IV. REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

The section presents corrections and clarifications that have been made to the text of the Draft EIR. These changes include revisions resulting from specific responses to comments and staff-initiated text changes to correct non-substantive errors. The text revisions are organized by section and page number as they appear in the Draft EIR and Recirculated Draft EIR. Text deleted from the Draft EIR is shown in ~~strikethrough~~, and new text is <u>underlined</u>. For corrections resulting from a response to a comment on the Draft EIR, references in parentheses refer to the topical response or comment letter and comment number.

SECTION II, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The text on page II-5 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Topical Response 5):

> **<u>"Mitigation Measure IV.A-3: Relocation of Units # 1-4</u>**
>
> <u>To reduce impacts related to Aesthetics, Unit # 1 (the unit nearest Fassler Avenue) shall be moved to the southeast of the parking garage; Units # 2-4 shall be moved northwards towards the amphitheatre; and the height of Unit # 2 shall be limited to one story."</u>

The text in the first bullet under Mitigation Measure IV.B-6 on page II-12 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment C-3):

> "Prohibit the use of highly undesirable species in landscape improvements on the site which could spread into the adjacent open space areas. Unsuitable species include: blue gum eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus globulus*), acacia (*Acacia* spp.), pampas grass (*Cortaderi* spp.), broom (*Cytisus* spp. and *Genista* spp.), gorse (*Ulex europaeus*), bamboo (*Bambusa* spp.), giant reed (*Arundo donax*), English ivy (*Hedera helix*), German ivy (*Senecio milanioides*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*), cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster pannosus*), fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), and periwinkle (*Vinca* spp.), among others identified <u>in the list of "Invasive Non-Native Species" maintained by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area[1] and</u> in the CalEPPC List.[2] This restriction on use of highly undesirable species in landscaping shall be included as a requirement in the CC&Rs for the project."

---

[1] *Golden Gate National Recreation Area, 2006, List of Invasive Non-Native Species for Which Removal within Golden Gate National Recreation Area is a Priority, March.*

[2] *California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 2006, Ibid.*

The text on page II-14 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-29):

> **"MM-IV.C-2: Archaeologist Oversight**
>
> A qualified archaeological monitor (which could include the construction foreman if appropriately trained by an archaeological monitor) shall be present during any and all ground-disturbing activities that occur in association with the project, including any utility and sewer hookups within the public streets. "

The text on page II-16 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment P-8):

> **"MM IV.D-2: Geotechnical Consultant Involvement**
>
> All geotechnical aspects of the proposed project and preliminary development of plans shall continue to be evaluated by the project geotechnical consultant. A letter from the project geotechnical consultant shall be submitted to the City ~~and submitted to the City for peer review as necessary. Peer review shall verify the approval of all geotechnical aspects of the site development layout, project geotechnical feasibility, and conformance with the geotechnical consultant's design recommendations,~~ that confirms it has reviewed all geotechnical aspects of the proposed site development layout, verifies project geotechnical feasibility, and verifies conformance with the geotechnical consultant's design recommendations made to ensure less-than-significant seismic impacts.
>
> ~~In addition, preparation of a single geotechnical engineering report, containing all recommended geotechnical design criteria for the project, shall be prepared no later than acceptance of detailed plans. This report shall be submitted to the City for peer review and acceptance by the City Geotechnical Consultant.~~"

SECTION III, PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The first paragraph on page III-1 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows:

> "The project applicant proposes to construct 34 residential units, a subterranean parking garage, and associated amenities in the western two acres of the proposed project site. The proposed project would include the following actions and approvals: a General Plan Amendment for the western parcel of the project site from the Open Space Residential to the Low Density Residential General Plan designation; rezoning from P-D with a HPD overlay to P-D with a Development Plan; exceptions to Planned Development Regulations for building height~~,~~; variances for parking space location and land coverage control~~, and parking variances~~; subdivision map (future application); and specific plan (future application)."

The discussion under subsection "D. Approvals Required" on page III-21 and III-22 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows:

> "Implementation of the proposed project would require the following actions or approvals from the City of Pacifica or other agencies:
>
> - General Plan Amendment
> - Rezoning to P-D with a Development Plan
> - ~~Height, Land Coverage Control, and Parking Variances~~
> - Exceptions to Planned Development Regulations for building height
> - Variances for parking space location and land coverage control
> - Specific Plan (future application)
> - Subdivision Map (future application)
> - Army Corps of Engineers (determination of jurisdictional status of any wetland)
> - Regional Water Quality Control Bard (NPDES permit for stormwater discharge)
>
> Ministerial approvals including grading, foundation and building permits, utility connections permits and any other ministerial actions may be required."

