



MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

Prepared For:

**Proposed Single-Family Dwelling at
200 Berendos Avenue
Pacifica, CA
(APN 022-330-150)**

Date Prepared:

December 17, 2007

Prepared By:

**CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1800 FRANCISCO BOULEVARD
PACIFICA, CA 94044
(650) 738-7341**

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant
With
Mitigation
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact



CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION,
INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST**

Date: December 17, 2007

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Requirements

This report has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and applicable guidelines.

Project Title: Proposed Single-Family Dwelling at 200 Berendos Avenue, Pacifica, California

Lead Agency: City of Pacifica
1800 Francisco Blvd.
Pacifica, CA 94044

Contact Person: Kathryn Farbstein, Assistant Planner
(650) 738-7341

Project Sponsor: Dave Colt
1397 Grand Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044

Owner: Gemma Ludkey
300 Tideaway Drive
Alameda, CA 94501-3511

Project Location: 200 Berendos Avenue, Pacifica, CA 94044

General Plan Designation/Zoning Classification: The General Plan designation for the one acre site is Open Space Residential and the site is zoned A/B-5/HPD, which is classified as Agricultural with Lot Size and Hillside Preservation District Overlays. Attachment "a" identifies the General Plan designation and zoning of the subject site and surrounding properties. The proposed project is compatible with both designations.

Project Description: The project applicant and property owner propose to construct a single-family residence of approximately 3,500 square feet and an attached garage of 700 square feet on a one acre parcel. The garage is attached at an angle and is slightly skewed from the proposed dwelling. The dwelling is 25 feet from the Calera Creek outlet. Calera Creek was diverted under Berendos Avenue just southwest of the project site and the end of the culvert is located on the subject site; thus, the creek freely flows 25 feet away from the proposed structure. The proposed site plan is shown in Attachment "b". The dwelling is proposed as two levels with a steeply peaked roof. In addition to the four bedrooms and three bathrooms on the upper level, the applicant is also proposing an open kitchen and dining area, living room, and a family room. The living area for the lower level would be approximately 1,600 square feet, and upper floor would be approximately 1,900 square feet. The total height of the proposed building would be 35 feet. Vehicular access to the site is from Berendos Avenue directly into the three car garage. The materials proposed would be composition and natural cedar

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

shingles for the roof, wood trim around doors and windows, and wood lap and stucco for the siding. Drainage from the developed area of the project site would be diverted to the storm drain system and not enter the creek.

The proposed project is in conformance with all City requirements and the required local permits and/or approvals including a Use Permit, Site Development Permit and Encroachment Permit except that approval of a Variance to exceed the maximum allowable site coverage and to provide two uncovered spaces off-site would be necessary.

Site Description: The approximately 1 acre project site is located in the central portion of the City of Pacifica in the Vallemar Neighborhood. The site is located south of Reina Del Mar and east of Highway 1 (See Attachment c) and is an irregularly shaped parcel abutting Berendos Avenue. The subject site is in the Calera Creek drainage basin at an approximate elevation of 210 feet above sea level. It occupies the foot of a steep, northeasterly facing hillside. The building site is proposed on an irregular, graded area that extends from the toe of the slope over the culvert containing a segment of the southern branch of the Calera Creek to the native slope with an average cross slope of approximately 50%. There is level area that extends about 50 feet into the property along Berendos Avenue before the creek culvert, which is the area proposed for development. Approximately 10 feet beyond the creek, the hillside slopes steeply uphill. The slope of the area between the proposed project improvements and the creek is approximately 15%. Runoff from the site currently drains to the creek channel or the street. The open channel of Calera Creek has banks approximately 5 feet high and extends northward before entering another culvert system north of the site. The culvert system was put in many years ago and based upon a site visit; it appears that minimal if any erosion has occurred along the stream banks.

Two Monterey pine heritage trees exist on the subject site more than 35 feet from the retaining wall uphill from the dwelling and more than 40 feet from the proposed dwelling. Approximately 8 Eucalyptus trees will be removed from the building site but these trees are not considered to be heritage trees. Up to 20 Eucalyptus trees can be removed without obtaining a tree permit. The arborist report has provided protection measures although the location of the two pine trees is such that it is anticipated that the trees will not be impacted during construction of this project.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Calera Creek flows from the canyons of Sweeney Ridge and undeveloped hills to the east of the subject site, and then through the Vallemar residential neighborhood and eventually to the Pacific Ocean near Rockaway Beach. East of the property, the creek flows along Berendos Avenue, crosses under the street through a 48 inch culvert, and then daylight on the northwest portion of the property. The creek extends for approximately 75 feet along the northwest property boundary. No other water features or wetlands were identified within 0.7 miles of the property. Water resources in the vicinity of the project include San Andreas Lake, approximately 1.8 miles east of the property, Laguna Salada, approximately 1.4 miles northwest of the property, and 4 to 5 constructed ponds all found within a five-mile radius of the site either located on golf courses or cemeteries.

The lands to the north and east of the subject site are developed with single-family dwellings. The undeveloped property to the west and south consists of more than 260 acres and is owned by the City of Pacifica. The City is currently in negotiation with the National Park Service to add this land to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and the process should be completed sometime next year. The western slope leading up to Sweeney Ridge is owned and operated by the GGNRA while San Francisco Public Utilities Commission owns lands along the eastern slope.

