

DRAFT

**INITIAL STUDY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**JULIA PFEIFFER BURNS STATE PARK
TIN HOUSE ROAD PROJECT**

AUGUST 2005



State of California
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT: JULIA PFEIFFER BURNS STATE PARK TIN HOUSE ROAD PROJECT

LEAD AGENCY: California Department of Parks and Recreation

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS: The Initial Study for this Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for review at:

- Monterey District Headquarters
California Department of Parks & Recreation
2211 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940
- Big Sur Station/Multi-Agency Facility
Big Sur Station #1
Big Sur, CA 93920
- Monterey City Library
625 Pacific
Monterey, CA 93940
- Monterey County Free Library
Big Sur Branch
Highway 1 @ Ripplewood Resort
Big Sur, CA 93920

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Tin House Road Project –

- This project proposes to make the following modifications to the Tin House Road at Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park utilizing the techniques described in the California State Parks Field Techniques for Forest and Range Road Removal (Merrill and Casaday, 2001). The purpose of the project is to reconfigure the drainage across and along Tin House Road to minimize the potential impacts of drainage and erosion on the road and adjacent lands as well as to comply with provisions of a court supervised settlement agreement. California Department of Parks and Recreation has agreed to remove fill material deposited near the hairpin turn at Tin House Road that is closest to Highway 1. Fill material will be removed from the road edge and natural creek channel.
- In order to restore the channel, the adjacent access road (Tin House Road) will be partially retained with a crib wall. The road bed adjacent to the creek will be stabilized to prevent rutting and erosion.

- Work required in the limits of the normal high water zone of the creek will be done in conjunction with a Department of Fish and Game (DFG)-approved dewatering plan. The dewatering plan will consist primarily of a coffer dam immediately upstream of the area of work, a bypass pipe to allow the creek to flow around the area of work, and a downstream silt fence assembly. After installing dewatering facilities the contractor will rescue any aquatic animals found in the dewatered zone and work area. Rescued species will be hand-netted and transported in buckets to an area of similar characteristics downstream of the work zone. The downstream silt fence will prevent movement back into the dewatered zone. The dewatered zone will be inspected prior to work starting each day to determine if live animals are in the area. All species will be relocated as described above if found at any time in the work zone or dewatered area.
- Culverts will be replaced with larger diameter culverts where they are undersized or damaged and where they contribute to erosion problems.
- The project also includes measures to improve natural drainage patterns across Tin House Road, reduce erosion potential, and encourage water flows across, rather than down the road. The road bed will be graded to an outsloped condition and inboard ditches will be eliminated through re-grading and fill. Swales and rolling dips will be constructed to direct overland flow across the road and into natural drainage courses.
- All areas disturbed by the project will be stabilized and in appropriate areas revegetated with native plants grown from seeds collected in the project area.
- Following construction existing uses of the road will not be changed by the project. The road will continue to be used as a public recreational trail and authorized vehicles (e.g. maintenance and emergency response vehicles) will be the only vehicles to access the road.

Questions or comments regarding this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration may be addressed to:

Ken Gray
Staff Park and Recreation Specialist
California Department of Parks & Recreation
Monterey District
2211 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 649-2862

Pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has independently reviewed and analyzed the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the proposed project and finds that these documents reflect the independent judgment of DPR. DPR, as lead agency, also confirms

that the project mitigation measures detailed in these documents are feasible and will be implemented as stated in the Negative Declaration.

Mathew Fuzie
District Superintendent

Date

Ken Gray
Staff Park and Recreation Specialist

Date

TABLE of CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 INTRODUCTION.....	2
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	5
3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST.....	10
I. Aesthetics.....	13
II. Agricultural Resources.....	15
III. Air Quality.....	16
IV. Biological Resources.....	18
V. Cultural Resources.....	24
VI. Geology and Soils.....	26
VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	29
VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality.....	32
IX. Land Use and Planning.....	36
X. Mineral Resources.....	37
XI. Noise.....	38
XII. Population and Housing.....	41
XIII. Public Services.....	42
XIV. Recreation.....	43
XV. Transportation/Traffic.....	44
XVI. Utilities and Service Systems.....	46
4 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	48
5 SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES.....	50
6 REFERENCES.....	54
7 REPORT PREPARATION.....	55

Appendices

- A MAPS, TABLES, AND CHARTS**
- B PROJECT DESIGN GRAPHICS**
- C CNDDDB RECORD SEARCH**
- D LIST OF ACRONYMS**
- E MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed Tin House Road Project at Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park, Monterey County, California. This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code §21000 *et seq.*, and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR) §15000 *et seq.*

An Initial Study is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment [CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)]. If there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15064(a). However, if the lead agency determines that revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant mitigate the potentially significant effects to a less-than-significant level, a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared instead of an EIR [CEQA Guidelines §15070(b)]. The lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons a proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why an EIR need not be prepared. This IS/MND conforms to the content requirements under CEQA Guidelines §15071.

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary approval authority over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15051(b)(1), "the lead agency will normally be an agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose." The lead agency for the proposed project is DPR. The contact person for the lead agency is:

Ken Gray
Staff Park and Recreation Specialist
California Department of Parks & Recreation
Monterey District
2211 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 649-2862

1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

The purpose of this document is to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed Tin House Road Project at Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to eliminate any potentially significant impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level.

This document is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1 - Introduction.
This chapter provides an introduction to the project and describes the purpose and organization of this document.
- Chapter 2 - Project Description.
This chapter describes the reasons for the project, scope of the project, and project objectives.
- Chapter 3 - Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.
This chapter identifies the significance of potential environmental impacts, explains the environmental setting for each environmental issue, and evaluates the potential impacts identified in the CEQA Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist. Mitigation measures are incorporated, where appropriate, to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- Chapter 4 - Mandatory Findings of Significance
This chapter identifies and summarizes the overall significance of any potential impacts to natural and cultural resources, cumulative impacts, and impact to humans, as identified in the Initial Study.
- Chapter 5 - Summary of Mitigation Measures.
This chapter summarizes the mitigation measures incorporated into the project as a result of the Initial Study.
- Chapter 6 - References.
This chapter identifies the references and sources used in the preparation of this IS/MND.
- Chapter 7 - Report Preparation
This chapter provides a list of those involved in the preparation of this document.

1.4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter 3 of this document contains the Environmental (Initial Study [IS]) Checklist that identifies the potential environmental impacts (by environmental issue) and a brief discussion of each impact resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

Based on the IS and supporting environmental analysis provided in this document, the proposed Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park Tin House Road Project will result in less-than-significant impacts for the following issues: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

In accordance with §15064(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, a MND shall be prepared if the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment after the inclusion of mitigation measures in the project. Based on the available project information and the environmental analysis presented in this document, there is no substantial evidence that, after the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment. It is proposed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted for this project, in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

CHAPTER 2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed Tin House Road Project at Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park (SP) in Monterey County, California. The purpose of the project is to reconfigure the drainage across and along Tin House Road to minimize the potential impacts of drainage and erosion on the road and adjacent lands as well as to comply with provisions of a court supervised settlement agreement. DPR has agreed to remove fill material deposited near the hairpin turn at Tin House Road that is closest to Highway 1. The fill material will be removed from the road edge and creek channel. The property boundary between DPR and the adjacent neighbor is the centerline of Redwood Creek. The fill has altered the natural flow line of the creek. By removing the fill from Redwood Creek, the creek will be able to flow along the natural channel, i.e. the property boundary. In order to restore the channel, the adjacent access road (Tin House Road) will be partially retained with a crib wall. The road bed adjacent to the creek will be stabilized to prevent rutting and erosion. Culverts will be replaced with larger diameter culverts where they are undersized or damaged and where they contribute to erosion problems. The project also includes measures to improve natural drainage patterns across Tin House Road, reduce erosion potential, and encourage water flows across, rather than down the road. The road bed will be graded to an outsloped condition and inboard ditches will be eliminated through re-grading and fill. Swales and rolling dips will be constructed to direct overland flow across the road and into natural drainage courses. All areas disturbed by the project will be stabilized and in appropriate areas revegetated with native plants grown from seeds collected in the project area. Following construction existing uses of the road will not be changed by the project. The road will continue to be used as a public recreation trail and it will be accessible for authorized vehicle use only.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

Situated in Monterey County, 37 miles south of Carmel on Highway 1, Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP encompasses over 2,000 acres of varied habitats, with spectacular views from the park's 3,000-foot ridges. Tin House Road is north of the park's main entrance on Highway 1 at Post Mile 36.9 and traverses generally moderately steep to steep slopes until it reaches the Tin House on a ridgeline nose about 1600 feet above Highway 1. The hairpin turn project site is located approximately 400 feet from the gate at the entrance to Tin House Road adjacent to Highway 1. The region is rural in nature, with pockets of small community development.