The first paragraph on page III-7 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment H-5):

> "The development would be ~~sited~~ located on a site formerly used as a quarry ~~below the ridgeline~~ and~~, therefore,~~ would be visible from Fassler Avenue. The gardens and open space areas would be sited east of the residential units. The proposed hiking trail would extend throughout the entire project site. The subterranean garage would consist of approximately 26,000 square feet and would provide 112 parking spaces. Three additional surface parking spaces (including one handicapped space) would be provided near the entrance to the proposed project site."

The text in Table III-1 on page III-19 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-6):

Table III-1
Summary of Key Components

Component	Relevant Information
Land Use	Residential, Recreational
Square Footage	Total Building[1] Area = 86,347 sf Total Recreation Area = 123,932 sf Total Developed Area: 210,279 sf
Site Coverage	Total Building Area = 17.8% of site

Table III-1
Summary of Key Components

Component	Relevant Information
	Total Recreation Area = 25.5% of site Total Developed Area = 43.3% of site
Building Height	Between ~~31'~~ 25'6" and 38'3"
Parking Spaces	115 (includes 3 guest spots)
Project Access	Vehicular: Two access points along Fassler Avenue, near western border of site Pedestrian: 5' sidewalk along Fassler Avenue and internal pedestrian walkways
Open Space	Private: 12,460 sf Shared: 13,060 sf

Notes: [1] including associated amenities such as yards, driveways, fire lanes, and utility areas

Source: Pacifica Quarry Homes, LLC, Site Plans. The Prospects, Fassler Avenue between Roberts Road & Driftwood Circle, City of Pacifica, San Mateo County, 10/6/05.

The text in Table III-1 on page III-19 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-7):

Table III-1
Summary of Key Components

Component	Relevant Information
Land Use	Residential, Recreational
Square Footage	Total Building[1] Area = 86,347 sf Total Recreation Area = 123,932 sf Total Developed Area: 210,279 sf
Housing Units	Detached Single-Family Residences = 17 (2 designated as affordable) Duplexes and Triplexes = 17 (3 designated as affordable)
Site Coverage	Total Building Area = 17.8% of site Total Recreation Area = 25.5% of site Total Developed Area = 43.3% of site
Building Height	Between 31' and 38'3"
Parking Spaces	115 (includes 3 guest spots)
Project Access	Vehicular: Two access points along Fassler Avenue, near western border of site Pedestrian: 5' sidewalk along Fassler Avenue and internal pedestrian walkways
Open Space	Private: 12,460 sf Shared: 13,060 sf

Notes: [1] including associated amenities such as yards, driveways, fire lanes, and utility areas

Source: Pacifica Quarry Homes, LLC, Site Plans. The Prospects, Fassler Avenue between Roberts Road & Driftwood Circle,

Table III-1
Summary of Key Components

Component	Relevant Information
City of Pacifica, San Mateo County, 10/6/05.	

The text on page III-20, second paragraph of the Draft EIR, has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment AA-1):

> "Access to the project site would be provided ~~at two points~~ by one full access point and one emergency access point along Fassler Avenue, near the western border of the project site. The westernmost access road into the project site would provide full access to the subterranean parking garage. The ~~second~~ emergency access point would lead into one of the access roads on the project site which (along with the other access road on the project site) would serve as a promenade, emergency access, and pedestrian walkway. The emergency access point would be used as an access point during emergencies only. Because the ~~second~~ emergency access point would be sited on top of the parking structure, it would be designed to meet California Department of Transportation Bridge Design Standards."

SUBSECTION IV, ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The text in the second paragraph on page IV-8 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-4):

> "As previously mentioned, the parcels to the north, west, and south ~~and southeast~~ of the project site are vacant. ~~and a condominium development (the SeaCrest Condominiums) borders the site to the east.~~ A multiple-family residential development is located almost immediately adjacent to the project site to the southeast east (along the north side of Fassler Avenue). A larger, single-family residential development is located across Fassler Avenue further southeast of the project site. There are also residential uses approximately 500 feet northeast of the project site, along Rockaway Beach Avenue."