Other public agency approval(s) that may be required: US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), State Department of Fish and Game (DFG), US Army Corp of Engineers and State Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked (X) 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"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <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 mitigation measures, as described on an attached sheet (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan) and agreed to by the applicant, have been added to the project. **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 on the effects that remain to be addressed.
- 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 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.

City of Pacifica: _____
(Signature)

Date: December 17, 2007

Kathryn Farbstein, Assistant Planner, City of Pacifica, Planning and Economic Development Department

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This checklist indicates the potential level of impact for each environmental factor, including subcategory, as follows:

Potentially Significant Impact: Applies if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If one or more of these entries are made, an EIR is required.

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". Describe mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect accordingly. Reference source documentation in parenthesis ().

Less Than Significant Impact: Requires brief explanation. Reference source documentation in parenthesis ().

No Impact: No explanation required when source documentation is referenced () and adequately supports that impact does not apply. Explanation is, however, required when finding is based on project-specific factors or general standards.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| 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? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The proposed project meets the City's existing General Plan and Zoning Code regulations and does not include any elements that would physically divide any established community. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or community conservation plan.

Mitigation: None required

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the | | | | |

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (1) ___ ___ ___ X

Discussion of Evaluation: The proposal to construct a single-family dwelling will induce minimal population growth by providing one new housing unit. However, since no new roads or other infrastructure are proposed other than the driveway and parking bays, the growth would be confined to the one dwelling proposed for construction. Infrastructure is available to accommodate the proposed project. The project would not displace any housing units or people, and it would not necessitate the construction of any replacement housing. Moreover, growth in this particular location has been accounted for in the City's General Plan designation of Open Space Residential, which averages more than five acres per dwelling unit depending on physical and practical constraints associated with a given project. Although the project site is roughly 1 acre in size, it is a legal lot zoned for residential development that can be developed with a single-family dwelling. Therefore, the amount of growth resulting from this particular project is consistent with the City's plans for the site. No significant negative impacts related to housing are anticipated by the proposed project.

Mitigation: None required.

III. **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: | | | | |
| 1) Rupture of 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? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| 2) Strong seismic ground shaking? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| 3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| 4) Landslides? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| 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? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| 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 wastewater? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

Discussion of Evaluation: Based upon the Geotechnical Investigation report prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants (September 21, 2006, letter dated July 13, 2007, and email confirmation dated December 7, 2007), the proposed site development and layout is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint as long as the recommendations specified as mitigation measures below are incorporated into the project. The following discussion is based on the geologist's recommendations.

The site is not within a State of California designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, but is located in the San Francisco Bay Area, considered one of the most seismically active regions in the United States. Significant earthquakes have occurred in the Bay Area, and will continue to occur, with varying intensities, depending upon the magnitude of earthquake, the distance of the site from the causative fault, and the type of materials underlying the site.

No known active faults or fault traces are known to pass through the subject site; therefore, the risk of fault rupture in the development area is low. The nearest active fault is the San Andreas, mapped approximately 1 ½ miles to the northeast. The off-shore trace of the San Gregorio-Seal Cove fault is approximately 5 miles to the southwest, projected between Moss Beach to the south and Marin Headlands to the north. Movement on the San Andreas fault has produced major earthquakes in 1906 and 1989, and strong ground shaking to the site area. There was a moderate earthquake in 1957. The 1906 and 1957 earthquakes were centered in Daly City on the northern peninsula segment of the San Andreas fault. The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake was centered in the southern Santa Cruz Mountains, approximately 50 miles to the south. Ground shaking in the site area from the major historic earthquakes was strong, to perhaps very strong in the 1906 event.

Due to its proximity to the San Andreas Fault and the generally seismically active region, it is expected that the site area would receive very strong ground shaking but it is not anticipated that a fault ground rupture across the subject site would occur because of the distance between the nearest mapped active fault and the site. It is not anticipated that earthquake induced land sliding would occur given the particular soil conditions of the site surrounding the proposed development. In addition, the risk of liquefaction is low due to the absence of ground water and the cohesive nature of the surface soils. However, mitigation measures are identified to ensure that the project's grading, drainage and foundation will be in compliance with recommendations by the geologist to reduce any potential effects to an acceptable level.

The proposed garage foundation is 25 feet from the open channel of Calera Creek. The proposed driveway will span the underground culvert that drains the creek beneath Berendos Avenue, south of the site. There was no evidence of significant erosion of the surface soils or channel bank, and there was no evidence of seepage or springs observed during the site investigation.

From review of previous landslide mapping and photogeologic interpretation, there is no evidence the proposed building site is constrained by active or dormant land sliding. However, given the steepness and the underlying soil conditions, there is potential for shallow (less than 5 feet) debris slides comprising a volume of up to 100 cubic yards over the project lifetime.

Surface soils identified across the site are colluvial soil and undocumented fill derived from past grading activity. The borings encountered approximately 9 feet of colluvium that gradually thickens to 12 feet at the northeast side of the property where it is mantled by up to 9 feet of fill in the graded area at the toe of the slope. These soils were underlain by Franciscan greenstone bedrock. Thus, the geologist determines that the surface soil is generally cohesive in nature; however, a mitigation measure requiring replacement with non-expansive soil for the first 3 feet will ensure that substantial risks to life and property will not occur.

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures have been identified for this project. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential geology impacts to less-than-significant levels.