2.3 BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Tin House Road is a 2.2 mile backcountry dirt road built circa 1944 to provide access to the Tin House prior to and following its construction in 1946. The road is about 12 feet

wide, with an eight to ten foot wide running surface. The road traverses steep slopes (ranging from 35% to 100%) and crosses several small watershed areas. The road is mostly constructed with an inboard cross slope and with metal culverts conveying water under the road at natural drainage areas. The beginning portion of the road runs parallel to Redwood Creek. The road leaves the creek side via a steep hairpin turn and commences upslope towards the Tin House. The creek channel near the hairpin turn has been blocked by a redwood wall and associated backfill.

Water runoff from slopes above the road is conveyed by the roadbed in the in-board ditch, sometimes traveling several hundred feet along the road, away from the natural drainage path for the runoff. Water is released from the in-board ditch to down-slope areas periodically as the terrain allows. The in-board ditch alters the path of runoff, sometimes concentrating water to a down-slope area that will not naturally receive concentrated runoff. Concentrating runoff on slopes in this manner can accelerate the rate of erosion and trigger landslides if conditions of slope instability exist.

In order to restore water to natural drainage paths and decrease erosion associated with the road, the roadbed will be re-graded from an inboard cross slope to an outboard cross slope and by constructing dips in the road to direct runoff. Where culverts exist they will be replaced to prevent fill failure if they are undersized or in a perched location. These techniques are referred to as road re-engineering in this document.

2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives for this project are:

- Restore the natural drainage course of Redwood Creek.
- Remove fill adjacent to the roadway at the hairpin turn adjacent to Redwood Creek in order to comply with a court supervised settlement agreement to restore proper placement of the property boundary.
- Improve drainage patterns across Tin House Road.

2.5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Tin House Road Project – This project proposes to make modifications to the Tin House Road at Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park utilizing the techniques described in the California State Parks Field Techniques for Forest and Range Road Removal (Merrill and Casaday, 2001). The purpose of the project is to reconfigure the drainage across and along Tin House Road to minimize the potential impacts of drainage and erosion on the road and adjacent lands as well as to comply with provisions of a court supervised settlement agreement. DPR has agreed to remove fill material deposited near the hairpin turn at Tin House Road that is closest to Highway 1. The fill material will be removed from the road edge and creek channel. The property boundary between Parks and the adjacent neighbor is the centerline of Redwood Creek. The fill has altered the natural flow line of the creek. By removing the fill from Redwood Creek, the creek will be able to flow along the natural channel, i.e. the property boundary. In order to restore the channel, the adjacent access road (Tin House Road) will be partially retained with a

crib wall. The road bed adjacent to the creek will be stabilized to prevent rutting and erosion.

Work required in the limits of the normal high water zone of the creek will be done in conjunction with a California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)-approved dewatering plan. The dewatering plan will consist primarily of a coffer dam immediately upstream of the area of work, a bypass pipe to allow the creek to flow around the area of work, and a downstream silt fence assembly. After installing dewatering facilities the contractor will rescue any aquatic animals found in the dewatered zone and work area. Rescued species will be hand-netted and transported in buckets to an area of similar characteristics downstream of the work zone. The downstream silt fence will prevent movement back into the dewatered zone. The dewatered zone will be inspected prior to work starting each day to determine if live animals are in the area. All species will be relocated as described above if found at any time in the work zone or dewatered area. Culverts will be replaced with larger diameter culverts where they are undersized or damaged and where they contribute to erosion problems.

The project also includes measures to improve natural drainage patterns across Tin House Road, reduce erosion potential, and encourage water flows across, rather than down the road. The road bed will be graded to an outsloped condition and inboard ditches will be eliminated through re-grading and fill. Swales and rolling dips will be constructed to direct overland flow across the road and into natural drainage courses.

All areas disturbed by the project will be stabilized and in appropriate areas revegetated with native plants grown from seeds collected in the project area.

Following construction existing uses of the road will not be changed by the project. The road will continue to be used as a public recreation trail and authorized vehicles (e.g. maintenance and emergency response vehicles) will be the only vehicles allowed to access the road.

Please see Appendix A for maps of the locations of the project.

The road will be out-sloped at 10% and will be constructed to an 8' minimum width, with adjustments made as needed to accommodate topography, line of sight, and the safe passage of roadway users.

2.6 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The construction window for this project will be from July 1, 2006 to October 15, 2006. During this time, the stream channel will be rehabilitated and the natural runoff patterns restored to Tin House Road. The majority of the work will occur between sunrise and sunset, Monday through Friday, with infrequent additional work on the weekends as necessary to meet construction schedules or avoid inclement weather conditions.

Work will be performed by 1-2 crews of 4-6 people, using specialized construction

equipment, including a small bulldozer, small excavator, and various transport vehicles. Individual vehicles and occasional larger delivery vehicles will be on-site during construction. Most heavy equipment will be stored at the intersection of Tin House Road and Highway 1 for the duration of construction. Crew vehicles will be parked in the paved parking area west of Highway 1 across from the intersection of Tin House Road. Due to limited areas to turn around it will be necessary for the construction contractor to drive some equipment up the road to a turnaround area near the Tin House.

2.7 VISITATION TO JULIA PFEIFFER BURNS STATE PARK

Visitor surveys estimate the following numbers of people visited Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP during the last five fiscal years:

2003/2004	133,020
2002/2003	144,723
2001/2002	105,348
2000/2001	43,098
1999/2000	105,141

The road proposed for re-engineering is located in a natural area of the park. As a result of this project, increased use of Tin House Road is not expected to occur. Overall park attendance should not increase or decrease as a result of this project.

2.8 CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND POLICIES

The work proposed as part of this project does not conflict with the local plans or policies of neighboring landowners, communities, or the County of Monterey. The project is consistent with DPR's mission statement and the resource protection, management, and public recreation purposes established for Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP. It is consistent with the Local Coastal Program Plan for Monterey County and the Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan. No general plan yet exists for JP Burns State Park. In the event a General plan is prepared, DPR will re-visit the use and maintenance of Tin House Road, together with all other routes of travel within the park.

2.9 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

DPR has approval authority for the proposed Road Rehabilitation Project at Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP. The project may require consultation and/or permits from the following agencies: California Department of Fish and Game (Notification of Lake or Streambed Alteration), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (following Nationwide Permits 27 and 33), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Section §401 Water Quality Certification). The project also requires compliance with Public Resources Code 5024 review, a coastal development permit from Monterey County and a temporary encroachment permit from Caltrans for traffic control on Highway 1.

2.10 RELATED PROJECTS

No other related projects are known at this time to be planned by other agencies that will affect the Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park Tin House Road Project. No additional work, other than regular maintenance, is currently in progress or planned for this unit.

CHAPTER 3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | Project Title: | Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park
Tin House Road Project |
| 2. | Lead Agency Name & Address: | California Department of Parks and Recreation |
| 3. | Contact Person & Phone Number: | Ken Gray, (831) 649-2862 |
| 4. | Project Location: | Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park |
| 5. | Project Sponsor Name & Address: | California Department of Parks and Recreation
Monterey District
2211 Garden Road
Monterey, California 93940 |
| 6. | General Plan Designation: | no approved State Park General Plan |
| 7. | Zoning: | Outdoor Recreation (Monterey County General Plan, 1982) |
| 8. | Description of Project: | The Tin House Road Project proposes to fill material from Redwood Creek and re-engineer Tin House Road at Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park. The project was initiated to comply with provisions of a court supervised settlement agreement to remove landslide debris from a neighboring landowner's property.
For more details please see Chapter 2 Section 2.5, Project Description. |
| 9. | Surrounding Land Uses & Setting: | Refer to Chapter 3 of this document (Section IX, Land Use Planning) |
| 10. | Approval Required from Other Public Agencies | DFG, Notification of Lake or Streambed Alteration
USFWS, consultation
Central Coast RWQCB, Section §401 Water Quality Cert.
Monterey County Coastal Development Permit
USACE, NWPs 27 and 33
Caltrans temporary encroachment permit |

1. 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.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None |

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 original scope of the proposed project **COULD** have had a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect because revisions/mitigations to the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. 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** or its functional equivalent will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment. However, at least one impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described in the report's attachments. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the impacts not sufficiently addressed in previous documents.

