City of Grover Beach
154 S. 8th Street
Grover Beach CA 93433 Community Development Department 805-473-4520

Initial Study of Environmental Impact

I. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION FORM

1a. File No.:

99-024

1b. Project Title:

Dune Boardwalk Project

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Grover Beach
Bob Mack, Interim Community Development Director
154 S. 8th St.
Grover Beach, CA 93433

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

David Foote, c/o ***firma***, (805) 781-9800

4. Project Location:

The project is located within Pismo State Beach (California Department of Parks and Recreation) between the Grand Avenue Day Use area and the "Butterfly Trees" at the northern city limit. The project is to be constructed between the existing golf course and the open dune and beach along the vegetated back dune area (see **Figure 1–Vicinity Map**).

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

City of Grover Beach
Community Development Department
154 S. 8th Street
Grover Beach CA 93433

6. General Plan Designation:

State Park

7. Zoning:

Coastal Open Space (CO)

8. Project Description

The Project is a recreational pedestrian path which will link the existing day use recreation area at the end of Grand Avenue in Grover Beach to the area known as the "Butterfly Trees" within Pismo State Beach in Pismo Beach.

The path is proposed to consist of a wood boardwalk traversing the vegetated backdune area and improvements to an existing unsurfaced trail

The Beach Boardwalk Feasibility Study prepared in 1997 by firma was reviewed by both the City of Pismo Beach and the City of Grover Beach and each City Council determined the "preferred Route" for the boardwalk. Alternative Routes were developed in consultation with the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Department of Transportation. The overall goal of these planning studies was to identify a feasible pedestrian route ultimately linking the Grand Avenue day-use area to the boardwalk promenade in Pismo Beach.

The range of alternative routes and path construction techniques analyzed in 1997 as part of the feasibility study for the Project were further refined in a December, 1999 Design Report. These have been further refined in consultation with various agencies and "stakeholders". On October 25, 2000, the joint Grover Beach and Pismo Beach City Councils directed city staff and the project consultants to proceed with the Grover Beach dune boardwalk project as a stand-alone project of independent utility with termini at the Butterfly Trees and the Grand Ave Day Use area.

The Project would be constructed on lands owned by the State of California within Pismo State Beach.

Pismo Beach State Park has annual visitation of about 1.3 to 1.6 million persons including the North Beach and Oceano campgrounds. Pismo Coast Village has about 560,000 visitors annually. In addition, the beach and dune areas can be accessed from public parking lots at Addie Street and Grand Avenue. Many local residents use the existing dune trails and beach on a regular basis for recreational walking.

As evidenced by the criss-crossing of footpaths in the dunes and the multitude footprints in the sand at the beach on any given day, it is apparent that the entire open space in the beach and dunes is heavily used by pedestrians on a regular basis. It is clear that the scenic and recreational value of the area is high and is desirable for hiking, recreational walking, play and wildlife observation.

As a result of the intensive visitor use of the area, the natural dune and beach resource is currently impacted to a high degree. This is evidenced by the degradation of native dune vegetation and potential harm to Snowy Plover habitat. Although isolated efforts at sand stabilization and revegetation have been largely successful, state resources to install additional fencing to control sand and foot traffic and revegetated areas is limited.

The boardwalk path would serve as a designated trail which, with appropriate signage, interpretive information and rail fences, would help control unrestricted access to the dunes that result in devegetation and potential disruption of potential Snowy Plover nesting areas which is the status quo. The Project would serve as a management tool to protect sensitive resources, as demonstrated at other similar dune areas at Marina State Beach and Oso Flaco Lake.

The Project also implements the City of Grover Beach Local Coastal Program (LCP) which calls for cooperation between the City and the California Department of Parks and Recreation to utilize all opportunities to provide additional public coastal access including measures to protect coastal resources from overuse, and maximizing public coastal access.

Figure 2 shows the proposed Dune Boardwalk alignment. The Boardwalk actually consists of three types of paths as shown on **Exhibits 1 and 2**:

- At grade boardwalk six to eight feet wide constructed of wood members roughly at grade. Minimal clearing of exotic iceplant vegetation and grade manipulation to smooth off the route will be required. The boardwalk will have a 36 inch high single rail barrier long the ocean side of the path with signage to encourage users to stay on the boardwalk.

- Raised boardwalk six feet wide constructed of wood. The construction system employs no heavy equipment for installation. Actual surface disturbance is limited because the deck is elevated to pass over undulating terrain. The boardwalk will have 42 inch high rails on both sides. The raised boardwalk will include an overlook / observation deck with interpretive display and seating.