SUBSECTION IV.A, AESTHETICS

The first sentence on page IV.A-2 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment H-5):

> "The proposed project site sits on a ridge that gradually ~~lowers in elevation to Rockaway Beach~~ descends to Highway 1. There are ridges on either side of the project site that are even higher in elevation."

The text in the third paragraph on page IV.A-2 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-12):

> "As discussed in Chapter IV (Environmental Setting), other public vantage points in the general project area include Highway 1, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area located approximately 0.75 miles east of the project site, Oddstad Park located approximately 0.60 miles south of the project site, and Frontierland Park located approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the project site. Due to the topography and adjacent ridgelines surrounding the site, the project would be minimally visible from various locations within ~~The project site is not visible from any of~~ the abovementioned public vantage points, but would not have a substantial adverse effect on the scenic vista from those vantage points. The most prominent public vantage points from which the site is visible are analyzed below. There are no areas designated by the City's General Plan as Open Space in the general project vicinity."

The text in the discussion under Impact IV.A-2 on page IV.A-21 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-12):

> "The proposed project ~~is not within the viewing corridor of~~ would be minimally visible from portions of a state scenic highway. ~~However, a~~ According to the City's General Plan, the City proposes to designate the Linda Mar Boulevard – Oddstad – Terra Nova Boulevard – Fassler Avenue loop as a scenic roadway. ~~According to the City's General Plan~~, Views along Fassler Avenue are considered a scenic resource because they afford unobstructed and sweeping views of the Pacific Ocean and surrounding undeveloped land and ridgelines. ~~and, a~~As discussed under Impact IV.A-1, implementation of the proposed project would substantially alter the views available from Fassler Avenue. As such, the proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources ~~within a scenic highway~~ and would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Mitigation Measure MM IV.A-1 described below would reduce impacts related to scenic resources in a scenic highway, but not to a less-than-significant level. Impacts would, therefore, remain ***significant and unavoidable***."

The text in the third paragraph on page IV.A-3 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-15):

> "The Open Space and Recreation and Community Design Elements of the General Plan contain policies aimed in part to preserve the visual character of the City. Although the General Plan does not define the term "scenic vista" the Open Space and Recreation Element draws a connection between open space and the City's visual resources. The visual resources noted in this element are most importantly the City's hillsides and ocean. The Community Design Element discusses the importance of protecting the City's important viewsheds and sometimes "rather delicate terrain of hillside areas" and includes policies to balance these values with the interests of local property owners and residents. ~~The Community Design Element designates Fassler Avenue adjacent to the project site as an important viewshed in the City.~~"

The text in the second paragraph on page IV.A-11 of the Draft EIR, has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment CC-5):

> "The area surrounding the project site to the east is characterized by low-intensity development primarily consisting of suburban neighborhoods dispersed among undeveloped areas. The area surrounding the project site to the north is characterized by undeveloped hillsides and vacant land. Fassler Avenue, a four lane road, borders the project site to the west and south. Across Fassler Avenue to the ~~west and~~ south of the project site consists primarily of undeveloped areas."

The text in the last paragraph on page IV.A-15 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-21):

> "Implementation of the proposed project would diminish the scenic quality of this view by introducing a new residential development into an area ~~previously~~ predominantly characterized by vacant land and undeveloped areas. ~~Because no other nearby residential developments are visible, the proposed project becomes the only visible development in the area.~~"

The text after Mitigation Measure IV.A-2 on page IV.A-23 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR as follows (refer to Topical Response 5):

> ***"Mitigation Measure IV.A-3: Relocation of Units # 1-4***
>
> To reduce impacts related to Aesthetics, Unit # 1 (the unit nearest Fassler Avenue) shall be moved to the southeast of the parking garage; Units # 2-4 shall be moved northwards towards the amphitheatre; and the height of Unit # 2 shall be limited to one story."