I find that, although the proposed project could have had a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, pursuant to applicable standards, and have been avoided or mitigated, pursuant to an earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, all impacts have been avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level and no further action is required.

Jill Poudrette
District Environmental Coordinator

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:
 - a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.
 - b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.
 - c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. A source list should be appended to this document. Sources used or individuals contacted should be listed in the source list and cited in the discussion.
8. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:
 - a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question **and**
 - b) the mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

I. AESTHETICS.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Situated in Monterey County, 37 miles south of Carmel on Highway 1, Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP encompasses over 2,000 acres of varied habitats, with spectacular views from the park's 3,000-foot ridges. Tin House Road is north of the park's main entrance on Highway 1 at Post Mile 36.9 and traverses generally moderately steep to steep slopes until it reaches the Tin House on a ridgeline nose about 1600 feet above Highway 1. The hairpin turn project site is located approximately 400 inland feet from the gate at the entrance to Tin House Road. The project location is within a state park and the surrounding area is rural in nature, with infrequent pockets of small community development.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) During construction, and until vegetation is established on the disturbed soil created by the project, the scenic vista, which includes the project site, will be affected. This will be a short-term effect that will last until the winter growing season following construction. Small portions of the project site are visible from Highway 1 immediately west of the project site. The proposed work will not hinder accessibility to any of the park's scenic areas and no new structures will be placed in the view corridor. Construction activities may have a limited temporary impact on the scenic view from Highway 1, but obstructions will be extremely limited and exposure of brief duration. All methods of construction, including construction materials, will be integrated with the re-vegetation that will occur when work is complete, reducing visual impacts to a less than significant level for the long term. There will be no long-term or permanent adverse impact to the existing scenic vista. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact.

- b) Only the lower portions of Tin House Road are located within the viewshed of a State Scenic Highway (Highway 1). The road traverses through mixed evergreen forest and chaparral/scrub plant communities. Rock outcroppings are present in the vicinity of the project, but will not be affected by the project. A limited number of trees 6" in diameter or less may need to be removed, but this will not comprise a significant portion of the canopy or impact the overall balance of vegetation in the area. Work near large redwoods by Redwood Creek and the crib wall planned to retain the edge of the roadway by the creek will utilize monitoring and hand labor to avoid damaging the trees. Large roots will not be cut and smaller roots will be sawn or pruned, not ripped. The exposed embankment between the new crib wall and the adjacent redwood tree will be supported with hand placed dry stacked native rock to minimize impacts to the tree. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impact.
- c) As with any construction project, there will be some temporary decrease in the visual appeal of the area immediately affected by the work being performed. However, the duration of the work will be limited and offset by the improvements that will result from the project. Therefore, the impact from this project will be less than significant.
- d) Lighting is not an element of this project. All work will be conducted during daylight hours, and no permanent new light sources will be introduced into the landscape. Therefore, there is no impact.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is located in Monterey County, south of Carmel. The park is zoned “Outdoor Recreation” and does not support any agricultural operations or farmland.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model for use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland.

DISCUSSION

a-c) As noted in the Environmental Setting above, Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is zoned for outdoor recreation in the Monterey County General Plan (1982) and does not support agricultural operations or farmland. This is a road and drainage improvement project and contains no component that will interfere with the use or result in the conversion of agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The land is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. No impact.

III. AIR QUALITY.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is located in Monterey County, which is part of the North Central Coast Air Basin, under the jurisdiction of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) and United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region IX. The Monterey Bay Area occupies a central location of California's coast. Ocean winds, relatively moderate levels of highway traffic, and the lack of an industrial base in the vicinity of the park result in relatively clean air at the location of the project.

According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), most areas in the district enjoyed relatively good air quality in 2004, with a decrease in exceedance of State standards for ozone. In 2002, the district was above the State standard for ozone during eight days; in 2003 it was three days; and in 2004 there were no days. The number of days above state standard for particulate matter (PM10, or particles with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less) was the same as it was in 2002, with seven days above the state standard. The district never exceeded the State or Federal standards in 2002, 2003, or 2004 for carbon monoxide. The district never exceeded the National standards for ozone or PM10 in all of 2002, 2003 and 2004. (Source: www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm, CARB 2005)

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT*:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individuals with compromised respiratory or immune systems)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

* Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make these determinations.

DISCUSSION

- a) Work proposed by this project is not in conflict with and will not obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality management plan for Monterey County or the MBUAPCD. No impact.
- b,c) The proposed project will not emit air contaminants at a level that, by themselves, will violate any local, state, or federal ambient air quality standard (AAQS), or contribute to a permanent or long-term increase in any air contaminant. However, project construction will generate short-term emissions of fugitive dust (PM10) and involve the use of equipment that will emit ozone precursors (i.e., reactive organic gasses [ROG] and nitrogen oxides, or NOx). Increased emissions of PM10, ROG, and NOx could contribute to existing non-attainment conditions and interfere with achieving the projected attainment standards. Consequently construction emissions will be considered a potentially significant short-term adverse impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impact to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES AIR-1
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ All active construction areas will be watered at least twice daily during dry, dusty conditions.▪ All trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials on public roads will be covered or required to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.▪ All equipment engines will be maintained in good condition, in proper tune (according to manufacturer's specifications), and in compliance with all State and federal requirements.▪ Excavation and grading activities will be suspended when sustained winds exceed 25 mph, instantaneous gusts exceed 35 mph, or dust from construction might obscure driver visibility on public roads.▪ Cover inactive storage piles.

- d) As noted in III (b,c) Discussion above, the project will only generate dust and equipment exhaust emissions for the brief period of construction. Since the construction site is located away from developed locations within the park, park visitors with conditions that will make them sensitive to these emissions will have the option of avoiding the area altogether or remaining in portions of the park that will be upwind or protected from blowing dust or other emissions. In addition, the road will be closed to visitor use during construction and until the new road surface is set. These conditions, in conjunction with Mitigation Measures AIR-1 above, will reduce the potential adverse impact to a less than significant level.
- e) The proposed work will not result in the long-term generation of odors. Construction-related emissions could result in a short-term generation of odors, including diesel exhaust and fuel vapors. These odors might be considered objectionable by some park visitors and employees. However, because construction activities will be short-term and odorous emissions will dissipate rapidly in the air, with increased distance from the source, the potential for impact will be considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is located in Monterey County, 37 miles south of Carmel. Elevation ranges from sea level to a height of 2,880 feet on a ridgetop approximately 1.8 miles inland. The unit lies in the transitional portion of the California coast where floral and vegetation elements with both northern and southern affinities meet. Coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) is nearing the southern limit of present-day distribution here as the plant communities of Coastal Sage Scrub and Central Coast Scrub approach their northern limits in the park, as well. Other plant communities present in the park are Mixed Evergreen Forest and Blue Brush Chaparral. A number of exotic plant species are also found in the park, including but not limited to: blue gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*), acacia (*Acacia* sp.), eupatorium (*Eupatorium adenophorum*), French broom (*Genista monspessulana*), Jubata grass (*Cortaderia jubata*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), and Monterey cypress (*Cupressus macrocarpa*). The vegetation types found in the immediate area of the proposed project include coniferous forest, scrub, and chaparral.

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES AND SPECIES OF SPECIAL CONCERN

The following species are identified by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), the California Department of Parks and Recreation and/or the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) as occurring or potentially occurring in the Partington Ridge 7.5 minute USGS quadrangle where the project is located and the six surrounding quadrangles (Pfeiffer Point, Big Sur, Ventana Cones, Chews Ridge, Tassajara Hot Springs, and Lopez Point). Except where noted these species do not occur in the vicinity of the Tin House Road project site.