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a design-level geotechnical investigation and report shall be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval by the City or City designee. The geotechnical investigation shall ensure that given the site's geotechnical conditions and potential geologic hazards, risks due to subsidence and unstable soils, are minimized to an insignificant level. All measures, design criteria, and specifications in the geotechnical report shall be incorporated into the project design. The design level geotechnical investigation and report shall be peer reviewed during the plan check process. Before the building permit is issued, all recommendations from the City's geotechnical peer review shall be incorporated into the design of the project. All soil handling and conditioning measures, and structural foundations shall be designed by a licensed professional engineer, and all on-site soil management and conditioning activities shall be conducted under the supervision of a licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist.

2. All recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants dated September 21, 2006, letter dated July 13, 2007 and confirming email from staff dated December 7, 2007, including, but not limited to the following, shall be incorporated into the project:
 - a. All building and utility improvements shall be designed and constructed in compliance with the California Building Code which was enacted in order to minimize any seismic impacts. Prior to issuance of building permits, building and utility design drawings shall be prepared and submitted to the City for review and confirmation that the proposed development fully complies with the building code.
 - b. Addition of at least 3 feet of freeboard to the proposed retaining walls behind the house to buffer the house from debris flow.
 - c. Grading shall be performed in the dry months between April 1 and October 31.
 - d. Areas to be developed shall be stripped of the upper three feet of undocumented fill and organic material, and replaced with compacted non-expansive soil. Pavements shall be overexcavated to a minimum depth of 12 inches and replaced with non-expansive soils.
 - e. Unsupported cut slopes of colluvium shall not exceed the existing site slope angle. Finished grading of the building site and areas of proposed new pavement shall slope at least 2 percent away from the foundations and pavements.
 - f. Although vertical trench excavations up to 5 feet are capable of standing with minimal bracing up to 30 days, contractors shall be alert for instability. Trench walls deeper than 5 feet shall be cut and braced in accordance with the State of California Safety Ordinance treating excavations and trenches.
 - g. Utility trenches shall be designed to prevent water flow into foundations, slabs or pavement subgrade soils and neighboring properties.
 - h. The proposed house foundation walls and other retaining walls shall gain support from drilled piers that are interconnected with grade beams and not use isolated piers.

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

- i. Living spaces shall be designed with raised wood floors.
- j. The compressible and expansive soils that underlie the driveway alignment and any off-street parking areas shall be overexcavated to a depth of 12 inches. For preliminary design purposes, driveway and parking area pavements shall contain a section of 2 ½ inches of asphaltic concrete underlain by 8 inches of Class II baserock. Final pavement design will be dependent upon the anticipated traffic and the materials exposed at the subgrade levels.
- k. Retaining walls shall be supported on piers and designed to resist an active equivalent fluid pressure of 55 pcf acting in a triangular pressure distribution for level backfill. All retaining walls must be fully backdrained and fully waterproofed. Ground surface behind retaining walls shall be sloped to drain in a positive manner so that ponding and erosion does not occur.
- l. The driveway and paved parking areas shall drain positively away from the pavement subgrades and building foundations. The house and garage roofs shall be provided with gutters and downspouts to carry water to an approved discharge location.
- m. A foundation drain shall be installed to reduce seepage into the building pad where the upslope foundation segment is not a foundation wall.
- n. Perforated pipe for retaining wall subdrains shall be connected to an equivalent solid PVC pipe, sloped at least 2 percent, to carry water to the street. Cleanouts shall be provided at all bends greater than 45 degrees, and at distances not exceeding 50 feet.
- o. Isolated areas where a perimeter foundation drain is not feasible shall be provided with a well-developed surface drainage basin seated in a ground depression having positive slopes to the inlet. Surface inlets shall be at least 12 inches square.
- p. Wire-mesh reinforced, concrete ratproofing over the crawl space soils shall be installed.
- q. Planting trees shall be done in such a manner as to ensure that the root growth does not impact the foundation and in accordance with guidance from a landscaping professional.
- r. Landscaping that promotes infiltration and seepage of moisture into the foundation and crawl space soils shall be avoided.
- s. The applicant shall use stabilizing native riparian vegetation along the creek channels to prevent erosion.
- t. After construction, barren soil surface shall be planted with native vegetation to reduce erosion and soil desiccation cracking.
- u. A licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist shall review the final foundation, grading and drainage plans for conformance with the items identified above. During construction, the geologist shall observe the rough and finished grading operations, foundation excavations prior to steel placement, and the installation of all drainage facilities prior to burial to ascertain that the recommendations in the report are implemented. Upon completion of the project, the licensed

Potential Significant Impact	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist. shall perform a site observation and report the results of the work in a final report.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|----------|-----|----------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| 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)? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| 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? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| 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 substantial flooding on- or off-site? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantially additional sources of polluted runoff? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which could impede or redirect flood flows? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |

Discussion of Evaluation: The project will result in covering and/or compacting vacant land that was previously undeveloped, resulting in increased impermeable surfaces. The development of the property as proposed will add

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

approximately 4,000 square feet (10% of the site) of impervious surface to the watershed. Consequently, the current absorption rates and drainage patterns would change with the proposed project or any development of the site. Mitigation measures identified below require a drainage plan to ensure the project does not have significant drainage impacts. In addition, given that only one dwelling is being proposed on a one acre parcel, the groundwater supplies will not be substantially depleted nor will the project interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project area is not within a 100-year flood zone.

