove. Existing regulations require that transient use sites <i>(1) shall be used and maintained in a manner consistent with the character of the neighborhood, (2) shall not impair the desirability of investment or occupation of the surrounding neighborhood, and (3) shall not have displayed thereon any sign that indicates the property is used or available for transient or short-term rental purposes</i> (PGMC Sec. 7.40.030.c) and failure of owners to comply with these requirements shall be grounds for denial or revocation of a transient use license. These existing requirements substantially reduce the potential for transient use sites to degrade the visual character or quality of the surrounding neighborhood, and no change to these requirements is proposed; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
(d) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would not authorize any new development. The City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects of light and glare generated by residential uses. The proposed amendment would not change these requirements, nor would a change in the term of residential occupancy result in a substantial increase to light and glare; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:				
<i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)				X
d) Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
(a-e) No Impact. There are no agricultural or forestry resources in the city; therefore, the proposed amendment would have no impact on agriculture or forest resources. No mitigation measures are necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:				
<i>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.</i>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<p>(a–e) Less than Significant Impact. Air quality emissions are typically comprised of short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions.</p> <p><u>Short-term Construction Emissions</u> The proposed amendment would revise regulations for the short-term rental of existing dwelling units and would not authorize additional development. The City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects due to construction emissions. No new development would be authorized by the proposed amendment; therefore, the impacts on short-term construction emissions or odors would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are necessary.</p> <p><u>Long-term Operational and Mobile Source Emissions</u> The proposed ordinance would not authorize new development, change land use intensity or development standards, or result in a substantial change in vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT); therefore, there would not be a substantial increase in long-term operational emissions from area sources (e.g. energy use) and/or from mobile sources. Impacts to long-term operational and mobile source emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
<p>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</p>				
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, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
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?				X
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?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
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?				X
(a-f) No Impact. The proposed amendment would revise regulations for the short-term rental of existing dwelling units and would not authorize additional development. The City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects on biological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts and no mitigation measures are necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
(a-d) No Impact. The proposed amendment would revise regulations for the short-term rental of existing dwelling units and would not authorize additional development. The City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects on cultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts and no mitigation measures are necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) 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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
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?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
(a-e) No Impact. The proposed amendment would revise regulations for the short-term rental of existing dwelling units and would not authorize additional development. The City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects on geology and soils. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in significant impacts and no mitigation measures are necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	
(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would revise regulations for the short-term rental of existing dwelling units and would not authorize additional development, increase land use intensity, or result in a substantial change in vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT). The City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects related to greenhouse gasses. Therefore, potential impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) 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?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) 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, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
(a-h) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would revise regulations for the short-term rental of existing dwelling units and would not authorize additional development. The City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects related to hazards and hazardous materials. The nearest airport (Monterey Regional Airport) is approximately 3 miles east of the City limits. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impacts and no mitigation measures are necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
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 which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
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 runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X	
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	
(a-j) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would revise regulations for the short-term rental of existing dwelling units and would not authorize additional development. The City's existing development regulations codified in the Pacific Grove Municipal Code and Local Coastal Program adequately address potential effects related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, potential impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
(a) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would revise regulations for the short-term rental of existing dwelling units and would not authorize additional development. Therefore, the project would not physically divide established communities in Pacific Grove. No mitigation measures are necessary.				
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, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
(b) Less Than Significant Impact. Applicable land use plans, policies or regulations include the Municipal Code, the General Plan and the Local Coastal Program.				