- Improved path surface will utilize the existing trail, which will be widened to six feet and be improved with decomposed granite with stabilizing polymer or compacted aggregate base to provide a suitable walking surface. Portions of this path type will have rails to contain and direct users and others will not, depending on proximity to the dunes. Vehicular access for state park will be maintained along the golf course boundary. Signage will be provided to direct users.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

North: Pismo State Beach North Beach Campground
South: Grand Avenue Day Use recreation area
East: Golf Course
West: Dunes and Beach

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

California Department of Parks and Recreation

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a Potentially Significant Impact as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

X	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Land Use / Planning
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Population / Housing
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Transportation / Traffic
	Public Services		Recreation		
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		

☐ There is no evidence before the Department that the project will have any potential adverse effects on fish and wildlife resources or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. As such, the project qualifies for a de minimis waiver with regards to the filing of Fish and Game Fees.

☒ The project has potential to impact fish and wildlife resources and shall be subject to the payment of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code.

City of Grover Beach
154 S. 8th Street
Grover Beach CA 93433 Community Development Department 805-473-4520

12. Determination: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project applicant in the form of a MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

☐ 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 20 has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

DAVID FOOTE
Printed Name

11·14·00
Date

City of Grover Beach
For

II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	1,8		X		
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	1,8			X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	1,8			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X	

Impact Discussion:

1a. The portion of the proposed project that traverses the back dune area will run up to the dune crest at the interpretive overlook platform. This platform deck will be at the dune grade but will be visible against the horizon when viewed from the east and south. Generally the proposed route will be in the backdune and conform closely to natural grade. Where the raised boardwalk is required to traverse undulating terrain, it will generally run up and down depressions between dune crests to come up over the crest and back down. As a result of this flexibility in response to terrain the boardwalk will for the most part be subordinate to the landform and will not silhouette against the dune horizon.

Mitigation:

To avoid potential significant effects on the scenic vista of the dune area, the project design will minimize the use of raised boardwalk where it would be seen in silhouette and run the raised boardwalk in an alignment that places the structure against or below the dunes.

1b. The project will not be visible from any scenic highway

1c. Because of the compact, narrow footprint of the boardwalk , the ability to conform the route to existing grades, and the low profile of the railing, the boardwalk will not substantially alter the visual quality of the dune environment. The boardwalk will not be significantly visible from the North Beach Campground or the golf course. In addition, the boardwalk will not be significantly visible from the beach area. Recreational features like boardwalks are common and accepted amenities in dune environments. Impacts are identified as less than significant.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
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?	1				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	1				X
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?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

2a. The subject site has no agricultural value.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	1				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	1				X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	1				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?					X

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

3a-e. The project will not significantly add vehicle trips because it will largely serve existing users. Persons that would otherwise not have walked in the dunes due to age or disability would be able to do so when the project is built, however this increment of change is neither quantifiable or likely to be significant. The project will not produce odors or pollutants.

4. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	4		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	4		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?	4			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?	4		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	4				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?	4				X

Impact Discussion:

Summary of the Natural Environment Study (see reference 4)

Impacts on vegetation are primarily on exotic ice plant *(Carpobrotus spp.)*. Due to the limited footprint of the path and reliance on hand operated power tools to construct, sensitive plants can be avoided. Jurisdictional wetlands and associated plant communities can be avoided by design. Impacts on aquatic habitats can also be avoided by design.

Mitigation measures, including pre-construction surveys and habitat, construction timing, use of hand tools, fencing and signage, will avoid or substantially reduce potential effects on Snowy Plover, California redlegged frog and Southwestern Pond Turtle habitat. No Snowy Plover nests are currently present within the dune/beach area north of Grand Avenue to Pismo Creek, nor have individuals been sighted in recent years. CRLF was not present when surveyed. Southwestern Pond Turtle is likely to be present but was not observed in field surveys.

4a-b. Sensitive Plant Communities

Potential indirect, cumulative impacts upon coastal foredune habitat, dune scrub and coastal freshwater marsh are identified. Impacts due to removal of vegetation for path construction are primarily upon exotic iceplant vegetation, and not these plant communities.

Features incorporated into the project that will mitigate impacts upon these plant communities include:

- The boardwalk shall include a railing on the west edge to contain users and discourage off-path foot traffic on the dunes and wetland areas
- The boardwalk shall include interpretive signage to alert the public to the sensitive nature of the dune and marsh environments
- The boardwalk path shall not encroach into freshwater marsh habitat

Sensitive Plant Species

Potential direct impacts are identified for *Erigeron blochaniae* and *Malacothrix incana* if individual plants cannot be avoided by route adjustments in the field.