Projects that exceed an acre of disturbed area require that a Notice of Intent (NOI) is filed with the State Water Resources Control Board to obtain coverage under the State General Construction Activity National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. In this case, the amount of disturbed area proposed for the dwelling, hardscape and roadways is 4,109 square feet or 0.09 acre, which is much less than the one acre threshold. Thus, the NPDES mandated NOI and SWPPP would not be required for this project.

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) through the NPDES permit regulates stormwater control before, during and after construction of the proposed project. Projects with impervious surface area exceeding 10,000 square feet in size, and not determined complete prior to August 15, 2006, require compliance with Provision C.3 of SMCWWPPP's amended NPDES permit. This project will not exceed 10,000 square feet of impervious surface; and therefore, the C.3 provision does not apply. Nonetheless, mitigation measures identified below require that Best Management Practices will be implemented to protect stormwater runoff from the site and ensure that water quality is not degraded as a result of the project.

The project is not anticipated to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will be in compliance with all RWQCB requirements. The Municipal waste discharge requirements are satisfied because staff from the Wastewater division have reviewed the project and indicated that it is in compliance with City codes. Given compliance with all state and local requirements, the small size of the project, the large lot size and the proposed mitigation measures, no other impacts are anticipated that would substantially degrade water quality.

The project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss involving flooding, and including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam in that the proposed dwelling will be placed on a hillside above the creek and no levee or dam exists in the neighborhood. Calera Creek is contained in a culvert below the driveway, the outlet is 25 feet way from the structures and the flow of the creek is channeled away from the dwelling. In addition, the geologist has confirmed that the project is geotechnically feasible even though it is located near Calera Creek.

The subject site is located approximately 1.25 miles away from the Pacifica Ocean and 1.8 miles from San Andreas Lake. Given the distance from these water bodies, the project will not be subject to a seiche or tsunami. The subject site is located on sloped land near a creek and may have the potential for mudflows. However, the issue of landslides has been previously addressed in the Geology and Soils section of the Initial Study, and the following mitigation measures identified in that section would also reduce the mudflow impacts to an insignificant level: MM1 and MM2 (b), (c), (g), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (r), (s), (t) and (u).

The project has the potential to impact the drainage patterns resulting in erosion or flooding but Public Works staff has identified several mitigation measures listed below to address any drainage impacts. In addition, an Improvement Plan including drainage systems is required to ensure that the drainage system proposed for the runoff water is adequate for the project and site, and does not result in any net increase in runoff. The drainage system will be privately maintained. With the mitigation measures identified below to protect water quality and surface runoff, it is anticipated that the project will not provide additional sources of substantially polluted water.

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

Mitigation: Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce potential hydrology and water quality impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- 1) San Mateo County Storm Water Pollution Best Management Practices (BMPs), described as follows, would be employed to ensure that water quality of surface runoff is maintained and no siltation of downstream waterways would occur.
 - a) All project grading would take place in the dry season between April 1 and October 31 to minimize immediate erosion/siltation effects.
 - b) Construction materials and waste shall be handled and disposed of properly in compliance with applicable law so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.
 - c) Discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, washwater or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses shall be controlled and prevented.
 - d) Sediment controls such as straw mulch, silt fences, sediment basins or traps and/or other measures shall be employed during construction.
 - e) Tracking dirt or other materials off-site shall be avoided and off-site paved areas and sidewalks shall be cleaned regularly using dry sweeping methods.
 - f) The contractor shall train and provide instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding construction BMPs.

- 2) Upon submittal of a building permit application, applicant must submit Improvement Plans that include the proposed drainage system, which must be approved to the satisfaction of the Public Works Deputy Director or the City Engineer. The Improvement Plans shall ensure that there shall be no runoff directed into the existing creek top of bank and the drainage system must insure that the Project does not increase total peak rates from the Project site. The proposed drainage system shall include but not be limited to the following:
 - a) A drainage system that carries the runoff from the retaining wall drain, roof drain and site drain.
 - b) Asphalt Concrete Curb shall be installed on the public right of way along the creek
 - c) A headwall shall be installed at the eastern end of the existing culvert.
 - d) A drainage inlet shall be installed that serves as a junction for all proposed drainage pipes. This inlet shall connect to the existing culvert.
 - e) The proposed drainage system shall be privately maintained.

- 3) Replant disturbed areas with native plant species to provide long-term erosion control.

V. **AIR QUALITY.** Would the project:

	Potential Significant Impact	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? ()	___	<u>X</u>	___	___
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal and state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ()	___	<u>X</u>	___	___
d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>

Discussion of Evaluation: Pacifica is located along the western edge of the San Francisco Bay Area air basin, and is affected by persistent and frequently strong winds from the Pacific Ocean. The City is also within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Other than occasional violations of standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter (PM10), within San Mateo County, the area's air quality standards are generally met. The project site is located within an existing urbanized area characterized by existing development of various types. Development of one single-family residential unit on the subject site of one acre would not create objectionable odors.

While the project's small size precludes significant pollutant emissions, construction of the project would likely result in a localized increase of dust or particulate matter generated from site grading and other soil disturbance during construction, which may temporarily expose receptors to air pollutants. According to BAAQMD, temporary, construction-related air quality impacts for all pollutants are considered less-than-significant if standard BAAQMD particulate matter control measures are implemented. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will be implemented in accordance with the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines to further reduce particulate emissions.