<p><u>Pacific Grove Municipal Code</u> The proposed project would amend portions of Chapter 7.40 of the Pacific Grove Municipal Code to revise existing regulations for the short-term rental of residential property. These revisions would not result in significant physical impacts on the environment, as discussed elsewhere in this Initial Study.</p> <p><u>Pacific Grove General Plan</u> The Pacific Grove General Plan provides a framework for future growth and development within the city. The Land Use Element includes goals and policies calling for orderly, well-planned, and balanced development consistent with the historic nature of Pacific Grove, the capacity of the city's infrastructure, and ability to assimilate new growth. General Plan land use policies relevant to the proposed project include the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Policy 2. Ensure that new development is compatible with adjacent existing development.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Policy 3. Balance a property owner's ability to develop with the desirability of maintaining neighborhood character.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Policy 15. Encourage land uses that generate revenue to the City while maintaining a balance with other community needs, such as housing, open space, and recreation.</p> <p>Because the proposed project would not result in a change in land use or authorize new development that is not already permitted by existing regulations, it would not conflict with the goals and policies of the City's General Plan. In addition, short-term residential rentals are currently permitted by the City, and the proposed modifications to existing regulations would be expected to result in an overall reduction in the number of short-term rental units as a result of the elimination of Type B licenses. The following provisions are intended to support the compatibility of short-term rentals with adjacent properties and maintain neighborhood character:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Tenant contact information.</u> Existing regulations require that each contract or tenancy that allows transient use shall identify the name, address, phone and e-mail contact information of at least one responsible tenant who has been informed by the owner or owner representative of the occupancy, parking and other limits that apply to transient use. The owner is required to record the license numbers of tenants' vehicle(s) and must provide that information to the City 				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
<p>upon request. (Section 7.40.020.c).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Inspection Report</u>. The proposed revisions would require that upon initial license application and each renewal application, the property owner must submit an inspection report verifying that the property is in conformance with appropriate land use and building permits (Section 7.40.020.d). • <u>Use, maintenance and signs</u>. Existing regulations require that a transient use site (1) shall be used and maintained in a manner consistent with the character of the neighborhood, (2) shall not impair the desirability of investment or occupation of the surrounding neighborhood, and (3) shall not have displayed thereon any sign that indicates the property is used or available for transient or short-term rental purposes (Section 7.40.030.c). Failure to comply with these requirements are grounds for license denial or revocation (Section 7.40.180) • <u>License numerical limits</u>. The proposed revisions would establish a a cap and density limit on STR licenses (Section 7.40.025): • <u>Parking</u>. The proposed revisions would continue to require short term rental units to provide on-site parking, thereby substantially reducing potential impacts to the availability of on-street parking (Section 7.40.030.g). • <u>Limit on overnight guests</u>. Existing regulations establish limits on the number of overnight guests who may occupy a short-term rental (Section 7.40.030.f). No change to these existing regulations is proposed. • <u>Prohibition of commercial events</u>. The proposed revisions would prohibit auctions, commercial functions and similar events at a short-term rental property (Section 7.40.030.i) • <u>Limit on amplified sound</u>. The proposed revisions would continue to prohibit amplified sound that is audible beyond the property boundaries of short-term rental units (7.40.030.h) and would require that tenants be informed of noise limits (Section 7.40.030.b). • <u>Owner responsibilities</u>. Existing regulations require that owners shall use their best efforts, and respond in a reasonable and timely manner, to ensure that every occupant of the transient use site does not create or contribute to unreasonable use of the property, cause unreasonable noise or disturbance, engage in disorderly or unlawful conduct, or overcrowd the site (Section 7.40.030.d). Existing regulations further require that the owner or owner representative shall be on-call full time to manage the property (Section 7.40.030.e). <p>In addition, the proposed regulations would help to generate revenue for the City in conformance with Policy 15.</p> <p>These provisions of the proposed amendment would substantially reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.</p> <p><u>Pacific Grove Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan</u></p> <p>The City of Pacific Grove is located in the coastal zone as defined by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan (LUP) is required under the provisions of the California Coastal Act of 1976, as amended, for all areas within the state's coastal zone. The LUP for Pacific Grove was adopted by the City Council on June 7, 1989, as an element of the City's General Plan and consists of a land use plan, zoning ordinance, zoning district maps and other ordinances, which when taken together, meet the requirements of, and implement the provisions and policies of the Coastal Act at the local level.</p> <p>The Coastal Act requires that lower cost visitor and recreational facilities be protected, encouraged and, where feasible, provided, and gives preference to development providing public recreational opportunities (Section 30213). Because the proposed amendment would continue to allow short-term</p>				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
lodging opportunities for coastal visitors in private residences, it would be consistent with the City's LUP and CCC policies promoting access to the city's beaches. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the LUP and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
(c) No Impact. There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans in effect within the city. No impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
(a-b) No Impact. No known mineral resources are located within the City of Pacific Grove nor designated in the City's General Plan or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on mineral resources. No mitigation is required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
