

---

---

## V. GENERAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

---

---

### A. IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

#### INTRODUCTION

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines states:

*“An EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR.”*

An Initial Study (IS) was prepared for the proposed project in August 2006 and is included in Appendix A. Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study, it was determined that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts to the topics listed below and therefore, the issues are not discussed in detail in Section IV of this EIR.

#### **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

*The project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) designates the site as Urban and “Built-Up Land”<sup>1</sup>, therefore no impact would result, and there is no further analysis of this issue required.*

*The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract. The project site is zoned Planned Development (PD) District with a Hillside Preservation District (HPD) overlay. The site is not under Williamson Act Contract, therefore no impact would result and no further analysis of this issue is required.*

*The project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use. No agricultural land uses are located on or in close proximity to the project site, therefore no impact would result and no further analysis of this issue is required.*

---

<sup>1</sup> California Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Overview, website: [http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/overview/survey\\_area\\_map.htm](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/overview/survey_area_map.htm), Accessed May 18, 2006.

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

*The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.* The proposed project includes development of residential and recreational uses. The types of hazardous materials associated with routine, day-to-day operation of the proposed project would include landscaping chemicals that would be used in quantities typical for landscaped residential developments and typical cleaning solvents used for household purposes. The transport, use, and disposal of these materials would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, project impacts related to this issue would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

*The project would not 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.* The proposed project would be a residential development, and as such is not expected to generate or use high levels of hazardous materials. In addition, onsite handling and storage of hazardous materials would be done according to all applicable local, State, and federal regulations. No upset or accident conditions resulting in the release of hazardous material into the environment can be reasonably expected to occur under these circumstances. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

*The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.* The project site is not within ¼ mile from an existing or proposed school. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

*The project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.* The proposed project site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>2,3</sup> Therefore, the project would not result in impacts related to being located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Thus, no further analysis of this issue is required.

*The project would not be located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.* Therefore, the project would not expose persons to a safety hazard related to airports. No further analysis of this issue is required.

*The project would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.* Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard associated with a private airstrip. No further analysis of this issue is required.

---

2 California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites, [www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese\\_List.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/Cortese_List.cfm), June 6, 2006.

3 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/npl/ca.htm#>, June 6, 2006.

*The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.* The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the City of Pacifica's General Plan's Safety Element and would not obstruct emergency evacuation routes.<sup>4</sup> The proposed project is also consistent with the objectives of the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Annex for the City of Pacifica.<sup>5</sup> A less-than-significant impact would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is necessary.

*The project would not 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.* A significant impact may occur if the project is located in proximity to wildland areas and poses a potential fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of fire. The project site is located in a largely undeveloped area of Pacifica with a residential neighborhood adjacent to the east of the site. Three criteria are used by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to evaluate the potential fire hazard in wildland areas: fuel loading (vegetation), fire weather (winds, temperatures, humidities and fuel moisture contents) and topography (degree of slope). According to the City of Pacifica General Plan fire hazards map, the project site is located in a low fire hazard area.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss associated with wildland fires. A less-than-significant impact would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

## **LAND USE**

*The project would not physically divide an established community.* The project site is currently vacant and the surrounding area is primarily open space. There are residential uses to the east of the project site and across Fassler Avenue. The proposed project would not divide an established community and no further analysis is necessary.

*The project would not 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.* CEQA requires consideration be given to whether a proposed project may conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations including, but not limited to, the General Plan, Specific Plan, or Zoning Ordinance. This environmental determination is in addition to the larger policy determination of whether a proposed project is consistent with a jurisdiction's General Plan. The former determination (that intended for consideration in a CEQA document) is limited to a review and analysis, and is made by the preparers of the CEQA document. The later determination by comparison, is made by the decision-

---

4 City of Pacifica General Plan, Safety Element. 1983.

5 City of Pacifica, Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Annex, November 7, 2005.

6 City of Pacifica General Plan, Safety Element. 1983.

making body of the jurisdiction and is based on a jurisdiction's broad discretion to assess whether a proposed project conforms to the policies and objectives of its General Plan as a whole.