Mitigation: Implementation of the following mitigation measures pursuant to Bay Area Air Quality Management District guidelines would reduce the project's construction-related air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level:

1. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods; active areas adjacent to existing land uses shall be kept damp at all times, or shall be treated with non-toxic stabilizers or dust palliatives.
2. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
3. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction site.
4. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites; water sweepers shall vacuum up excess water to avoid runoff-related impacts to water quality.

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

5. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
6. Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
7. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to expose stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
8. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.
9. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
10. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
11. Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.
12. Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (6) | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (6) | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 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? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: Project traffic would use Berendos Avenue and Reina Del Mar Avenue to access State Highway 1, thereby adding incremental traffic (10 trips during an average weekday) to the intersection of Reina Del

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

Mar and Highway 1. For signalized intersections in Pacifica, a project is considered to create a significant adverse impact on traffic conditions at the intersection if for any peak hour:

1. The level of service at the intersection degrades from an acceptable LOS D or better under background conditions to an unacceptable LOS E or F under project conditions, or
2. If the intersection is already operating at an unacceptable LOS E and the addition of project traffic causes both the critical movement delay at the intersection to increase by two (2) or more seconds and the critical demand-to-capacity (V/C) ratio to increase by more than 0.010, or
3. If the intersection is already operating at an unacceptable LOS F and the addition of project traffic causes both the critical movement delay at the intersection to increase by one (1) or more seconds and the demand-to-capacity (V/C) to increase by more than 0.010.

An exception to this rule applies when the addition of project traffic reduces the amount of average delay for critical movements (i.e., the change in average delay for critical movements is negative). In this case the threshold of significance is an increase in the critical V/C value of more than 0.010.

According to the November 7, 2007 Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by RKH Civil and Transportation Engineering, the project will have no calculated effect on traffic flow through the intersection of State Route 1 and Reina Del Mar Avenue during peak hours; and therefore, will not have a significant adverse impact on traffic conditions, as that term is defined above.

The project includes a two-car garage and two open parking spaces as required by the HPD overlay. If a Variance request is approved; additional public parking will be provided for any visitor to the surrounding area and therefore, the proposed parking satisfies parking requirements for the City of Pacifica. The proposed dwelling would serve as a private residence; thus, the increase in traffic would be minimal and generally consistent with single-family residential development. Additionally, access to the proposed dwelling, including emergency vehicle access, is from Berendos Avenue, which abuts the project site. Existing roadway capacities are capable of supporting the minimal increase in traffic generated by the project and, as such, no significant impacts are anticipated. With respect to cumulative traffic impacts, as found by the traffic consultant's report, the project will not have any impact that is considered cumulatively considerable under CEQA because the incremental effects of the traffic generated by this one single family home are not considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current and probable future projects in the area as determined by the traffic consultant. The construction of a new single family home will have no effect on air traffic patterns, or substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The project will have no effect on alternative transportation modes.

Mitigation: None required.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- 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 & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?()

___ X ___ ___

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & 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? (6, 7,8)

— X — —

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (5)

— — — 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

Discussion of Evaluation: A Biological Site Assessment (including review of the redesign) was completed for the subject site by TRA Environmental Sciences, Inc. in October 2006, and updated in July and December, 2007, and a Tree Protection Plan was prepared by an arborist in October 2006. In addition, staff consulted with both representatives from the State Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the United States Department of Fish and Wildlife (USFWS).

The property consists primarily of northern coastal scrub vegetation and eucalyptus trees, and approximately 0.15 acre area of ruderal grassland. The flat portion of the property where the project is proposed contains the highly disturbed ruderal grassland and has very few native plants. Two soil types are present on the property. The area where the dwelling is proposed contains Orthents, cut and fill Urban-land complex solids which were likely disturbed when Berendos Avenue was constructed. Barnebe-Candlestick complex soils are found on the steep slopes of the site (NCRS 2006). During inspection of the subject site, six species of birds were identified, one butterfly (Cabbage White), one amphibian (California red-legged frog (CRLF)) and 36 plants, half of which are considered non-native species.

The location of the subject site in relation to the nearby open space is such that no wildlife, with the exception of the riparian species, would need to travel through the site to reach any other open space. Riparian species such as the CRLF traveling along the riparian corridor created by Calera Creek will eventually reach the subject site and culvert. As stated in the assessment, a subadult CRLF was spotted in the pond below the culvert by the biologist during the site inspection. The CRLF is a federally listed threatened species and a California species of special concern. A USFWS representative noted that given that the site contains riparian habitat and that a CRLF was found on the site, the San Francisco Garter Snake (SFGS) also may use the site. The SFGS is a state and federally listed

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

endangered species and a state fully protected species. However, any wildlife like the CRLF or SFGS leaving the creek bed and heading up the hill in search of upland habitat will not likely be affected by the project because most of the one acre site and the uphill portion will not be developed. In addition, a 25 foot buffer is included as a mitigation measure as specified below. The 25 foot buffer will provide sufficient maneuvering area for the CRLF and SFGS and any other riparian creatures to survive by ensuring that a corridor of habitat will be maintained that connects the creek to the Cattle Hill area. Furthermore, the buffer, as well as mitigation measures proposed in the Geology and Soils section (Section III, Mitigation 1 and 2), and in the Hydrology and Water Quality Section (Section IV, Mitigation 1, 2 and 3) will prevent erosion into the creek, thereby protecting the habitat for the CRLF and SFGS. Additional mitigation measures are included to protect the CRLF and SFGS during construction activities.