Animal Species Potentially Occurring Within the Project Area

Smith's Blue Butterfly (*Euphilotes enoptes smithi*) – A federally endangered species that is completely dependent upon coast buckwheat and seacliff buckwheat during all life stages. Seacliff buckwheat (*Eriogonum parvifolium*) is known to exist in the project area. The plants are generally confined to areas within thirty feet of each side of Tin House Road. During field surveys conducted during the summer of 2005 by Dr. Richard A. Arnold, the Smith's Blue Butterfly was found to exist in the project area. This project could impact Smith's Blue Butterfly, but impacts will be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures (see Discussion below).

Doudoroff's Elfin Butterfly (*Incisalia mossii doudoroffi*) – A species of special management concern for California State Parks in the Big Sur Sector that occurs in the Los Padres National Forest. The host plant for this species is the Pacific Stonecrop (*Sedum spatulifolium*) which, during surveys conducted in January 2005, was not located along Tin House Road. Spreading dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa* ssp. *pumila*) is a potential host plant for this species and does occur in the project area. During construction spreading dudleya will be salvaged, to the best extent possible, and be re-planted after construction.

Bay checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha bayensis*) – federally listed threatened. This species does not occur in the project area.

California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*) – A federally threatened species under the Endangered Species Act and a species of special concern in California. Habitat for this species is characterized by dense, shrubby riparian vegetation associated with deep, still or slow-moving water. During recent site assessments at the project area typical breeding habitat was not observed. The high gradient of the stream, along with the closed overhead canopy make it unlikely for this species to occur in the area.

Foothill Yellow-Legged Frog (*Rana boylei*) – A California species of special concern that requires shallow, flowing water in small to moderately sized streams with at least some cobble-sized substrate. Some areas of Redwood Creek in the project area fit this general description and therefore, it is possible for the species to occur in the area. However, during recent site visits this species was not encountered.

Coast Range Newt (*Taricha torosa*) – A California species of special concern with a general range that coincides with the project area. This species breeds in still or slow moving water and therefore, ideal habitat does not exist in the project area. The project is unlikely to impact the coast range newt.

Western Pond Turtle (*Clemmys marmorata*) – A California species of special concern that is very unlikely to occur at or near the project site due to the high gradient, shallow stream type and its associated high, closed canopy. Habitat for this species does not occur in the project area; therefore the project is unlikely to impact Western pond turtles.

Southwestern pond turtle (*Clemmys marmorata pallida*) – California species of special concern. This species does not occur in the project area.

California Horned Lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum frontale*) – A California species of special concern that is associated with a broad range of habitat types but is generally found in open or near open areas with sandy soils where basking opportunities are available. Sandy soils were not observed at or near the project area; therefore, habitat for this species does not exist and the project will not impact this lizard.

Steelhead – south/central California coast (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*) – Federally threatened. Suitable habitat does not occur at the project site.

Double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*) – California species of special concern. This species does not occur in the project area.

Black swift (*Cypseloides niger*) – California species of special concern. Black swifts nest and roost in high cliffs and forage for insects high in the air, therefore, the project will not affect this species.

Prairie falcon (*Falco Mexicanus*) – California species of special concern. This species does not occur along the coastline. The project will not affect this species.

American badger (*Taxidea taxus*) – California species of special concern. Suitable habitat does not occur in the project area.

Plant Species Potentially Occurring Within the Project Area

Seacliff buckwheat (*Eriogonum parvifolium*) – see Smith’s Blue Butterfly discussion above.

Pacific Stonecrop (*Sedum spatulifolium*) – see Doudoroff’s Elfin Butterfly discussion above.

Spreading Dudleya (*Dudleya cymosa ssp. pumilla*) – see Doudoroff’s Elfin Butterfly discussion above.

Lewis’ clarkia (*Clarkia lewisii*) – This is a CNPS list 4 species and was found in the project area during surveys conducted in July and August 2005. Mitigation measures will be followed to reduce impacts to this species to a less than significant level (see Mitigation Measure Bio-1 below).

The following plant species do not occur in the project area and/or suitable habitat is not present in the project area:

Santa Lucia fir (*Abies bracteata*) – CNPS list 1B

Jolon clarkia (*Clarkia jolonensis*) – CNPS list 1B

Hutchinson’s larkspur (*Delphinium hutchinsoniae*) – CNPS list 1B

Cone Peak bedstraw (*Galium californicum ssp. lucianense*) – CNPS list 1B

Little Sur manzanita (*Arctostaphylos edmundsii*) – CNPS list 1B

Fragrant fritillary (*Fritillaria liliacea*) – CNPS list 1B

Arroyo Seco bush mallow (*Malacothamnus palmeri var. lucianus*) – CNPS list 1B

Dudley’s lousewort (*Pedicularis dudleyi*) – California listed rare, CNPS list 1B

Adobe sanicle (*Sanicula maritima*) – California listed rare, CNPS list 1B

Maple-leaved checker bloom (*Sidalcea malachroides*) – CNPS list 1B

Muir’s tarplant (*Cariquistia muirii*) – CNPS list 1B

Talus fritillary (*Fritillaria falcata*) – CNPS list 1B

Santa Lucia bedstraw (*Galium clementis*) – CNPS list 1B

Napa false indigo (*Amorpha californica var. napensis*) – CNPS list 1B

Umbrella larkspur (*Delphinium umbraculorum*) – CNPS list 1B

Pinnacles buckwheat (*Eriogonum nortonii*) – CNPS list 1B

Round-leaved filaree (*Erodium macrophyllum*) – CNPS list 2

Carmel Valley malacothrix (*Malacothrix saxatilis var. arachnoidea*) – CNPS list 1B

Hooked popcorn flower (*Plagiobothrys uncinatus*) – CNPS list 1B

Hickman’s checker bloom (*Sidalcea hickmanii ssp. hickmanii*) – CNPS list 1B

San Luis Obispo sedge (*Carex obispoensis*) – CNPS list 1B

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is home to several other endemic plant species and sensitive plants,

including Monterey paintbrush (*Castilleja latifolia*), branching beach aster (*Corethrogyne leucophylla*), Rattan's cryptantha (*Cryptantha rattanii*), and Santa Lucia gooseberry (*Ribes sericeum*). Based on recent site visits, it does not appear that suitable habitat exists within the project area for these species.

	<u>LESS THAN POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) The biological investigation for this document consisted of a search of existing biological databases and inventories, and various site visits. A search of the CNDDDB was conducted for special status species within the Partington Ridge 7.5 minute quadrangle and the six surrounding quadrangles to determine which species might be present in the vicinity of the project site. Special status species include plants and animals that are legally protected or that are considered sensitive by federal, state, or local resource conservation agencies and organizations. The results of the CNDDDB record search are provided in Appendix C. As noted in the Environmental Setting above, the Smith's blue butterfly (*Euphilotes enoptes smithi*), a federally endangered species, and Lewis' clarkia (*Clarkia lewisii*), a CNPS list 4

species, are known to exist in certain portions of the project area. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Recommendations provided in a preliminary review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will be adopted as mitigation for any potential impacts that may occur to the Smith’s blue butterfly and its habitat (seacliff buckwheat and associated duff), including starting work in late summer after the butterfly has pupated, salvaging/removing buckwheat plants and duff prior to construction and spreading this material back over the site following construction, and replanting buckwheat plants lost during the proposed work at a 3:1 ratio. Any spreading dudleya and Lewis’ clarkia occurring in the project area will be salvaged to the best extent possible and any plants lost during construction will be replaced at a 3:1 ratio. Certain designated areas containing concentrations of seacliff buckwheat, spreading dudleya and/or Lewis’ clarkia will be avoided by project construction entirely.▪ Re-contoured areas will be re-vegetated as soon as construction work is completed to protect against excessive erosion or loss of topsoil and intrusion of invasive plants.▪ Project design and construction methods will be altered as necessary to comply with DFG, USFWS, or other responsible agency permitting requirements.

b) Work required in the limits of the normal high water zone of the creek will be done in conjunction with a DFG-approved dewatering plan. The dewatering plan will consist primarily of a coffer dam immediately upstream of the area of work, a bypass pipe to allow the creek to flow around the area of work, and a downstream silt fence assembly. After installing dewatering facilities the contractor will rescue any aquatic animals found in the dewatered zone and work area. Rescued species will be hand-netted and transported in buckets to an area of similar characteristics downstream of the work zone. The downstream silt fence will prevent movement back into the dewatered zone. The dewatered zone will be inspected prior to work starting each day to determine if live animals are in the area. All species will be relocated as described above if found at any time in the work zone or dewatered area. The project will have a less than significant level of impact to any riparian zones or any other sensitive natural community with the implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-2.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-2
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ All mature trees at the site will be retained and protected from construction impacts

using best management practices. Special care will be taken to avoid impacts to the old growth redwoods adjacent to the creek channel.