The General Plan land use designation for the project site is Open Space Residential (OSR) on 7.6 acres of the western Portion, with the remaining 3.6 acres designated Low-Density Residential (LDR). OSR allows an average of one residential unit per more than five acres, and LDR allows three to nine units per acres. The proposed project would include a General Plan Amendment to designate the western portion of the site from OSR to LDR. Therefore, with approval of the proposed project, including the associated General Plan Amendment, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the project site. The site is zoned for Planned Development (PD) District, which allows diversification of the relationships of various buildings, structures and open spaces in planned building groups, while ensuring compliance with district regulations. The site is also within a Hillside Protection District (HPD) overlay. It is the intent of the HPD overlay to place controls on proposed development within hillside areas of the City in order to preserve and enhance their use as a prime resource, help protect people and property from all potentially hazardous conditions particular to hillsides, assure that any development be economically sound, and encourage innovative design solutions. The proposed project includes a rezoning of the site to PD with a Development Plan. This would be done in accordance with the City's zoning code which stipulates that development under the P-D District is to be implemented through adoption of a development and specific plan. Therefore, with the approval of the proposed project, including the associated zone change, the proposed project would be in conformance with the zoning regulations for the project site.

In addition to requiring consistency with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinances, the proposed project would also be required to be consistent with the City of Pacifica's Strategic Plan, dated February 14, 2006. The City's Strategic Plan outlines goals and objectives that would help the City achieve its mission to act as a steward to its natural attributes and cultivate and sustain a high quality of life for residents, business, and visitors. The proposed project would be consistent the goals outlined in the strategic plan.

Given the project's consistency with the City's land use plan, policies and regulations, impacts related to land use are considered less than significant and no further analysis is required.

### ***MINERAL RESOURCES***

*The project would not result in the loss or availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents or the state or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.*

There are no known mineral resources at or near the project site. Although the project site previously operated as a quarry, it is not the location of an area of a known mineral resource of regional significance. The Pacifica Quarry and Mori Point were designated in 1987 as an area of regional mineral significance.<sup>7</sup> This is the only area of the City with such a designation, and it is not located on or near the project site.

---

<sup>7</sup> City of Pacifica General Plan, Conservation Element, March 1978.

Thus, the proposed project would not result in the loss or availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents or the state. No further analysis of this issue is required.

## **POPULATION AND HOUSING**

*The project would not 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). The proposed project consists of 34 residential units. New residential uses would increase the City population. Using an existing persons-per-household size of 2.728, the proposed project would be expected to accommodate approximately 93 (2.728 x 34) residents. According to Association of Bay Area Governments, by the date of the project's completion in the fall of 2008, the City's projected population would be 38,840. Assuming that all residents generated by the proposed project are new to the City, these residents would account for 0.24 percent of the 2006 baseline population (38,739) and 0.24 percent of the projected population for the year 2008. Since the proposed project would not exceed the City's population projections, impacts would be less than significant. No further analysis is required.*

*The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people; necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.*

There are no existing housing units on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, and no further discussion of these issues is required.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES**

*The project would not 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,*
- *Police Protection,*
- *Schools,*
- *Parks, or*
- *Other public facilities.*

Fire protection services to the project site and area are provided by the North County Fire Authority (NCFA). The NCFA is a Joint Powers Authority that serves the communities of Pacifica, Daily City, and Brisbane. There are two fire stations in the project area. Station 71 is located at 616 Edgemar Avenue and is staffed by a three person Type I Paramedic-Engine Company and a Battalion Chief. Station 72 is located at 1100 Linda Mar Boulevard and is staffed by a three person Type I Paramedic-Engine Company. If new facilities were required, their expansion or construction would be subject to CEQA review. However, it is not anticipated that implementation of the proposed project would necessitate the

expansion of construction of fire-protection facilities. Therefore, project impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

The proposed project site would be served by the Pacifica Police Department.<sup>8</sup> The Pacifica Police Department (PPD) operates out of the main station located at 2075 Pacific Coast Highway and currently has authorized 37 sworn and 5.5 non-sworn employees for a total of 42.5 employees. According to the Pacifica PPD, the department is adequately staffed with the current levels although the PPD is authorized for six additional officers. The PPD anticipates that an increase in traffic at the intersection of Fassler Avenue and SR 1 would increase traffic-related incidents thereby increasing demand on the department. However, the PPD has also indicated that such increases in demand would not necessitate the construction of a new facility. Impacts are, therefore, less than significant and no further analysis is required.

