Environmental Review
Initial Study

Application Number: 05-0053

Date: April 11th, 2005
Staff Planner: Matthew Johnston

I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

APPLICANT: Bill Williamson, Department of Public Works
OWNER: County Right of Way
Margaret Mc Culley, Arthur Montgomery

APN: 105-171-09
105-131-42
SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 2

LOCATION: This project is located on Valencia Creek, at the crossing of Valencia Road and Valencia Creek, postmile marker 3.2, in the Aptos Area.

SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The proposed project will retrofit an existing baffle system in an existing culvert and install rock weirs downstream of the culvert, to improve fish passage on Valencia Creek in Aptos.

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ARE EVALUATED IN THIS INITIAL STUDY. CATEGORIES THAT ARE MARKED HAVE BEEN ANALYZED IN GREATER DETAIL BASED ON PROJECT SPECIFIC INFORMATION.

____	Geology/Soils	____	Noise
__x__	Hydrology/Water Supply/Water Quality	____	Air Quality
____	Energy & Natural Resources	____	Public Services & Utilities
____	Visual Resources & Aesthetics	____	Land Use, Population & Housing
____	Cultural Resources	____	Cumulative Impacts
____	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	____	Growth Inducement
____	Transportation/Traffic	____	Mandatory Findings of Significance
__X__	Biological Resources	____	

DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL(S) BEING CONSIDERED

____ General Plan Amendment	____ Use Permit
____ Land Division	__x__ Grading Permit
____ Rezoning	__x__ Riparian Exception
____ Development Permit	____ Other:
____ Coastal Development Permit	

NON-LOCAL APPROVALS

Other agencies that must issue permits or authorizations:
California Department of Fish and Game
US Army Corps of Engineers
Regional Water Quality Control Board

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW ACTION

On the basis of this Initial Study and supporting documents:

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

__x__ 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 the attached mitigation measures 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.

Paia Levine

4.28.05
Date

For: Ken Hart
Environmental Coordinator

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS
Parcel Size:
Existing Land Use:
Vegetation:
Slope in area affected by project: _x_ 0 - 30% ___ 31 – 100%
Nearby Watercourse: Valencia Creek
Distance To: Project is in the Creek

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Groundwater Supply: No
Water Supply Watershed: No
Groundwater Recharge: yes
Timber or Mineral: No
Agricultural Resource: No
Biologically Sensitive Habitat: Yes
Fire Hazard: No
Floodplain: No
Erosion: No
Landslide: No
Liquefaction: No
Fault Zone: No
Scenic Corridor: No
Historic: No
Archaeology: No
Noise Constraint: No
Electric Power Lines: N/A
Solar Access: N/A
Solar Orientation: N/A
Hazardous Materials: N/A

SERVICES

Fire Protection: Aptos – La Selva Fire
School District: N/A
Sewage Disposal: N/A
Drainage District: Valencia
Project Access: Valencia Road
Water Supply: N/A

PLANNING POLICIES

Zone District: Residential Agriculture
General Plan: Rural Residential
Special Designation:

Urban Services Line:	___ Inside	_x_ Outside
Coastal Zone:	___ Inside	_x_ Outside

PROJECT SETTING AND BACKGROUND:

Valencia Creek is a perennial stream within the Aptos Creek watershed in Santa Cruz County. At the project location, the creek's substrate is generally dominated by silt and sand although gravel, cobble and boulder are also present. The stream channel averages 12-18 feet in width and is incised at the project site approximately 20 feet. Two small pools were present below the outlet that were only about 2 feet deep and filled with sediment. A pool with an undercut bank and woody debris was present about 40 feet downstream. Downstream channel conditions were dominated by large woody material and abundant fine sediments within the channel, in stream bars and floodplain terraces. Numerous pools with abundant woody debris were present immediately upstream of the project site.