- c) The project will have a less than significant level of impact to any wetlands with the implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-3.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-3
▪ All impacts to wetland plant species will be mitigated by replacing them on a 3:1 ratio.

- d) The project will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, with the possible exception of the Smith’s blue butterfly, or any established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor, and will not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Implementation of the Mitigation Measure Bio-1 above will reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level.
- e,f) There are no conservation plans, policies, or ordinances that apply to the proposed project or project area; therefore, the project will have no impact to this area.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Tin House Road was constructed in the mid-1940’s to provide access to the Tin House site. The road in itself is a potential historic feature associated with the historic Tin House located near the end of the road. The Tin House was built for Helen Hooper Brown and her husband Lathrop as a vacation home. Wartime shortages led to a unique building material: the house was constructed from two metal gas stations, which had been dismantled and reassembled on the site. The Tin House is mentioned in the 1990 draft Cultural Resources Inventory for Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP (Davis 1990), as well as referenced in the Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP Resource Element (Resource Protection Division 1990). The Tin House has never been formally evaluated for its integrity and significance; however, it appears potentially eligible for at least the California Register of Historical Resources. The road is a contributing feature to the setting of the house.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) While the re-grading of the road will result in a less than significant impact to potential resources, the excavation at Redwood Creek near the hairpin turn could reveal previously undocumented resources. As a precaution, the following condition must be followed.

CULTURAL CONDITION 1 – EXCAVATION AT HAIRPIN TURN AND REDWOOD CREEK

- A DPR-approved archaeologist will be on-site during excavation occurring near the hairpin turn at Redwood Creek. The archaeologist will photo document as necessary and record any archaeological features that may be discovered.

- b) No known archaeological sites will be impacted by the project. The project primarily involves re-grading areas of previously disturbed dirt and it is unlikely that any previously unknown archaeological sites will be encountered during construction. If any previously unknown archaeological resource is encountered, implementation of CULTURAL CONDITION 2 below will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

CULTURAL CONDITION 2 – PREVIOUSLY UNKNOWN CULTURAL RESOURCES

- In the event that previously undocumented cultural resources are encountered during project construction (including but not limited to dark soil containing shellfish, bone, flaked stone, groundstone, or deposits of historic trash), work in the immediate vicinity of the find will be temporarily halted or diverted until a DPR-qualified cultural resource specialist has evaluated the find and implemented appropriate treatment and disposition of the artifact(s).
- Once any significant cultural resources are found in a project location, a DPR-qualified historian and archaeologist (and Native American representative, if appropriate) will monitor any ground-disturbing work in that area from that point forward.

c) No human remains or burial sites have been documented or are known to exist at the proposed project sites. No impact is anticipated, but if any human remains or burial artifacts are identified, implementation of CULTURAL CONDITION 3 below will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

CULTURAL CONDITION 3 – HUMAN REMAINS

- In the event that human remains are discovered, work will cease immediately in the area of the find and the project manager/site supervisor will notify the appropriate DPR personnel. Any human remains and/or funerary objects will be left in place or returned to the point of discovery and covered with soil. The DPR Sector Superintendent (or State Representative) will notify the County Coroner, in accordance with §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, and the Native American Heritage Commission (or Tribal Representative). If a Native American monitor is on-site at the time of the discovery, the monitor will be responsible for notifying the appropriate Native American authorities.
- If the coroner or tribal representative determines the remains represent Native American interment, the NAHC in Sacramento and/or tribe would be consulted to identify the most likely descendants and appropriate disposition of the remains. Work will not resume in the area of the find until proper disposition is complete (PRC §5097.98). No human remains or funerary objects would be cleaned, photographed, analyzed, or removed from the site prior to determination.
- If it is determined the find indicates a sacred or religious site, the site will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Formal consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and review by the Native American Heritage Commission/Tribal Cultural representatives would also occur as necessary to define additional site mitigation or future restrictions.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The bedrock geology of Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP at Tin House Road is known as the Salinian Block. It consists of a prism of granitic and metamorphic basement rocks. The road corridor is underlain by charnockitic tonalite, a dark greenish gray, coarsely crystalline, slightly to highly foliated igneous rock composed predominately of plagioclase, hornblende, actinolite and chlorite with lesser quartz and biotite. The topography of the park is a reflection of the relative hardness of the underlying rock, which contains occasional planes of weakness, leaving the possibility of large slides of relatively intact rock.

Shallow-seated landslides (debris flow landslides) have occurred in the general vicinity of the project area along various areas of the road. These failures tend to occur at the heads of colluvial-filled drainages, after sustained intense rainfall produces saturated conditions.

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is located in the Northwest Coast Ranges Soil Region (Soil Region I). The soil of the project area, as mapped by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, is Gambo-Sur and/or Rock outcrop-Xerorthents complex. These soils have rapid to very rapid runoff and the erosion hazard is very high.

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is located approximately 17 miles from the Monterey Bay-Tularcitos Fault Zone. The San Andreas Fault lies about 42 miles northeast of the project area. The San Gregorio-Sur Fault lies approximately one mile west of the park. Strong earthquake shaking can be expected in the event of a seismic event. This could cause landslide movement and other ground collapse, especially in alluvial areas.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) While the chance of the rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground-shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides is certainly possible in this area, due to the location of the San Andreas and San Gregorio-Sur faults, the proposed project will not add any element or structure that will increase public exposure. Although those working on the project will be exposed to any event that might occur, the San Andreas Fault extends nearly the length of California and exposure for most of those working on the project will be similar, whether working on the project or simply living and working in the area. Therefore, the impact from the project will be less than significant.
- b) Rehabilitation of the road and work to re-establish the original drainage patterns in the watershed will result in short-term soil disturbance. This will require protection during the first rainy season following construction to prevent increased short-term rates of erosion. The following Mitigation Measure GEO-1 will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Removing and storing plant duff and organic soil and then covering newly graded areas with this material will promote re-vegetation efforts. Re-vegetation using local native plant species and protecting newly disturbed areas using erosion control methods appropriate for the site will reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

MITIGATION MEASURE GEO-1

- DPR North Coast Redwoods District Road Re-contouring Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be used in all areas to control soil and surface water runoff, including re-contouring to restore natural drainage patterns, placement of geotextiles or biodegradable reinforcement, and drainage and slope erosion control methods, as appropriate.
- If storms are anticipated during construction, “winterizing” will occur, including the covering of any stockpiled soils and the use of temporary erosion control methods to protect disturbed soil.
- Other temporary erosion control measures will also be used as needed, including, but not be limited to, the following:
 - Fill compaction to stabilize material, including tractor walking (repeatedly rolling treads or tires over new fill) all placed fill material.
 - Standard erosion control measures on all areas of ground disturbance, such as employing silt fences, weed-free straw bales, weed-free straw or rice wattles, and/or sediment detention basins to prevent soil loss and siltation.
 - Weed-free straw mulch will be applied to the site.
 - All disturbed areas along the roadway will be seeded with a native and/or erosion control mix and planted with nursery-grown plants to provide soil stability and immediate cover.
 - Plant duff and organic soil will be removed from graded areas and stored. After grading is complete the stored material will be spread over disturbed areas intended for re-vegetation.