Mitigation measures incorporated into the project description to reduce potential impacts on sensitive plants include:

- The boardwalk route shall be staked in the field prior to construction and the alignment shall be reviewed by a botanist to identify whether any Erigeron or Malacothrix would be removed or impacted. Since the concentration of these species on the site is very low, avoidance should be the first priority. If necessary, the route shall be adjusted to avoid these species to the degree feasible and areas of other native dune plants shall be protected during construction.
- Where plants are unavoidably removed, a revegetation plan shall be implemented which replaces affected plants at a 10:1 ratio with plants propagated from on-site sources. In addition, the replanting program shall include other dune species as appropriate to the specific impact area. Replanting shall be maintained and monitored for three years and shall have 50% survival at the end of three years.

Sensitive Wildlife Species

California Redlegged Frog (CRLF)

The project could result in indirect impacts on suitable CRLF habitat along Meadow Creek. It could also result in direct disturbance of individual frogs if present during construction. Both impacts are mitigable by implementing the following measures:

- Avoid Degradation of Suitable CRLF Habitat: Although no CRLF were identified in the protocol survey, suitable habitat does exist in the project area and shall be avoided. (The project has been designed to avoid this habitat and all jurisdictional wetlands).
- Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for CRLF: Conduct surveys for CRLF within the vicinity of the proposed route to determine if habitat is currently occupied and identify what protective measures should be implemented prior to construction.
- Avoid Disturbance of CRLF Breeding Lifestage: If CRLF are identified as present in the preconstruction survey, to avoid disturbance to the breeding lifestage of CRLF within the vicinity of the project site, restrict the timing of construction to the degree feasible to outside of the typical breeding period for this species (November through April 30).
- Avoid Disturbance of CRLF During Construction Activities: To avoid disturbance of individual CRLF occurring within the vicinity of the construction, exclude frogs from the construction area prior to and throughout the duration of the construction. This can be accomplished by installing exclusion netting around perimeter of construction at least one week prior to construction.

Southwestern Pond Turtle

The project could create a barrier to turtle movement which could be a direct impact.

- To mitigate potential impediments to turtle movement, the boardwalk path shall be constructed with space for turtles to crawl under the path. Openings under the path shall be at 25-foot intervals where the path is adjacent to suitable habitat, i.e., Meadow Creek. A pre-construction survey and fencing of habitat areas where construction work will occur shall be implemented.

Snowy Plover

The project description calls for the boardwalk to be located in the backdune away from foredune areas where potential Snowy Plover habitat exists. The project would not have direct impacts on Snowy Plover habitat. Indirect impacts include temporary construction noise and the continued use of the dune area by pedestrians, which will occur with or without the project.

Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant levels include:

- Perform a pre-construction survey for Snowy Plover nests in the area 100 feet seaward of the boardwalk route. Modify path alignment to achieve a 100-foot setback or shift construction timing accordingly if nests are present.
- Limit construction activities to the reardune area and avoid construction activities that require heavy motorized equipment to before April 30 or after August 30. (Most boardwalk construction activities involve only power hand tools.)
- The boardwalk shall include railings on the duneward site of the path to limit foot traffic off path and shall include signage warning users of the sensitive nature of the dune environment and Snowy Plovers in particular.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. **CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:					

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	5				X

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	5				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	5				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	5				X

Impact Discussion:

5a-d. Based on Phase 1 surface survey and a historical survey, no significant cultural are present within the project construction area.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. 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				X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	1				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	1,3			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	1,3			X	
iv) Landslides?	1				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	1,3			X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	1,2				X

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	1				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

6a-e. Due to the project's location in dune sand the only potentially significant geologic /soil hazard is in wind erosion if significant areas are devegetated. Due to the narrow width and ability of the construction systems to respond and conform to natural terrain, significant areas will not be devegetated and erosion risks are less than significant. The project will provide minor stabilization in the form of rice straw mulch and native seed to about 2000 square feet of existing devegetated dune to stabilize localized bare areas along the boardwalk. This will be a beneficial effect.

7. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	1,3				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	1,3				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	1,3				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	1,6				X

e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	1				X
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	1				X
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	1				X
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

7a-h. The project will not involve the use or transport of toxic or hazardous materials other than typical substances used in basic construction.

		Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:					
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	3			X	
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	1				X

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	1,7				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	1,7				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	1,7				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	1			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	1,7				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	1,7			X	
I) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	1,7				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	1,7			X	

Impact Discussion:

8a-j. Based on engineering analysis (see source 7), review of the site environs and discussions with state park officials, no proposed features would be likely to impede or raise flood levels significantly. No habitable structures are proposed.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	1				X

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				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	1,2				X

Impact Discussion:

9a-c. The proposed project is consistent with the Grover Beach Local Coastal Plan and is supported by the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	1				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?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

10a-b The project would not result in any effects on mineral sources.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. NOISE. Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	1,2			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	1				X

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	3				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	1,3			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	1				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

11a-b. The project will not increase ambient noise levels significantly because the boardwalk will be limited to pedestrians. Short-term noise will occur during construction. The use of motorized construction vehicles will be generally limited to deliveries and refuse transport. Power machinery will generally be limited to hand tools. Due to the low ambient noise levels present these temporary increases of sporadic duration would not cause the City day-night noise level standard or the stationary noise source standard to be exceeded. No significant effects are identified.

12. **POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:**	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	1				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	1				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of re-placement housing elsewhere?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

12a-c. The project will not add population or displace housing..

13. PUBLIC SERVICES.	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire protection?	1				X
Police protection?	1				X
Schools?	1				X
Parks?	1				X
Other public facilities?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

13a. The project will not create the need for any public service facilities.

14. RECREATION:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	1,3			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	1			X	

Impact Discussion:

14a. The project may increase the total number of visitors to the dunes by providing an path accessible to the very young, the old and disabled. The ultimate number of users is limited to a large degree by the number of existing parking spaces at the day use facility. However because the project will also help keep current users from indiscriminately walking across the dunes there will be a net beneficial effect on recreational facilities.

15. **TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:** Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	1			X	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	1				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	1				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	1			X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	1,3			X	
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	1			X	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

15a-g. The project will be primarily accessed by users parking in the 160 space day use parking lot. This lot serves as parking for beach access and for the existing restaurant, as well as equestrian users. The project in itself will not generate significant new trips or impact local roads adversely. To the extent that the project provides an alternative way to get to the Butterfly trees, use of the day use parking lot could divert vehicles that now park unsafely at the Butterfly trees along Highway 1. This would be a beneficial effect.

16. **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	1				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	1				X

c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	1				X
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	1				X
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	1				X
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	1				X
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

16a-g. The project will not create new water or sewer facilities or significantly add to sewer demand, water demand or solid waste.

		Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17.	**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?	4		X		

b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively consider-able" 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)?	1			X	
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	1,3			X	

Impact Discussion:

17a. The project, due to its limited scope and location, does not have the potential to substantially reduce sensitive habitat, cause wildlife species to drop below self-sustaining levels or eliminate examples of California history or prehistory. The project can avoid by design sensitive habitat near the site and will not be constructed in areas where Snowy Plover would be likely to nest. The project will be constructed in backdune areas which are covered with iceplant. These areas are not Snowy Plover habitat.

17b. The project could add to the total number of visitors to the dunes by making an accessible path for the elderly and disabled. This potential increase is offset by the provision of railings and signage to keep walkers on the path, thus reducing to a significant degree the indiscriminant travel over the dunes which is currently degrading the environment.

17c. No significant adverse effects on humans are identified.

17. EARLIER ANALYSES.	
Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one of more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (D0. In this case a discussion should identify the following items:	
a)	**Earlier analysis used.** The Initial Study relied upon the adopted Local Coastal Program for the City of Grover Beach and its adopted Negative Declaration.
b)	**Impacts adequately addressed.** (Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.) The LCP and related CEQA document adequately addressed agriculture, hazards, geology, and land use. No mitigation is referenced because no impacts were identified.
c)	**Mitigation measures.** (For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions of the project.) None identified.

18.	SOURCE REFERENCES.
1.	City of Grover Beach, Local Coastal Program, January 2000
2.	FIRMA, Beach Boardwalk Feasibility Study, August 1997
3.	FIRMA, Design Report and Project Description,December 1999
4.	Levine Fricke Recon, Natural Environment Study, Wetland Delineation and Red Legged Frog Survey , August 2000
5.	Conejo Archaeological Consulting, Phase 1 Archaeological Survey, April 2000
6.	FIRMA, Initial Site Assessment Checklist, February 2000
7.	Garing Taylor Associates, Floodway Study, November 1999
8.	FIRMA , Visual Resource Analysis, December 1999