Valencia Creek and the Aptos Creek watershed is known to support both steelhead and resident rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and may support a coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) fishery.
California red-legged frogs (*Rana aurora draytonii*) have been identified within 5 miles of the project site, and a qualified biologist, approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), will conduct protocol level surveys prior to construction. There is also the potential for the yellow-legged frog *(Rana boylii*), and the Pacific pond turtle **(***Actinemys marmorata)*, two California Species of Special Concern**.** The surveys will include these species as well.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The Valencia Road P.M. 3.2 project is being done to retrofit an existing baffle and weir system within a steep (3.8%), 10' diameter Class 3 RCP on Valencia Creek, within the Aptos Creek Watershed. The project involves the demolition and removal of the existing baffle system within the culvert and placement of three rock weirs downstream to promote backwater conditions at the existing culvert outlet and apron feature. Upstream work will be limited only to temporary placement of the coffer dam and diversion pipe. Significant disturbance to upstream channel bed and banks is not anticipated.

This project requires a complete stream diversion/bypass system with 2 coffer dams constructed upstream and downstream with approximately 200' of 18" HDPE pipe, clean gravel bags, visquine and possibly small submersible pumps to maintain clear bypass flows. Staging and concrete cleanout will be done on existing roadway surfaces, out of the riparian zone. The equipment that may be used includes an excavator, loader, and backhoe. Throughout the construction period, the stream will be diverted and in-stream activities will be limited to the dewatered reach.

Equipment access to the channel and culvert outlet will be done via a temporary access road from the existing roadway surface down the left bank, minimizing the loss of existing riparian trees to saplings less than 6 inches in diameter. This area has been identified as requiring the least amount of vegetation removal or grading to allow access to the channel. The equipment will work in the dewatered streambed for rock weir placement. Concrete will be poured within in the culvert to form the ramp baffles. Once the work is complete and the new concrete ramp baffles are sufficiently cured, the HDPE pipe will be removed and the stream will be allowed to run through the culvert baffle system. Concrete accelerants and surface sealants will be required to minimize the diversion period and limit potential concrete leachate contamination. All disturbed areas will get seeded and revegetated with locally appropriate native species at the end of the project. The work to be done will be timed to coincide with the seasonal low flows in Valencia Creek, specifically July 1 through October 15. Revegetation may extend into winter, depending on site and weather conditions.

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

A. Geology and Soils

Does the project have the potential to:

1.	Expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of material loss, injury, or death involving:				
	A. 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 as identified by other substantial evidence?	____	____	____	X
	B. Seismic ground shaking?	____	____	____	X
	C. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	____	____	____	X
	D. Landslides?	____	____	____	X
2.	Subject people or improvements to damage from soil instability as a result of on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, to subsidence, liquefaction, or structural collapse?	____	____	____	X

Following a review of mapped information and a field visit to the site, there is no indication that the development site is subject to a significant potential for damage caused by any of these hazards.

3.	Develop land with a slope exceeding 30%?	____	____	____	X

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

There are slopes that exceed 30% on the property. However, no improvements are proposed on slopes in excess of 30%.

4. Result in soil erosion or the substantial loss of topsoil? ____ ____ ____ X

Some potential for erosion exists during the construction phase of the project to access the creek bed, however, this potential is minimal because all work will be conducted during the dry season and standard erosion controls are a required condition of the project. The access point will be limited to a 50-foot reach of the left bank below the culvert where there is limited woody vegetation. No trees greater than 6 inches will be removed. Prior to approval of a riparian exception, the project must have an approved Erosion Control Plan, which will specify detailed erosion and sedimentation control measures. The plan will include provisions for disturbed areas to be planted with ground cover and to be maintained to minimize surface erosion.

5. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code(1994), creating substantial risks to property? ____ ____ ____ X

There is no indication that the development site is subject to substantial risk caused by expansive soils.

6. Place sewage disposal systems in areas dependent upon soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, leach fields, or alternative waste water disposal systems? ____ ____ ____ X

No septic systems are proposed.