- c) The soils at Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park are considered to be poorly suited to the development of buildings, roads, and recreation facilities such as trails and camp areas, according to ratings developed by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service. The proposed project will restore natural drainage patterns. This restoration, along with the mitigation measures listed above in GEO-1 will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- d) The presence or absence of expansive soils will not result in any risk of life or property as a result of the work proposed by this project; therefore, no impact.
- e) This project does not include the installation of septic tanks or leach fields; therefore, no impact.
- f) The project site does not include any paleontological resources or unique geologic features; therefore, no impact.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is a nearly 2,200 acre park located in Monterey County, south of Monterey. None of the unit's facilities use or store substantial amounts of hazardous materials on-site. There is no known hazardous contamination and the site is not suspected of containing any hazardous wastes, debris, or soil contamination. No airstrips exist within the park or adjacent to park property.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be 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? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a, b) Construction activities will require the use of certain potentially hazardous materials, such as fuels, oils, and solvents. These materials are generally used for excavation equipment, generators, and other construction equipment and will be contained within vessels engineered for safe storage. Large quantities of these materials will not be stored at the construction site. Spills, upsets, or other construction-related accidents could result in a release of fuel or other hazardous substances into the environment. The following mitigations will reduce the potential for adverse impacts from such incidents to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURE HAZMAT-1
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All equipment will be inspected for leaks immediately prior to the start of construction, and regularly inspected thereafter until equipment is removed from park premises.• The contractor(s) will prepare an emergency spill response plan prior to the start of construction and maintain a spill kit on-site throughout the life of the project. This plan will include a map that delineates construction staging areas, where refueling, lubrication, and maintenance of equipment may occur. In the event of any spill or release of any chemical in any physical form on or immediately adjacent to Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park during construction, the contractor will immediately notify the appropriate DPR staff (e.g., project manager or state representative).• Equipment will be cleaned and repaired (other than emergency repairs) outside the park boundaries. All contaminated water, sludge, spill residue, or other hazardous compounds will be disposed of outside park boundaries, at a lawfully permitted or authorized destination.

- c) There are no schools or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, no impact.
- d) Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5. Therefore, no impact will occur with project development.
- e,f) Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private air strip. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of this project.
- g) The majority of the construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. Project will rehabilitate the Tin House Road, allowing emergency access to continue. Therefore, there will be no interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact will occur as a result of this project.
- h) The project area contains moderate amounts of grasses and shrubs that become highly combustible during the dry season (June-October). This is currently a public use area and

associated with this access is the risk of accidental wildfire ignition. In addition, heavy equipment can get very hot during the warmer part of the work season, and this equipment will sometimes be close to vegetation. Improperly outfitted exhaust systems or friction between metal parts crushing rocks could generate sparks. Once construction is complete, the project will not add any new uses that could create significant additional long-term or permanent increased fire risks. Due to the steep terrain and relatively narrow roadway of the project area, there are increased risks (including personal injury, wildfire, hazardous material spill, etc.) during project construction for equipment operators while on the road. The following Mitigation Measures HAZMAT-2 and HAZMAT-3 will reduce the potential for short-term adverse impacts from project construction to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURE HAZMAT 2 - FIRE MANAGEMENT/CONSTRUCTION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ A safety plan will be developed and reviewed by all project staff prior to the start of any work. Job site characteristics to reduce the potential for fire will be included.▪ Spark arrestors or turbo-charging (which eliminates sparks in exhaust) and fire extinguishers will be required for all heavy equipment.▪ Construction crews will be required to park vehicles away from flammable material, such as dry grass and brush. At the end of each workday, heavy equipment will be parked over mineral soil, asphalt, or concrete to reduce the chance of fire.▪ The project manual shall specify that equipment operators assigned to this project shall have documented previous experience on steep terrain and in confined areas.▪ Park staff will be required to have a State Park radio or cell phone on site, which allows direct contact to Monterey County Fire Department and centralized dispatch center, to facilitate the rapid dispatch of control crews and equipment in case of a fire. Fire suppression equipment will also be available on park grounds.

MITIGATION MEASURE HAZMAT 3 - FIRE MANAGEMENT/PUBLIC USE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Signs will be installed at entry points and along the road advising visitors of fire dangers and avoidance measures for potential causes of accidental ignition.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located in the northern portion of Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP within the Santa Lucia Hydrologic Unit. No major groundwater basins are located along the Big Sur Coast. Locally limited, outflow is almost entirely the product of precipitation and runoff. Redwood Creek, like other perennial streams in the area, is a small stream whose headwaters are located in the upper reaches of the Santa Lucia Range where annual runoff ranges from ten to twenty inches. The other watercourses along Tin House Road are intermittent, holding water only during the wet season.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through 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 on- or off-site flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is within the jurisdiction of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB), Central Coast Region. The project will be in compliance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. (See Mitigation Measure HAZMAT-1 above regarding potential impacts from accidents, spills, or upset). Project emphasis is primarily to reconstruct and stabilize existing dirt road locations and improve natural drainage conditions. Changes to existing drainage patterns will not increase flow or result in increased sedimentation in existing drainages. Ground disturbance will be minimal outside the existing road footprint. Additionally, most work will be accomplished during the dry season, further lessening any chance of impact to surface water quality. The proposed project scope does not include waste discharge work of any kind and will not increase or alter existing conditions. Project location, design, and timing, in combination with the Mitigation Measures GEO-1 AND HAZMAT-1 will control soil erosion and surface water runoff and ensure no water quality standards are violated. Work required in the limits of the normal high water zone of the creek will be done in conjunction with a DFG-approved dewatering plan. The dewatering plan will consist primarily of a coffer dam immediately upstream of the area of work, a bypass pipe to allow the creek to flow around the area of work, and a downstream silt fence assembly. After installing dewatering facilities the contractor will rescue any aquatic animals found in the dewatered zone and work area. Rescued species will be hand-netted and transported in buckets to an area of similar characteristics downstream of the work zone. The downstream silt fence will prevent movement back into the dewatered zone. The dewatered zone will be inspected prior to work starting each day to determine if live animals are in the area. All species will be relocated as described above if found at any time in the work zone or dewatered area. These measures will result in a less than significant impact to water quality and waste discharge.
- b) The proposed project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or create a net deficit in any aquifer; no major aquifers occur within the project boundaries. Water supplies for the park will not be affected by the proposed project. Impact to groundwater from this project will be less than significant.
- c) The absorption rate of the site will be improved by the project. Currently, water flows down the degraded roadbed itself, preventing natural drainage dissipation. Watershed coupling is a term that is used to describe a road system or network that captures water unnaturally. Remediation of watershed coupling will occur through this project. Outsloping the road will facilitate surface flow across the road surface, preventing water from flowing down the

roadbed. The project includes removing landslide debris from Redwood Creek. The landslide debris poses a serious erosion threat in its current condition. The excavated landslide debris will be used locally to recontour roadways where it cannot wash back into the creek. Woody debris will be placed on finished surfaces and clean imported river rock will be placed within the normal high water line. Boulders and large woody debris will be incorporated into new banks to reduce channel velocity through the project site. Potential for erosion will be significantly reduced at the site. Some short-term disturbance of the channel is necessary in order to remove the landslide debris. No aspect of the project will result in significant erosion or siltation, on or off site. Therefore, the impacts will be less than significant.

- d) The proposed project will not alter drainage patterns in a manner that will result in on-or off-site flooding. Some redirection of stormwater runoff will occur as erosion problems and inadequate drainage systems are corrected. Restoration of Redwood Creek to its natural drainage path and removal of landslide debris from within the normal high water zone of the creek will reduce the potential of flooding related to Redwood Creek. Any potential runoff impact will be less than significant.
- e) See VIII(c) Discussion above. Less than significant impact.
- f) See VIII(c) Discussion above. Less than significant impact.
- g) The project does not include the construction of housing and will not be within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact.
- h) See VIII(g) Discussion above. No impact.
- i) There is no levee or dam in any location that could threaten people or structures within Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP, with or without the project. Project will improve existing culverts conveying water under the road at various drainage areas. These culverts will be replaced as necessary to provide 25-year flood protection and the roadway at culverts will be designed to withstand over-topping flood. The existing wood wall in Redwood Creek near the hairpin turn will be removed along with sediment and landslide debris, thereby reducing risk associated with a failure of the wall. No impact.
- j) The project location within Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is bordered by Highway 1 which is bordered by the Pacific Ocean. Any location along the coastline could be at risk of inundation by a tsunami, including the area in and around Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP, although the higher elevations of the unit will be less at risk. A number of major faults extend on a northwesterly line along the foot of the hills east of the park, as well as numerous small fracture faults throughout the area, both on- and off-shore. Several of these can be considered active. Due to the elevation of the project site the chance of inundation by a tsunami is highly unlikely in this area, and therefore, this project will not substantially increase the exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of these events. In fact, stabilization and repair of the road will improve public safety during such an event, due to the current severe degradation of the road. Although those working

on the project will be exposed to any event that might occur, all coastal locations within a substantial distance of the park would experience a similar event; exposure will be much the same, whether working on the project or simply living or visiting in the area. No significant impact from seiche or tsunami inundation.