SUBSECTION IV.B, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The first bullet to Mitigation Measure IV.B-6 on page IV.B-23 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment C-3):

> "Prohibit the use of highly undesirable species in landscape improvements on the site which could spread into the adjacent open space areas. Unsuitable species include: blue gum eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus globulus*), acacia (*Acacia* spp.), pampas grass (*Cortaderi* spp.), broom (*Cytisus* spp. and *Genista* spp.), gorse (*Ulex europaeus*), bamboo (*Bambusa* spp.), giant reed (*Arundo donax*), English ivy (*Hedera helix*), German ivy (*Senecio milanioides*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*), cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster pannosus*), fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), and periwinkle (*Vinca* spp.), among others identified in the list of "Invasive Non-Native Species" maintained by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area[3] and in the CalEPPC List.[4] This restriction on use of

[3] *Golden Gate National Recreation Area, 2006, List of Invasive Non-Native Species for Which Removal within Golden Gate National Recreation Area is a Priority, March.*

highly undesirable species in landscaping shall be included as a requirement in the CC&Rs for the project."

SUBSECTION IV.C, CULTURAL RESOURCES

The text on page IV.C-8 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-29):

"MM-IV.C-2: Archaeologist Oversight

A qualified archaeological monitor (which could include the construction foreman if appropriately trained by an archaeological monitor) shall be present during any and all ground-disturbing activities that occur in association with the project, including any utility and sewer hookups within the public streets. "

SUBSECTION IV.D, GEOLOGY/SOILS

The text on page IV.D-7 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment P-8):

"MM IV.D-2: Geotechnical Consultant Involvement

All geotechnical aspects of the proposed project, and preliminary development of plans shall continue to be evaluated by the project geotechnical consultant. A letter from the project geotechnical consultant shall be submitted to the City ~~prepared that approves~~ that confirms it has reviewed all geotechnical aspects of the proposed site development layout, verifies project geotechnical feasibility, and verifies conformance with the geotechnical consultant's design recommendations~~, insuring~~ made to ensure less-than-significant seismic impacts.

~~In addition, preparation of a single geotechnical engineering report, containing all recommended geotechnical design criteria for the project, shall be prepared no later than acceptance of detailed plans. This report shall be submitted to the City for peer review and acceptance by the City Geotechnical Consultant.~~"

SUBSECTION IV.E, HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

The text in the first paragraph on page IV.E-2 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-28):

---

[4] *California Exotic Pest Plant Council, 2006, Ibid.*

"The quality of surface and groundwater at the project site is affected by land uses within the watershed that drain through the site and the composition of geologic materials. Drainage from the site could contribute to the quality of water in drainages downstream and eventually in the ~~San Francisco Bay and~~ Pacific~~a~~ Ocean."

SECTION VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The text under the paragraph headed "Aesthetics" on page VI-3 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-27):

"The EIR concluded that project impacts related to scenic vistas~~, visual character~~ and scenic resources would be significant and unavoidable."

The text on page VI-3 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-32):

"Biological Resources

Under Alternative A, the site would not be developed and disturbance of the site would not occur. The EIR concluded that impacts related to biological resources would be significant and with implementation of mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant. Because no new development would occur under this alternative, any biological resources that are present on the site would not be disturbed. This Alternative would not result in impacts."

The text under the paragraph headed "Aesthetics" on page VI-5 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-27):

"The EIR concluded that impacts related to scenic vistas~~,~~ and scenic resources within a scenic highway~~, and visual character~~ would be significant and unavoidable . . . ."

The text under the paragraph headed "Aesthetics" on page VI-8 of the Draft EIR has been changed to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-27):

"The EIR concluded that impacts related to scenic vistas~~,~~ and scenic resources within a scenic highway~~, and visual character~~ would be significant and unavoidable . . . ."

The text under the paragraph headed "Aesthetics" on page VI-11 of the Draft EIR has been changed to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-27):

"The EIR concluded that impacts related to scenic vistas~~,~~ and scenic resources within a scenic highway~~, and visual character~~ would be significant and unavoidable . . . ."

The text under the Table Entry for Visual Character, Impacts of the Proposed Project, on page VI-14 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-27):

"~~Significant and Unavoidable~~ Less than Significant"

The text under the Table Entry for Visual Character, Alternative B, on page VI-14 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-27):

"~~Significant and Unavoidable~~ Less than Significant"

The text under the Table Entry for Visual Character, Alternative C, on page VI-14 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-27):

"Less Than Significant ~~w/Mitigation~~"

The text under the Table Entry for Visual Character, Alternative D, on page VI-14 of the Draft EIR has been changed in the Final EIR to read as follows (refer to Response to Comment U-27):

"Less Than Significant ~~w/Mitigation~~"