7. Result in coastal cliff erosion? ____ ____ ____ X

B. Hydrology, Water Supply and Water Quality

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Place development within a 100-year flood hazard area? ____ ____ X ____

This project consists of installing weirs and retrofitting existing baffles set into an existing culvert in the channel of Valencia Creek, and therefore within the 100-year

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

flood hazard area. The stream below the culvert has down-cut up to two feet in recent years, and the proposed 36 cubic yards of rock required to construct the weirs will offset some of the stream bed lost to erosion and will bring the stream bed close to where it was when the existing culvert was built in 1998. The project is designed to withstand 100 year flows and does not significantly affect 100-year flood levels.

2.	Place development within the floodway resulting in impedance or redirection of flood flows?			x	

The baffles within the culvert are to be retrofitted to improve fish passage. There will be no negative impact on flood conveyance. The weirs to be installed will arrest on-going down-cutting of the channel. Further, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Rate Map dated April 15, 1986, the project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area.

3.	Be inundated by a seiche or tsunami?				x
4.	Deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit, or a significant contribution to an existing net deficit in available supply, or a significant lowering of the local groundwater table?				X

This project does not impact groundwater.

5.	Degrade a public or private water supply? (Including the contribution of urban contaminants, nutrient enrichments, or other agricultural chemicals or seawater intrusion).				X
6.	Degrade septic system functioning?				x

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
7. Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which could result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on or off-site?			X	

The proposed project will create a series of pools in a reach that has been actively down-cutting in order to facilitate fish migration.

8. Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, or create additional source(s) of polluted runoff?			X	

This project will not result in any change to runoff.

9. Contribute to flood levels or erosion in natural water courses by discharges of newly collected runoff?				X

No new impervious surfaces are proposed as part of the project, thus there will be no additional storm water runoff that could contribute to flooding or erosion.

10. Otherwise substantially degrade water supply or quality?			X	

C. Biological Resources

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Have an adverse effect 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?		X		

*A preliminary biotic constraints analysis was developed for this site by Kittleson Environmental Consulting in January of 2005. This report identifies several listed species that may be present at the project site. Aptos Creek watershed is known to support both steelhead and resident rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and may support a coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) fishery. Prior to site disturbance, a*

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

qualified fisheries biologist will fence off and clear the project reach of all steelhead, relocating them to a predetermined suitable location above the project site. The project reach will then be isolated with coffer dams and routed low past the project reach through a flexible culvert.

Federally listed as threatened, California Red Legged Frogs (CRLF) have been found within 5 miles of the project site, and yellow legged frogs (YLF) and pacific pond turtles (PPT), both species of special concern, are identified as potentially being present at the site. Protocol pre-construction surveys for each of these species by federally approved biologists will be done. Any fish, YLF, or PPT will be relocated to appropriate habitat outside the project area. This, along with follow-up monitoring during construction by the project biologist as recommended in the biotic report (Preliminary Biotic Constraints Analysis, Kittleson, 2005), will ensure no significant detrimental impacts to these species. If CRLF are found, the project will be temporarily halted and US Fish and Wildlife will be consulted for direction. The purpose of this project is to enhance fish passage, and there will be a beneficial long-term impact on fish species. There is a low likelihood of the presence of sharp-shinned or Cooper's hawks, both species of special concern. Presence or absence will be determined by two site visit surveys prior to construction. If breeding hawks are present, the project will not commence until September, after the breeding season.

2. Have an adverse effect on a sensitive biotic community (riparian corridor), wetland, native grassland, special forests, intertidal zone, etc.)? _____ x _____ _____

The disturbance associated with creating access to the stream channel will have a short-term effect on the stream bank the area of the stream bank that is marked by the resource planner and/or project engineer. No trees greater than 6 inches will be removed. Grade will be restored to slope and native riparian species will be planted following project completion. A 3 to 5-year monitoring program of the revegetation of the disturbed slope.
As proposed, on balance, this project will not have a significant adverse effect on the riparian corridor.

3. Interfere 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 or migratory wildlife nursery sites? _____ _____ x _____

The proposed project will improve the movements and migrations of fish and is considered a beneficial impact.