The potential for inundation from a mudflow (in the form of a small landslide) may occur due to earthmoving activities, especially in conjunction with heavy rains and/or saturated soil. Mitigation measure HYDRO-1 below, in combination with HAZMAT-1 above, will reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURE HYDRO-1

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work will be conducted during the dry season (July-October).• No excavation work will occur on slopes greater than 10% during periods of heavy rains or when soils are saturated.• Work will be directed and/or inspected periodically on-site by the Project Manager or other qualified personnel to assure soil compaction and finish grading meet job specifications. |
|--|

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Situated along Highway 1 south of Big Sur, Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park is a nearly 2,200 acre park of varied habitats and spectacular views. The Park borders Highway 1, a State Scenic Highway, on the south and west. The park is zoned Outdoor Recreation by the Monterey County General Plan, 1982. Areas along the Pacific Ocean are within the Coastal Zone and are subject, in most cases, to the 1976 Coastal Act and the Coastal Zone Management Act, as administered by the California Coastal Commission. Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park has no approved General Plan, although the project is necessary for DPR to comply with a court supervised settlement agreement, as well as to repair and rehabilitate the road. The project is consistent with the Department’s Cultural Resource Management directives and the Natural Resources section of the Department’s Operations Manual.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) No established communities exist within the boundaries of Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP and the project will remove fill material sediment and debris near the road from a neighboring landowner’s property; therefore, the proposed project will cause no impact.
- b) This project is consistent with all applicable state and local land use plans, policies, and regulations, including the Local Coastal Program Plan for Monterey County. While no general plan for the park exists, the project is consistent with DPR’s mission statement and the resource protection, management, and public recreation purposes established for Julia Burns SP. With certification, this Mitigated Negative Declaration, the project will be in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No impact.
- c) There are no conservation plans, policies, or ordinances that apply to the project or project area, therefore, the project will have no impact in this area.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The majority of the construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP in Monterey County, California. A portion of the project will be conducted on a neighboring landowner’s property in order to restore proper placement of the property line, which is the center line of Redwood Creek. No significant mineral resources have been identified within the park.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) No known mineral resources of local or regional importance have been identified in the park by the Mineral Land Classification Program, administered by the California Department of Conservation. Therefore, no loss of mineral resources will occur as a result of the proposed project. No impact.
- b) The project site has not been classified or nominated as a local important mineral resource recovery site. No impact.

XI. NOISE.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park encompasses over 2,200 acres of varied habitats and spectacular views. The Park borders Highway 1, a State Scenic Highway, on the south and west. The closest town is Big Sur, located approximately 12 miles to the north. The nearest community is the Partington Ridge community, located approximately one-half (½) mile to one mile north of the project area. The closest housing compound to the south is approximately one-quarter (¼) mile from the main work site. The area is rural in nature, with pockets of small community development.

The project site is relatively undeveloped and no noise-sensitive land uses are located in the immediate vicinity of any of the proposed construction. Construction activities associated with the project will occur within the park boundaries with the exception of the activities associated with restoring the property boundary to its historic location.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be 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? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) Construction noise levels at and near the project area will fluctuate, depending on the type and number of construction equipment operating at any given time. There are no noise-sensitive land uses located in the vicinity of the project site that will be substantially affected by the proposed construction-related activities and no known noise standards applicable to this area. However, depending on the specific construction activities being performed, short-term increases in ambient noise levels could result in speech interference near the project site and a potential increase in annoyance to nearby neighbors. Use of day use areas is a discretionary act, with park users free to seek out other nearby recreational areas, including other areas within the park. There are alternate trail and day use areas available that offer a similar experience to the project site. Construction-generated noise will be considered to have a potentially significant short-term impact to nearby noise-sensitive receptors (e.g. neighbors). Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce those potential impacts to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURE NOISE-1
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Construction activities will generally be limited to daylight hours and a Monday through Friday work week. Any alterations in this schedule, if deemed necessary, will be made to address overriding construction considerations or worker safety.• Internal combustion engines used for any purpose at the job site will be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. Equipment and trucks used for construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., engine enclosures, acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, intake silencers, ducts, etc.) whenever feasible and necessary.• Stationary noise sources and staging areas will be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible. If they must be located near sensitive receptors, stationary noise sources will be muffled to a feasible extent and/or, where practicable, enclosed within temporary sheds.

- b) Construction activity will not involve the use of explosives, pile driving, or other intensive construction techniques that could generate significant ground vibration or noise. Therefore, groundborne vibration or noise generated by the project will have a less than significant impact.
- c) Once the proposed project is completed, all related construction noise will cease. Nothing within the scope of the proposed project will result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. The project's primary emphasis is to repair and improve existing facilities, resulting in no expansion of use beyond current levels. Therefore, no impact to permanent ambient noise levels will be anticipated.
- d) See XI(a) Discussion above. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 above will reduce any potential adverse impact to a less than significant level.

e,f) Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is not located within an airport land use plan, nor within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of this project.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park borders Highway 1, a State Scenic Highway, on the south and west. The nearest community is the Partington Ridge community, located north of the project area. The area is rural in nature, with pockets of small community development. Growth in the area is very limited. Primary access to the area is via Highway. 1. A portion of the project will be conducted on a neighboring landowner's property in order to restore proper placement of the property line, which is the center line of Redwood Creek.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) Work proposed by this project consists of repair and restoration of existing facilities rather than the expansion of facilities that might encourage increased usage. The project does not have a housing component, resulting in no additions or changes to the existing local infrastructure. Therefore, it will have no impact on population growth in the area.
- b) As noted in XII(a) Discussion above, the project will have no housing component and will not modify or displace any existing housing. No impact.
- c) As noted in XII(a) Discussion above, the project will have no housing component and will displace no one, either temporarily or permanently. No impact.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Situated along Highway 1 south of Big Sur, Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park encompasses nearly 2,200 acres of varied habitats and spectacular views. The park borders Highway 1, a State Scenic Highway, on the south and west. The area is rural in nature, with pockets of limited small community development. Fire protection is provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service. The community of Big Sur has a volunteer fire brigade, as well. Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park is patrolled by DPR Rangers with Monterey County Sheriffs serving as backup. Primary access to the area is via Highway 1, a highway that is designated to remain a two lane scenic road.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Alterations to Tin House Road at Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP as a result of the proposed project are designed to repair and maintain existing facilities. None of the project elements will contribute to a significant increase of visitation or populations and the level of required services is expected to remain static. However, as noted in VII (g) above, use of construction equipment around flammable annual grasses presents an increased fire risk that could result in additional demands on local response teams. Any impact on service will be temporary and nothing in the project scope will contribute to the need for an increase in the level of public services. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZMAT-2 will reduce the potential impact to fire protection services to a less than significant level.

XIV. RECREATION.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP has been set aside, in part, to provide recreational opportunities for the citizens of the state. Thousands of people visit the park each year. The park contains two environmental campsites and a day use area.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) No additional structures or attractions will be added that will substantially increase visitation or demands to this or any other park or recreational facility in the area. No impact.
- b) The project does not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The project will correct the current physical deterioration of the existing Tin House Road. For this reason, any potential impact from this project will be less than significant.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park encompasses over 2,200 acres of varied habitats, spectacular views and 3,000-foot ridges nearby. The Park borders Highway 1, an officially designated State Scenic Highway, on the south and west. A state highway becomes an officially designated State Scenic Highway when the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) receives and approves a scenic corridor protection program from a local jurisdiction. The area is rural in nature, with pockets of limited small community development. Primary access to the area is via Highway 1, which is designated to remain a two lane scenic road.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that would substantially increase hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) A significant increase in overall visitation to Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is not anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Most construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. Although Highway 1 is the only access road for construction equipment, the addition of several vehicles entering and leaving during daylight hours will not constitute a substantial increase in traffic volume or result in congestion. The contractor will be required to prepare a traffic control plan and to obtain a temporary encroachment

permit for traffic control. Heavy equipment will be stored off the Highway for the duration of the project reducing the traffic impact. Therefore, the project will result in a less than significant impact.