The project site is served by the Pacifica School District (PSD). PSD operates elementary schools (grades K through 5th) and middle schools (grades 6th through 8th). Laguna Salada Union High School District and Jefferson Union High School District operate high school (grades 9th through 12th) facilities for the residents of Pacifica. The estimated number of students the proposed project would generate is derived by multiplying the number of students per dwelling unit (the student yield factor) by the number of dwelling units in the project (34 units). The California State Allocation Board Office of Public School Construction reports that the statewide student yield factor per dwelling unit is 0.5 students for grades K through 6th and 0.2 students for grades 7th through 12th.<sup>9</sup> The statewide average student yield factor may be broken down as 0.071 students in each grade year K through 6th and 0.033 students in each grade year 7th through 12th. To calculate project impacts on the PSD, the statewide average student yield factor per dwelling unit may be expressed as 0.43 elementary school students and 0.14 middle school students, and 0.13 high school students. Applying the statewide average student yield factor, the project would generate 25 students – approximately 15 elementary school students, 5 middle school students, and 5 high school students.

Pursuant to California Education Code Section 17620(a)(1), the governing board at any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement against any construction within the boundaries of the district, for the purpose of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities. As such, the project applicant would be required to pay the required developer fees to PSD and the two high school districts to offset any impacts the project could have to schools. Provided in Section 65996 of the California Government Code, the payment of such fees is deemed to fully mitigate the impacts of new development on schools services. Therefore, project impacts related to school services would be less than significant. No further analysis of this issue is required.

---

8 Chief Saunders, Pacifica Police Department, Memorandum, Subject; Attached Input Request for Project on Fassler Avenue. Written Correspondence. June 1, 2006.

9 Title 2, Cal. Code Regs., § 1859.2; California State Allocation Board Office of Public School Construction, "Enrollment Certification Projection," (Form SAB 50-01, rev. Jan. 2003) <http://www.opsc.dgs.ca.gov/SAB+Forms/Default.htm>.

Project implementation would result in increased use of the City's parks, beaches, and recreational facilities. However, recreational uses would be provided onsite and it is anticipated that the residents of the proposed project would largely utilize the onsite facilities. Nonetheless, any increase in use of existing facilities would be minimal since the project is anticipated to increase the City's population only by 93 residents. Any additional needs would be served by existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

No other public facilities have been identified that could be substantially adversely affected by the project. No further analysis of this issue is necessary.

### ***RECREATION***

*The project would not 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.* Project implementation would result in increased use of the City's parks, beaches, and recreational facilities. However, recreational uses would be provided onsite and it is anticipated that the residents of the proposed project would largely utilize the onsite facilities. Nonetheless, any increase in use of existing facilities would be minimal since the project is anticipated to increase the City's population by only 93 residents. Implementation of the proposed project would not, therefore, cause substantial physical deterioration of existing facilities. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis is required.

### ***UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS***

*The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.* Wastewater from the project site would be treated according to the wastewater treatment requirements enforced by the City and the Regional Water Quality Control Board for disposal in the City of Pacifica municipal sewer system. Therefore, project impacts related to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements would be less than significant, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

*The project would not require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or storm water drainage facilities, nor would there be a need for expansion of existing facilities.*

*The project would 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.*

The primary water treatment facility that would serve the project site is the San Francisco Public Utility Commission's (SFPUC) Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant (HTWTP).<sup>10</sup> Currently, the HTWTP is undergoing an expansion to increase capacity to 160 million gallons per day (mgd).<sup>11</sup> According to

---

<sup>10</sup> Weiss, Bert. Project Manager, North Coast County Water District, Written Communication, June 12, 2006.

<sup>11</sup> San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, website: [http://sfwater.org/Project.cfm/PRJ\\_ID/145](http://sfwater.org/Project.cfm/PRJ_ID/145), Accessed June 13, 2006.

standard water-usage rates<sup>12</sup>, the proposed project would generate a water demand of approximately 10,362 gallons per day. This would represent approximately a 0.01 percent increase of the HTWTP's capacity upon completion of the expansion project. The City of Pacifica's Caldera Creek Water Recycling Plant (CCWRP) treats wastewater within the City and currently has a capacity of 20 mgd. The CCWRP currently treats approximately 4.0 mgd.<sup>13</sup> As such, adequate capacity is available at the CCWRP to serve the increase in demand resulting from the proposed project. It is, therefore, anticipated that the increase in demand for water and wastewater treatment would adequately be met. Impacts would be less than significant and no further analysis of this issue is required.

*The project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.* Water service at the project site and in the project area is provided through the North Coast County Water District (NCCWD). The water supply provided to NCCWD is subject to an agreement with the SFPUC. The most recent Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) prepared by the NCCWD indicates that under the current terms of the contract with the SFPUC, the NCCWD's maximum supply (maximum wholesale allocation) is 3.84 mgd (4,301.04 acre feet per year). This existing allocation is sufficient to meet the NCCWD's needs from present time through 2030. Changes in water demand presented as discussed in the UWMP are based on growth projections set forth in the City's General Plan. According to the UWMP, approximately 44 new connections per year, 220 new water connections by 2010, and approximately 1,100 by 2030 would result. Since the proposed project is consistent with the land use designations set forth in the City of Pacifica General Plan, it has been accounted for in the NCCWD's UWMP and could be adequately served by existing water entitlements. Impacts are, therefore, less than significant and no further analysis of this issue is required.