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
4. Produce nighttime lighting that will illuminate animal habitats?				X
5. Make a significant contribution to the reduction of the number of species of plants or animals?			X	

Refer to C-1 and C-2 above.

6. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (such as the Significant Tree Protection Ordinance, SensitiveHabitat Ordinance, provisions of the Design Review ordinance protecting trees with trunk sizes of 6 inch diameters or greater)?			X	

The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances.

7. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Biotic Conservation Easement, or other approved local, regional,or state habitat conservation plan?				X

D. Energy and Natural Resources

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Affect or be affected by land designated as "Timber Resources" by the General Plan?				X
2. Affect or be affected by lands currently utilized for agriculture, or designated in the General Plan for agricultural use?				X

The project site is not currently being used for agriculture and no agricultural uses are proposed for the site or surrounding vicinity.

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
3. Encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use of these in a wasteful manner?				X
4. Have a substantial effect on the potential use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource (i.e., minerals or energy resources)?				X

E. Visual Resources and Aesthetics

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Have an adverse effect on a scenic resource, including visual obstruction of that resource?				X

The project will not directly impact any public scenic resources, as designated in the County's General Plan (1994), or obstruct any public views of these visual resources.

2. Substantially damage scenic resources, within a designated scenic corridor or public view shed area including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings?				X

The project site is not located along a County designated scenic road or within a designated scenic resource area.

3. Degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridge line?			X	

The existing visual setting is riparian. The temporary access road to the creek will be visible from Valencia Road, however, the disturbed area will be planted with native riparian species and will be indistinguishable after a season's growth.

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
4. Create a new source of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
5. Destroy, cover, or modify any unique geologic or physical feature?				X

There are no unique geological or physical features on or adjacent to the site that would be destroyed, covered, or modified by the project.

F. Cultural Resources

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5?				X

The existing structure(s) on the property is not designated as a historic resource on any federal, State or local inventory.

2. Cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5?			X	

Archeological resources are mapped in the vicinity of this project. However, this project proposes disturbance to be confined to the road prism, the interior of the culvert, and site disturbance in the creek bed only. Therefore, it is unlikely that any archeological resource will be disturbed. Pursuant to County Code Section 16.40.040, if at any time in the preparation for or process of excavating or otherwise disturbing the ground, any human remains of any age, or any artifact or other evidence of a Native American cultural site which reasonably appears to exceed 100 years of age are discovered, the responsible persons shall immediately cease and desist from all further site excavation and comply with the notification procedures given in County Code Chapter 16.40.040.

3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

Pursuant to Section 16.40.040 of the Santa Cruz County Code, if at any time during site preparation, excavation, or other ground disturbance associated with this project, human remains are discovered, the responsible persons shall immediately cease and

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

desist from all further site excavation and notify the sheriff-coroner and the Planning Director. If the coroner determines that the remains are not of recent origin, a full archeological report shall be prepared and representatives of the local Native California Indian group shall be contacted. Disturbance shall not resume until the significance of the archeological resource is determined and appropriate mitigations to preserve the resource on the site are established.

4.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?				X

G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Does the project have the potential to:

1.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as a result of the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, not including gasoline or other motor fuels?				X
2.	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?				X

The project site is not included on the October 2, 2002 list of hazardous sites in Santa Cruz County compiled pursuant to the specified code.

3.	Create a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area as a result of dangers from aircraft using a public or private airport located within two miles of the project site?				X
4.	Expose people to electro-magnetic fields associated with electrical transmission lines?				X

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
5. Create a potential fire hazard?			X	
6. Release bio-engineered organisms or chemicals into the air outside of project buildings?				X

H. Transportation/Traffic

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X

There will be no impact because no additional traffic will be generated.