(a-d) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would not authorize new development or change existing regulations regarding construction or mechanical equipment noise. However, potential noise impacts could occur if occupants were to engage in activities or behavior that is disruptive to adjacent residents, such as shouting or playing loud music outdoors. It is not possible to				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
<p>quantify or predict in any meaningful way the differences between long-term residents and short-term tenants with regard to human-generated noise. However, in order to address this concern, the proposed regulations continue to include the following provisions intended to minimize such noise impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Limit on overnight guests.</u> Existing regulations establish limits on the number of overnight guests who may occupy a short-term rental (Section 7.40.030.f). No change to these existing regulations is proposed. • <u>Prohibition of commercial events.</u> The proposed revisions would prohibit auctions, commercial functions and similar events at a short-term rental property (Section 7.40.030.i) • <u>Limit on amplified sound.</u> The proposed revisions would prohibit amplified sound that is audible beyond the property boundaries of short-term rental units (7.40.030.h) and would require that tenants be informed of noise limits (Section 7.40.030.b). • <u>Owner responsibilities.</u> Existing regulations require that owners shall use their best efforts, and respond in a reasonable and timely manner, to ensure that every occupant of the transient use site does not create or contribute to unreasonable use of the property, cause unreasonable noise or disturbance, engage in disorderly or unlawful conduct, or overcrowd the site (Section 7.40.030.d). Existing regulations further require that the owner or owner representative shall be on-call full time to manage the property (Section 7.40.030.e). <p>These provisions would substantially reduce potential noise impacts to a level that is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.</p>				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
(e-f) No Impact. The project area is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, no noise impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
(a-c) No Impact. The proposed amendment would not authorize new development or induce substantial population growth. No existing housing units or people would be displaced as a result of the amendment. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact housing and population. No mitigation is required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 public services:				
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?				X
Parks?			X	
Other public facilities?			X	
Less than Significant Impact. As noted in Section X.b (Land Use and Planning), the proposed amendment would continue to impose regulations on the short-term rental of residential units such as limits on the number and density of short-term rental licenses, the number of occupants, the number of vehicles, and noise. Existing regulations require that the property owner or representative be on-call full-time to manage the property. These provisions would substantially reduce potential impacts on fire protection, police protection, parks and other public facilities to a level that is less than significant. Because short-term tenants do not attend local schools, no impact on schools would occur. No mitigation is required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	
(a-b) Less Than Significant Impact. Short-term rental of residential units is currently permitted in the city subject to licensing requirements. The proposed amendment would impose more restrictive				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
regulations on the number and density of short-term rental licenses. The amendment would not authorize additional development or increase land use intensity; therefore, potential impacts on existing parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation is necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC –				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system. Including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			X	
(a-f) Less than Significant Impact. Short-term residential rentals are currently permitted in the City subject to obtaining a transient use license. The proposed amendment would not authorize new development and would impose more restrictive regulations on the short-term rental of residential units such as limits on the number and density of short-term rental licenses, the number of occupants, and parking requirements. Therefore potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				X
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				X
(a-b) No Impact. Short-term rental of residential units is currently permitted in the city subject to licensing requirements. The proposed amendment would not authorize additional development or increase land use intensity; therefore, no impacts to tribal cultural resources would occur and no mitigation is necessary.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) 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?			X	
c) 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?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
(a-g) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would revise existing regulations for the short-term rental of residential units. No new development or increase in land use intensity would be authorized by the proposed amendment; therefore, impacts to utilities and service systems would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Not applicable
XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
No Impact. The proposed amendment would modify current regulations for the short-term rental of existing residential units located in developed areas. Because no new construction would be authorized by the amendment, no impacts to fish and/or wildlife species or historical resources would occur.				
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)?			X	
Less than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would modify current regulations for the short-term rental of existing residential units located in developed areas. No new construction would be authorized by the amendment, and the proposed regulations would be more restrictive than currently exist with respect to the number and occupancy of short-term rentals; therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
Less than Significant Impact. The proposed amendment would modify current regulations for the short-term rental of existing residential units located in developed areas. No new construction would be authorized by the amendment, and the proposed regulations would be more restrictive than currently exist with respect to the number and occupancy of short-term rentals. Therefore, potential impacts on human beings, either direct or indirect, would be less than significant.				