Nine special-status wildlife species were considered for their potential to occur on site. Only the CRLF was observed during the site investigation. Due to the habitat value of the site, the biologist concluded that there was a low potential for Monarch butterfly or dusky footed woodrat to be present on the site. Mitigation measures have been identified below that will protect the CRLF, SFGS, the Monarch butterfly and the dusky footed woodrat.

The subject site has trees such as the stand of eucalyptus and the Monterey pines that are identified on the plans and discussed in the arborist report. The eucalyptus trees are not considered heritage trees but are regulated by a logging ordinance if more that 19 trees are removed. In this case, fifteen eucalyptus trees are proposed for removal due to location within the building pad. The biologist identified some of the branches of the eucalyptus trees and the dense shrubs on the site as capable of supporting nests for birds but did not believe that any of the branches in the Monterey pine trees would be large enough to support nests. Mitigation measures have been specified below to protect nesting birds that may utilize the site.

No rare, threatened or endangered plants as identified by the California Native Plant Society were determined to have the potential to occur within the subject site by the biologist. In addition, no evidence that special-status natural communities were present on the subject site exists.

Agencies such as the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) may regulate the creek located on the subject site. In discussing the project with the USACE, it was determined by the USACE in a May 30, 2006 e-mail that this project would probably not need to be reviewed by USACE. A mitigation measure is specified below to ensure that the project complies with all requirements established by USACE and RWQCB. RWQCB also regulates stormwater runoff which is addressed by mitigation measure #1 below.

Twenty five special-status plant species were considered for their potential to occur onsite. No special-status plant species were found on the subject site. Due to the amount of disturbance on the property that has already occurred and the large number of non-native species identified by the biologist, it is unlikely that any rare plants would be found on the site. In addition, the site inspection by the biologist was conducted during a time period when many of these plants would be in bloom; thus, making identification of any of these special-status plant species easier to detect.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures have been identified for this project. They are based on the biologist's report (October 2006) and updated letters (July 27 and December 6, 2007), and communications with USFWS and DFG representatives. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

- 1) Best Management Practices as previously specified in Section IV under Mitigation Measure #1 shall be incorporated into the project to prevent erosion and siltation from entering the creek and drainage during construction. Native species shall be used for long term erosion control.
- 2) A minimum of a 25 foot undisturbed buffer area between any portion of the building including the foundation and the top of the creek bank shall be maintained at all times. The buffer zone shall remain in its natural state and except for revegetation required by other mitigation measures, no disturbance (such as paving) shall take place in this area.
- 3) The applicant shall obtain all appropriate permits and any other required approvals from the USACE and RWQCB prior to building permit issuance.
- 4) On-site CRLF and SFGS training (including CRLF and SFGS education and reporting requirements) for construction personnel by an USFWS-approved CRLF and SFGS biologist shall be required prior to construction.
- 5) A 4 foot high CRLF and SFGS exclusionary fence around the construction site shall be installed prior to construction.
- 6) A preconstruction survey for CRLF and SFGS shall be conducted within 48 hours of construction starting on the project site. If any CRLF or SFGS are found during the survey or during construction, work shall not occur until USFWS has been contacted and has given their approval for work to occur.
- 7) A USFWS-approved CRLF and SFGS biologist shall be available on-call to visit the site in the event a CRLF or SFGS is found.
- 8) The applicant shall consult with and obtain any necessary authorizations from USFWS and DFG prior to building permit issuance.
- 9) Monarch Butterfly: If any eucalyptus trees must be removed during the monarch butterfly winter roosting season, (October – February of any given year) the site shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist to ensure that a roosting colony is not present. Since timing of monarch migration on the coast side varies year to year, the survey shall be conducted at a time to coincide with monarch roosting activity on the coast side for that particular year. Information on monarch roosting activity must be verified with local experts prior to conducting the survey. If a roosting colony is not detected, tree removal may commence and no further surveys are warranted. However, if a roosting colony is detected, trees shall not be removed until the winter roosting season has concluded (i.e. no more monarchs have been observed in the general area or using the trees). If trees have already been removed prior to the onset of the winter roosting season, no surveys are warranted.
- 10) Protection of San Francisco Dusky-footed Woodrats: Although no San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat houses were observed on the project site during the site visit, this species is locally common and given the habitat, a San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat house could be present at the time of construction. To avoid significant impacts to this species, a preconstruction survey shall be completed within one week prior to the start of construction. A qualified biologist shall perform one daytime survey for woodrat houses within the project footprint. If during this survey no woodrat house is detected, the project can proceed as scheduled. If during this survey a woodrat house is detected, one of the following avoidance/minimization measures shall be implemented. These measures are listed in order of priority, meaning the first measure is the preferred

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

measure to be implemented as it provides the least amount of impact to the woodrat. If it is not feasible to implement the first measure due to the site conditions, the second shall be implemented.