19.	MITIGATION MEASURES/MONITORING PROGRAM.
1.	**Mitigation measure to avoid potential significant effects on the scenic vista of the dune area:** the project design will minimize the use of raised boardwalk where it would be seen in silhouette and run the raised boardwalk in an alignment that places the structure against or below the dunes. • **Monitoring:** Community Development Department (CDD) shall verify the final route complies with the measure at the time of construction staking.
2.	**Mitigation: Features incorporated into the project that will mitigate impacts upon sensitive plant communities include:** • The boardwalk shall include a railing on the west edge to contain users and discourage off-path foot traffic on the dunes and wetland areas. • The boardwalk shall include interpretive signage to alert the public to the sensitive nature of the dune and marsh environments adjoining or near the path. • The boardwalk path shall not encroach into freshwater marsh habitat. • **Monitoring:** CDD to verify the final plans have the elements specified in the measure prior to issuance of a building permit, and check compliance in the field.
3.	**Mitigation measures incorporated into the project description to reduce potential impacts on sensitive plants include:** • The boardwalk route shall be staked in the field prior to construction and the alignment shall be reviewed by a botanist to identify whether any Erigeron or Malacothrix would be removed or impacted. Since the concentration of these species on the site is very low, avoidance should be the first priority. If necessary, the route shall be adjusted to avoid these species to the degree feasible and areas of other native dune plants shall be protected during construction. • Where plants are unavoidably removed, a revegetation plan shall be implemented which replaces affected plants at a 10:1 ratio with plants propagated from on-site sources. In addition, the replanting program shall include other dune species as appropriate to the specific impact area. Replanting shall be maintained and monitored for three years and shall have 50% survival at the end of three years. • **Monitoring:** CDD to verify avoidance and replacement during pre-construction and construction phases, retaining a qualified professional to identify monitoring activities related to sensitive plants. CDD to verify adequacy for any needed replacement plan and monitoring for three years.

4.	**Mitigation to reduce potential significant impacts to California redlegged frog potentially present near the project:** • Avoid Degradation of Suitable CRLF Habitat: Although no CRLF were identified in the protocol survey, suitable habitat does exist in the project area and shall be avoided. (The project has been designed to avoid this habitat and all jurisdictional wetlands). • Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for CRLF: Conduct surveys for CRLF within the vicinity of the proposed route to determine if habitat is currently occupied and identify what protective measures should be implemented prior to construction. • Avoid Disturbance of CRLF Breeding Lifestage: If CRLF are identified as present in the preconstruction survey, to avoid disturbance to the breeding lifestage of CRLF within the vicinity of the project site, restrict the timing of construction to the degree feasible to outside of the typical breeding period for this species (November through April 30). • Avoid Disturbance of CRLF During Construction Activities: To avoid disturbance of individual CRLF occurring within the vicinity of the construction, exclude frogs from the construction area prior to and throughout the duration of the construction. This can be accomplished by installing exclusion netting around perimeter of construction at least one week prior to construction. • **Monitoring:** CDD to verify qualified biologist is retained for monitoring and compliance with pre-construction and construction-stage measures.
5.	**Mitigation to reduce potential significant impacts to Southwestern Pond Turtle:** To mitigate potential impediments to turtle movement, the boardwalk path shall be constructed with space for turtles to crawl under the path. Openings under the path shall be at 25-foot intervals where the path is adjacent to suitable habitat, i.e., Meadow Creek. A pre-construction survey and fencing of habitat areas where construction work will occur shall be implemented. • **Monitoring:** CDD to verify final plans include turtle passages under boardwalk, and compliance with pre-construction stage survey and fencing requirements.
6.	**Mitigation measures to reduce potential indirect and cumulative impacts to Snowy Plover to less than significant levels include:** • Perform a pre-construction survey for Snowy Plover nests in the area 100 feet seaward of the boardwalk route. Modify path alignment to achieve a 100-foot setback or shift construction timing accordingly if nests are present. • Limit construction activities to the reardune area and avoid construction activities that require heavy motorized equipment to before April 30 or after August 30. (Most boardwalk construction activities involve only power hand tools.) • The boardwalk shall include railings on the duneward site of the path to limit foot traffic off path and shall include signage warning users of the sensitive nature of the dune environment and Snowy Plovers in particular. • **Monitoring:** CDD to verify qualified biologist is retained for pre-construction survey in coordination with USFWS and CDFG. CDD to monitor and verify final route and compliance with construction activity timing limits.

The above mitigation measures are included in the project to mitigate potential adverse environmental impacts. Section 15070(b)(1) of the California Administrative Code requires the applicant to agree to the above mitigation measures before the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration is released for public review. I hereby agree to the mitigation measures and monitoring program outlined above.

Jim A. Olson
Applicant

11/16/00
Date