*The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.* Solid waste generated by users at the project site and surrounding area is disposed of at the Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill.<sup>14</sup> The most recently reported closure date and remaining capacity for the landfill is January 2018 and 44,646,148 cubic yards, respectively. Using standard solid waste generation rates<sup>15</sup>, the proposed project would generate approximately 416 lbs/day and approximately 152,000 lbs per year of solid waste. This translates to a generation rate of approximately 0.19 ton of solid waste per day and 68.95 tons of solid waste per year for the proposed project. The Ox Mountain facility currently has a permitted maximum disposal of 3,598 tons/day.<sup>16</sup> The solid waste generated by the proposed project would represent 0.005 percent of the allowed daily

---

12 Single family residential unit = 379.5 gallons/day/unit & Residential 2 bedroom condo = 230 gallons/day/unit

13 Martinez, Brian. City of Pacifica Department of Public Works, Personal Communication, June 22, 2006.

14 Martinez, Brian. City of Pacifica Department of Public Works, Personal Communication, June 22, 2006.

15 Using most conservative estimate from the CIWMB of 12.23 lbs/household/day for residential land uses. "Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates for Residential Developments", website accessed June 26, 2006.

16 California Integrated Waste Management Board, Jurisdiction Landfill Overview, California Waste Stream Profiles, <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Facility/Landfill/LFProfile1.asp?COID=41&FACID=41-AA-0002>, Accessed June 26, 2006.

capacity. Because the landfill is not operating at capacity it is anticipated that this increase would result in a less-than-significant impact. No further analysis of this issue is required.

*The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The construction and operation of the proposed project would be required to adhere to all applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impact would result with regard to compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and no further analysis of this issue is required.*

## **B. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS**

Section 15126.2(b) of the Guidelines to the California Quality Act requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts which cannot be avoided. Specifically, Section 15126.2(b) states:

*“Describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reason why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described.”*

Based on the analysis contained in this EIR, the proposed project would result in significant environmental impacts related to aesthetics. Specifically, impacts related to scenic vistas and damage to scenic resources within a scenic highway would result from implementation of the proposed project.

## **C. GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECTS**

Section 15126.2(d) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed action could be growth inducing. This includes ways in which the project would foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Section 15126.2(d) of the *CEQA Guidelines* reads as follows:

*“Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.”*

The proposed project would contribute to economic growth by increasing the local population that would rely on nearby businesses. The construction phase of the project would also generate temporary work that would contribute to short term economic growth.

The project is a residential development and does not include any commercial development. Without commercial development, the project would not provide jobs that would attract people to the area and therefore does not require new housing to be constructed.

The project includes the improvement of Fassler Avenue to include turn lanes into the project site. Road improvements have a potential to allow for additional development, however the road improvements associated with the project would serve the project only. Therefore, road improvements would not attract development to the project vicinity and would not be growth inducing.

## **IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES**

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that significant irreversible environmental changes associated with a proposed project shall be discussed, including the following:

- *Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project that may be irreversible because a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely;*
- *Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement that provides access to a previously inaccessible area), which generally commit future generations to similar uses; and*
- *Irreversible damage that could result from environmental accidents associated with the project.*

Construction of the proposed project would require the use of nonrenewable resources (i.e., wood, metals, sand, gravel, fossil fuels) for building materials and to fuel construction vehicles and equipment. Subsequent use and maintenance of the project would also require the long-term consumption of these nonrenewable resources at reduced levels. However, the project applicant proposes to include renewable, recycled and environmentally preferable materials in the project construction materials. In addition, the proposed project would make use of photovoltaic cells to create solar power, as well as passive solar heating, which would decrease the project's dependence on fossil fuels for energy.

The proposed project would set aside 9.2 acres of the 11.2 acre site to be used as open space. Such a practice could encourage other future developments in the area to set aside land to be used as open space.

Implementation of the project would increase the amount of activity on the site, which would increase the likelihood of environmental accidents, such as fire on the site. However, federal and state safety regulations, as well as local compliance monitoring by the North County Fire Authority would limit the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by fire.