- a) The project footprint shall be adjusted to avoid the woodrat house by at least 5 feet. Safety and silt fencing shall be erected around the house to avoid impacts during construction.
- b) If the project footprint must go directly through or within 5 feet of a house, CDFG shall be consulted and one of the two following options shall be implemented:
 - i. If the house appears inactive (e.g. no scat or fresh leaves and twigs), approval will be sought from CDFG to dismantle the house and replace the lost resource by building an artificial house. One artificial house shall be built for every one existing inactive house.
 - ii. If the house appears active, approval will be sought from CDFG to 1) trap the occupant(s) of the house, 2) dismantle the house, 3) construct a new artificial house with the materials from the dismantled house, and 4) release the occupant into the new artificial house. If there is more than one occupant, a new house shall be constructed for each occupant. The new house shall be placed no more than 20 feet from its original location and as far from the project footprint as necessary to be protected from construction activities. If the house is to be moved downslope of the project footprint, extra precautions shall be taken, such as a plywood barrier, to stop falling/sliding materials from impacting the new house. Houses shall only be moved in the early morning during the non-breeding season (October through February). If trapping has occurred for three consecutive nights and no woodrats have been captured, the house shall be dismantled and a new house constructed.

11) If possible, all tree removal and trimming as well as ground disturbing activities shall not occur during nesting season from February 15 to August 31. However, if construction occurs during this time period, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey for nesting birds no more than three days prior to the removal or trimming of any tree and prior to the start of any ground disturbing activities. If active nests are not present, construction can proceed. If active nests are detected, the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) shall be contacted on how to proceed so as to avoid impacts to protected birds, for example by establishing a 50-foot radius buffer around passerine and non-passerine nests, and an up to 250-foot radius for raptors.

12) The applicant shall not plant invasive and exotic plants for landscaping on the subject site. The invasive and exotic plants are on a list compiled by the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal IPC 2005).

13) The heritage trees on site shall be preserved and protected. All recommendations in the arborist's report shall be incorporated into the project, including but not limited to: (a) no excavated soil shall be placed on the root zone, and (b) roots shall be cut with a saw or lopper and not torn with excavating equipment.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future 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

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

Discussion of Evaluation: There are no known mineral resources at the subject property and no loss of availability of a locally important mineral or mineral resource recovery site would occur as a result of the project.

Mitigation: None required.

IX. 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? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 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? | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Sect. 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 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 of airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 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? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| h) Expose people or structures to 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? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The site is not on the CORTESE list of hazardous waste sites. The proposed single-family dwelling on a one acre parcel is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through construction, routine transport, use, release or disposal of hazardous materials. Minor amounts of hazardous materials might be used during construction, including paints, solvents, pesticides and herbicides. However, use and disposal of such materials in compliance with the State Health and Safety Code, Pacifica Municipal Code, and the Uniform Fire Code would be required.

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Additionally, the project contractors are required to follow the San Mateo County Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program Best Management Practices during construction. These regulations would apply to this project just as they would in every similar development.

The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The site is not within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and will not interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plans. The project is located in an urban area where there is no significant risk of wildland fires.

Mitigation: None required.

X. **NOISE.** Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|----------|-----|----------|
| a) Exposure of persons or 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| 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? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project exposes people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The construction of one single-family unit on a one acre parcel would represent a new source of noise in the area. However, the anticipated noise is expected to be minimal and consistent with existing noise levels in the surrounding single-family neighborhood. Construction noise will occur during project construction, as with all new construction projects, resulting in increased exterior noise levels within the project vicinity. To address construction generated noise, several controls will be incorporated into the project. Specifically, construction activities would be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays pursuant to Section 8-1.06 (111.2) of the Pacifica Municipal Code. It should be noted that any impacts related to noise would be temporary, lasting only through the project construction period;

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

typically 9-12 months for a project of this type. With the mitigation measure identified below and compliance with the noise ordinance, no significant impact related to noise is expected occur.

Mitigation: Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level:

1. All construction equipment shall be equipped with improved noise muffling and have the manufacturers' recommended noise abatement measures, such as mufflers, engine covers and engine isolators in good working order. All equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than five minutes and an information sign shall be posted at the entrance to the construction site that identifies the permitted construction hours and provides a telephone number to call and receive project information or to report complaints regarding excessive noise levels.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to main acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Fire protection? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Police protection? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Schools? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| d) Parks? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| e) Other public facilities? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The construction of a single-family residential development is expected to cause an increase in demand for public services. The increase, however, is insignificant and is within the limits of existing service capacities. All departments and agencies responsible for supplying public services for this project have indicated their ability to meet the needs of the project. The developer will be assessed any necessary fees to cover these services in connection with the City's issuance of building permits for the project. Thus, no significant impact on Public Services would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

	Potential Significant Impact	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
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?	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>

Discussion of Evaluation: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, and does not exceed the expected growth in the City under the General Plan. Therefore, utilities and service systems needed to serve the project have been planned for and are available to accommodate the proposed single-family development. The appropriate departments and agencies have been notified about the proposal and have indicated that services and utilities are available. The North Coast County Water District (NCCWD or District) prepared an Urban Water Management Plan in December 2005, which projects and plans for water demands until 2010. This plan indicates that there is sufficient water to service the project. The plan analyzes the District's available sources of water supply, existing and estimated demand for water, and whether sufficient water supplies exist for planned development in the District's service area under normal and dry year conditions. On page 24 of the plan, the District concludes that sufficient water supplies exist for projected growth and existing uses under normal years, using growth projections from the City's General Plan and the U.S. Census. In conclusion, because the project is consistent with the City's General Plan, the Urban Water Management Plan effectively included this project in its analysis of anticipated growth in water demand and would be able to provide service. Lastly, electric, gas, water, storm, and sewer lines exist within close proximity of the project site and a condition of approval would require all new utility services to be underground. Thus, no significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? ()	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or				

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

quality of the site and its surroundings? () X

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? X

Discussion of Evaluation: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic ocean vista and the site is not identified in the General Plan as having the potential for designation as a scenic roadway. The subject site is located in an infill site in a residential neighborhood.

