Notice of Exemption
City of King

To: ☒ Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814 (Address)

☒ County Clerk
County of Monterey

From: (Public Agency): City of King
212 S. Vanderhurst Ave
King City, CA 93930

Project Title: Zone Text Amendment Case No. ZON26-000003 (Seasonal Employee Housing Ordinance Amendment)

Project Location: Citywide, King City, CA 93930

Project Location - City: City of King Project Location - County: Monterey County

Description of Nature, Purpose, and Beneficiaries of Project: The Ordinance No. 2026-845 is a zoning text amendment to Title 17, Chapter 17.79 (Seasonal Employee Housing) of the King City Municipal Code. The amendment removes local discretionary barriers and aligns the City's local development standards with the California Employee Housing Act (Health and Safety Code Section 17000 et seq.) and the Fair Employee and Housing Act. It standardizes review processes to match state-mandated allowances for seasonal employee housing. The amendment does not change the applicable zoning designations or zoning densities for seasonal employee housing. The amendment is intended to align the City's regulations with State law and does not authorize a change in land use or density beyond what is already permitted under the City's existing General Plan and Zoning Code.

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: City Council of the City of King

Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project: City of King

Exempt Status: (check one)
☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);
☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
☒ Categorical Exemption. **CEQA Guidelines 15378(b)(5) Organizational or Administrative Activity; alternatively, CEQA Guidelines 15061(b)(3) Common Sense Exemption**
☐ Statutory Exemptions. State Code Number:

Reasons why project is exempt: CEQA. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code section 21065 and CEQA Guidelines section 15378(a), the City Council finds that this Ordinance amendment is not a "project" because its adoption is an organizational or administrative activity of the City under CEQA Guidelines section 15378(b)(5) that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment. Accordingly, this Ordinance amendment is not subject to CEQA. Also, even if this Ordinance amendment qualified as a "project" subject to CEQA, the City Council finds that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3), there is no possibility that this project will have a significant impact on the physical environment. This Ordinance merely consists of text amendments to the King City Municipal Code to ensure compliance and alignment with State of California laws governing agricultural employee housing, such as Health and Safety Code Section 17000 et seq., known as the Employee Housing Act. It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility this Ordinance's administrative amendments to the King City Municipal Code directly or indirectly authorize or approve any reasonably foreseeable physical change(s) to the environment. Accordingly, the City Council finds that adoption of this Ordinance amendment is exempt from CEQA under the general rule.

In the alternative, even if the Ordinance amendment is not exempt from further environmental review or documentation based upon CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3), the environmental impacts of establishing seasonal employee housing standards, amending Title 17, and implementing Chapter 17.79 were previously fully evaluated in the City's prior Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS-ND)

adopted for Case Nos. GPA 2018-001, ZC 2018-001, and ZC 2018-002. Here, the zoning designations and densities authorizing the building of seasonal employee housing are not changing; rather, the Ordinance is being amended to ensure compliance and alignment with State of California laws governing agricultural employee housing, such as Health and Safety Code Section 17000 et seq., known as the Employee Housing Act. Thus, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15162, the Ordinance amendment does not require any additional environmental review or documentation since on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, there is no evidence establishing one or more of the following exists:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous negative declaration; or

(B) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Further, even if the Ordinance amendment is not exempt from further environmental review or documentation based upon CEQA Guidelines section 15162, the City Council finds the Ordinance amendment is consistent with the City's General Plan, General Plan Environmental Impact Report, Historic Downtown Revitalization Plan, Adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration, and is absolved of further environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15183 since the Ordinance amendment does not alter the zoning nor zoning density contained within the General Plan and/or Historic Downtown Revitalization Plan for the FSC zone, which continues to allow seasonal employee housing and multi-family housing to be built. Also, there is no substantial evidence establishing (1) the existence of project-specific impacts "peculiar" to the project or its site; (2) a significant impact not evaluated in the prior EIR or plan; (3) significant off-site or cumulative impacts not evaluated in the prior EIR; and/or (4) a showing that previously identified impacts are more severe based on new information not known when the prior EIR was certified.

Lastly, even if the Ordinance amendment is not exempt from further environmental review or documentation based upon CEQA Guidelines section 15183, new seasonal employee housing or agricultural employee housing, projects, as well as projects consisting exclusively of repair or maintenance of existing agricultural employee housing, are now exempt from CEQA review, streamlining the creation of safe, affordable dwellings for agricultural workers. (See Public Resources Code § 21080.44 and Health and Safety Code § 17021.8; See also Public Resources Code § 21080.66.) As such, the Ordinance amendment is exempt from further environmental review since it does not alter the zoning nor density of the parcels within the FSC zone and continues to allow for the building of seasonal employee housing.

Therefore, based on the above, the proposed Ordinance amendment is not subject to further environmental review or documentation.

Lead Agency: City of King, 212 S. Vanderhurst Avenue, King City, CA 93930

Contact Person: Area Code/Telephone/Extension: Jose Arreola, City Manager, 831-386-5917

If filed by applicant:

Notice of Exemption
City of King

1. Attach certified document of exemption finding.
2. Has a Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Signature: _____ Date: September 10, 2026
Title: City Manager

☒ Signed by Lead Agency
☐ Signed by Applicant

Date received for filing at OPR: n/a