2. Cause an increase in parking demand which cannot be accommodated by existing parking facilities?				X
3. Increase hazards to motorists, bicyclists, or pedestrians?			X	

During construction there may be cause to temporarily close one lane of traffic while machinery accesses the creek from the staging area next to the road. These closures will be temporary, no longer than 5 minutes at a time, and standard signage and traffic controls will be in place. Emergency service vehicles will be allowed to pass without delay.
The proposed project will comply with current road requirements to prevent potential hazards to motorists, bicyclists, and/or pedestrians. No disturbance of the road surface is proposed.

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
4. Exceed, either individually (the project alone) or cumulatively (the project combined with other development), a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated intersections, roads or highways?			X	

I. Noise

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Generate a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
2. Expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
3. Generate a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	

Noise generated during construction will increase the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas. Construction will be temporary, however, and given the limited duration of this impact it is considered to be less than significant.

J. Air Quality

Does the project have the potential to:
(Where available, the significance criteria established by the MBUAPCD may be relied upon to make the following determinations).

1. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	

	Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation	No Impact	Not Applicable
2. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of an adopted air quality plan?			X	

The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plan.

3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
4. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

K. Public Services and Utilities

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Result in the need for new or physically altered public 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:				
a. Fire protection?				X
b. Police protection?				X
c. Schools?				X
d. Parks or other recreational activities?				X

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
e. Other public facilities; including the maintenance of roads?				X
2. Result in the need for construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
3. Result in the need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
4. Cause a violation of wastewater treatment standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
5. Create a situation in which water supplies are inadequate to serve the project or provide fire protection?				X
6. Result in inadequate access for fire protection?			X	

One lane will remain open at all times. Fire trucks, ambulances and other emergency vehicles will not be blocked from using the road at any time.

7. Make a significant contribution to a cumulative reduction of landfill capacity or ability to properly dispose of refuse?				X

M. Non-Local Approvals

Does the project require approval of federal, state, or regional agencies? Yes x No ____

N. Mandatory Findings of Significance

1. 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant, animal, or natural community, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Yes ____ No x

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short term, to the disadvantage of long term environmental goals? (A short term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long term impacts endure well into the future) Yes ____ No x

3. 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, and the effects of reasonably foreseeable future projects which have entered the Environmental Review stage)? Yes ____ No x

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Yes ____ No x

Environmental Review Initial Study
Page 19

M. Non-Local Approvals

Does the project require appr
or regional agencies? Yes x No ____

N. Mandatory Findings of Si

1. Does the project have t
degrade the quality of th
substantially reduce the
wildlife species, cause a
population to drop belov
levels, threaten to elimir
community, substantiall
or restrict the range of a
plant, animal, or natural
eliminate important exar
periods of California hist
Yes ____ No x

2. Does the project have th
achieve short term, to th
long term environmental
impact on the environme
occurs in a relatively brie
time while long term imp
the future)
Yes ____ No x

3. Does the project have im
individually limited, but c
considerable ("cumulativ
means that the incremen
project are considerable
connection with the effec
and the effects of reason
future projects which hav
Environmental Review st
Yes ____ No x

4. Does the project have en
which will cause substant
on human beings, either
indirectly?
Yes ____ No x

TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

REQUIRED	COMPLETED*	N/A
Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission (APAC) Review		x
Archaeological Review		x
Biotic Report/Assessment	1/17/05	
Geologic Hazards Assessment (GHA)		x
Geologic Report		x
Geotechnical (Soils) Report		x
Riparian Pre-Site		x
Septic Lot Check		x
Other:		

Environmental Review Initial Study

TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

REQUIRED	COMPLETED*	N/A
Agricultural Policy Advisory Co (APAC) Review		x
Archaeological Review		x
Biotic Report/Assessment	1/17/05	
Geologic Hazards Assessment		x
Geologic Report		x
Geotechnical (Soils) Report		x
Riparian Pre-Site		x
Septic Lot Check		x
Other:		

Attachments:

1. Vicinity Map
2. Project Plans
3. Preliminary Biotic Constraints Analysis, Kittleson Environmental Consulting, 1/20/05

Attachments:

1. Vicinity Map
2. Project Plans
3. Preliminary Biotic Constraints Analys