The proposed project is not within the viewing corridor of a state scenic highway. The proposed multi-story single-family dwelling will not substantially damage natural scenic resources such as trees, rocky outcroppings and historic buildings. Although 15 eucalyptus trees will need to be removed for the proposed dwelling, the remaining trees will be preserved, including the heritage trees. No rocky outcroppings exist in the area of the site that will be developed with the roadways, dwelling and landscaped areas. The vacant site does not contain any historic structures.

Implementation of the proposed project would involve development of a multi-level single-family dwelling with an attached garage on a currently vacant site. The project site would be graded to accommodate the proposed dwelling. The development including any grading for the site is limited to the footprint of the building. The site is one acre and 10% of the site would be covered by the building, paved area and other impervious surfaces. Thus, due to the minimal disturbance for development of the proposed dwelling on the subject site and the compatibility of the project with the surrounding neighborhood, the impact would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Development of the proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare, including interior and exterior building lighting and vehicle headlights, reflective surfaces, such as windows and light-colored paint on a hillside that is currently vacant. However, the proposal is limited to a multi-story single-family dwelling, which is similar to the surrounding Vallemar neighborhood of single-family dwellings; thus, the anticipated increase in light and glare impacts for one dwelling is minimal and similar to the nearby dwellings. In addition, the subject site is considered to be a large lot for a single-family development in that neighborhood; thus, the light and glare impacts created for one structure spread out over a one acre lot in comparison to light and glare impacts produced by a dwelling placed on a standard 5,000 square foot lot (which is more typical in that neighborhood) would be much less.

Mitigation: None required.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources 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 ceremonies? () X

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

Discussion of Evaluation: There are no known cultural or historical resources within the subject site or project vicinity. No archeological remains have been reported with the surrounding development. However, it is always possible that underground resources could be encountered during the project construction period. Impacts to unidentified resources could be significant.

Mitigation: Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- 1) In the event that a presently undetected cultural resource, including human remains, is revealed, all earthmoving activity within 25 feet of the discovery will cease. The project sponsor will be obligated to retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant who would examine the newly found materials, assess their significance and perform appropriate exploratory and investigative procedures to determine and implement the best course to ensure that there is no significant adverse impacts associated with cultural resources on the site.

XV. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| 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? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The project site is zoned A/B-5 District with an HPD overlay. The project site is not under Williamson Act Contract. Although the site is zoned for Agricultural use, construction of a single-family dwelling is permitted with approval of a Use Permit and Site Development Permit. No agricultural land uses are located on or in close proximity to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources.

Mitigation: None required.

XVI. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Potential Significant <u>Impact</u>	Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	--	---	---------------------

Discussion of Evaluation: The project would neither generate nor create any need for additional recreational opportunities or facilities within the City nor is it suitable for non-motorized modes of transportation such as hiking or biking. Use of local parks or recreational facilities, if any, would be minimal and would not result in any substantial deterioration of any such parks or facilities. Further, the project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, proposed project impacts on recreational facilities would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

XVII. 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? | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 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) | — | — | -- | <u>X</u> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The proposed project involves the development of a vacant one acre lot with one single-family residence. The proposed project is compatible with the existing land uses in the area and will not have any significant impact under this heading, as mitigated under previous sections. Given the size of the project and its impacts and mitigation measures, the incremental effects of this single family home are not considerable when considered in connection with the effects of past, current and probable future projects. As discussed in Section VI above, the project does not have a significant cumulative traffic impact.

This initial study found that the proposed construction of one residential unit at 200 Berendos Avenue, with implementation of the identified mitigation measures, will have no significant impacts on the environment, the habitat of fish or wildlife species or populations, plant or animal communities, rare or endangered plants or animals, or important examples of the major period of California history or prehistory.

Mitigation: None required.

Potential Significant Impact
Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
Less Than Significant Impact
No Impact

LIST OF REFERENCES, CONTACTS AND ATTACHMENTS

List of References

1. City of Pacifica - General Plan, as amended to June 1993.
2. City of Pacifica - Zoning Code, August 1992.
3. Earth Investigation Consultants – Geotechnical Investigation, September 2006 and Letter Dated July 13, 2007; email confirmation from staff to Earth Investigation Consultants dated December 7, 2007)
4. Brian Spigelman - Tree Protection Plan, October 2006
5. TRA Environmental Sciences – Biological Site Assessment, October 2006, and Letters Dated July 27 and December 6, 2007
6. RKH Civil and Transportation Engineering – November 2007
7. FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2005. Map of Approximate Locations of 100-year Flood Areas
8. Department of Fish and Game, Dave Johnston, email communication May, 2006
9. U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Mark D'Avignon, Letter, May 2006
10. North Coast County Water District - Urban Water Management Plan 2006-2010, December 2005
11. Email Communications with DFG on October of 2007
12. Email and Verbal Communications with USFWS in October, November and December of 2008

Contact

Kathryn Farbstein, Assistant Planner
City of Pacifica
1800 Francisco Blvd.
Pacifica, CA 94044
(650) 738-7341

Attachments

- a. Land Use and Zoning Maps
- b. Project Site Maps
- c. City Map/Location of Site in Relation to Highway 1 and Reina Del Mar