- b) Per XV(a) Discussion above, the impact on congestion resulting from additional visitor or construction vehicles to normal traffic on Highway 1 will be minimal; therefore, the project will result in a less than significant impact.
- c) Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is not located within an airport land use plan; therefore, no impact.
- d) As noted in XV(a) Discussion above, most construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. There are no incompatible uses related to this proposed project. Trail users will be directed to use an alternate trail to the Tin House during construction. No significant impact.
- e) One of the project's main goals is to improve the deteriorated condition of Tin House Road which will be maintained for emergency access. Work will not restrict access to or block any public road or emergency access route. Therefore, the project will result in a less than significant impact.
- f) The improvement of Tin House Road is not expected to result in an increase in overall visitation to Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP. The nearby scenic overlook which serves as a parking lot for the Tin House Road trailhead has sufficient spaces to accommodate any limited increase in use that could follow this project. Therefore, the project will result in a less than significant impact.
- g) There are no policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation that apply to the project or project area. No impact.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park borders Highway 1, a State Scenic Highway, on the south and west. The closest town is Big Sur, located approximately 12 miles to the north. The nearest community is the Partington Ridge Community, located approximately one-half (½) mile to 1 mile north of the project area. The closest housing compound to the south is approximately one-quarter (¼) mile from the main work site. The area is rural in nature, with pockets of small community development. Sewage treatment facilities and potable water are not available in the area of the park where the project is proposed. Water supplies for the project will be brought in as needed.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP is within the jurisdiction of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Coast Region). The project will be in compliance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZMAT-1 above regarding accidents, spills, or upset the potential for impacts will be reduced to less than significant level.
- b) As noted in the Environmental Setting above, there is no potable water in the project area. The proposed project contains no elements that will have an impact on public water or wastewater treatment facilities. No impact.
- c) The project scope does not include waste discharge work of any kind, will not increase or alter existing conditions. Therefore, there will be no impact.
- d) As indicated in the Environmental Setting above there are no water supplies available at the project site so water will be brought in as needed. Water required for dust control will be trucked into the site from either the Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park main entrance or Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park and will not impact any natural stream. Therefore, there will be no impact.
- e) Wastewater treatment services are provided by DPR personnel with DPR-owned facilities. No impact.
- f) The project will not increase the park's solid waste disposal needs. The contractor shall be required to provide and maintain portable toilets for workers. Landslide debris and sediment removed from Redwood Creek will be used within the Park to create out sloped road section thereby eliminating the need to export any material. No impact.
- g) The proposed project does not have a solid waste component. No impact.

CHAPTER 4

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) The proposed project was evaluated for potential significant adverse impacts to the natural environment and its plant and animal communities. Recovery of the plant communities will occur within 1-5 years of project completion. Impacts to sensitive plant species (seacliff buckwheat, Lewis' clarkia and spreading dudleya) will be mitigated to less than significant levels. Possible impacts to sensitive wildlife (Smith's blue butterfly and Doudoroff's elfin butterfly) will be avoided by restricting construction to avoid the breeding season; construction will only occur between July 1 and October 15, 2006, with additional restrictions in areas of identified sensitive habitat. Impacts to soil and water resources will be minimized by limiting certain types of construction to the dry months of the year. Full implementation of all mitigation measures incorporated into this project will reduce all impacts to a less than significant level.
- b) The proposed project was evaluated for potential significant adverse impacts to the cultural resources of Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park. It was determined that the work will not

significantly disturb historic or archaeological resources. The improved road will follow the existing historic road alignment, except for minor deviations necessary for public safety and protection of the natural resources. Full implementation of all conditions incorporated into this project will reduce all impacts to a less than significant level.

- c) DPR often has other smaller maintenance programs and rehabilitation projects planned for a park unit. However, no other related projects are known at this time to be planned by other agencies that will affect the Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park Tin House Road Project. No additional work, other than regular maintenance, is currently in progress or planned for this unit. The project will not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.
- d) Most project-related environmental effects have been determined to pose a less than significant impact on humans. However, possible impacts from construction emissions (Air Quality), accidents and fire (Hazards and Hazardous Waste), and noise, though temporary in nature, have the potential to result in significant adverse effects on humans. Due to the steep terrain and relatively narrow roadway of the project area, there are increased risks (including personal injury, wildfire, hazardous material spill, etc.) during project construction for equipment operators while on the road. The project manual shall specify that equipment operators assigned to this project shall have documented previous experience on steep terrain and in confined areas. These potentially significant adverse impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level when all mitigation measures incorporated into this project are fully implemented.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND CONDITIONS

The following mitigation measures will be implemented by DPR as part of the Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park Tin House Road Project.

AIR QUALITY

MITIGATION MEASURE AIR-1

- All active construction areas will be watered at least twice daily during dry, dusty conditions.
- All trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials on public roads will be covered or required to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- All equipment engines will be maintained in good condition, in proper tune (according to manufacturer's specifications), and in compliance with all State and federal requirements.
- Excavation and grading activities will be suspended when sustained winds exceed 25 mph, instantaneous gusts exceed 35 mph, or dust from construction might obscure driver visibility on public roads.
- Inactive storage piles will be covered.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-1

- Recommendations provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will be adopted as mitigation for any potential impacts that may occur to the Smith's blue butterfly and its habitat (seacliff buckwheat and associated duff), including starting work in late summer after the butterfly has pupated, salvaging/removing buckwheat plants and duff prior to construction and spreading this material back over the site following construction, and replanting buckwheat plants lost during the proposed work at a 3:1 ratio. Any spreading dudleya and Lewis' clarkia occurring in the project area will be salvaged to the best extent possible and any plants lost during construction will be replaced at a 3:1 ratio. Certain designated areas containing concentrations of seacliff buckwheat, spreading dudleya and/or Lewis' clarkia will be avoided by project construction entirely.
- Re-contoured areas will be re-vegetated as soon as construction work is completed to protect against excessive erosion, loss of topsoil and intrusion of invasive plants.
- Project design and construction methods will be altered as necessary to comply with DFG, USFWS, or other responsible agency permitting requirements.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-2

- All mature trees at the site will be retained and protected from construction impacts using best management practices. Special care will be taken to avoid impacts to the old growth redwoods adjacent to the creek channel.

MITIGATION MEASURE BIO-3

- All impacts to wetland plant species will be mitigated by replacing them on a 3:1 ratio.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

CULTURAL CONDITION 1 – EXCAVATION AT HAIRPIN TURN AND REDWOOD CREEK

- A DPR-approved archaeologist will be on-site during excavation occurring near the hairpin turn at Redwood Creek. The archaeologist will photo document as necessary and record any archaeological features that may be discovered.

CULTURAL CONDITION 2 – PREVIOUSLY UNKNOWN CULTURAL RESOURCES

- In the event that previously undocumented cultural resources are encountered during project construction (including but not limited to dark soil containing shellfish, bone, flaked stone, groundstone, or deposits of historic trash), work in the immediate vicinity of the find will be temporarily halted or diverted until a DPR-qualified cultural resource specialist has evaluated the find and implemented appropriate treatment and disposition of the artifact(s).
- Once any significant cultural resources are found in a project location, a DPR-qualified historian and archaeologist (and Native American representative, if appropriate) will monitor any ground-disturbing work in that area from that point forward.

CULTURAL CONDITION 3 – HUMAN REMAINS

- In the event that human remains are discovered, work will cease immediately in the area of the find and the project manager/site supervisor will notify the appropriate DPR personnel. Any human remains and/or funerary objects will be left in place or returned to the point of discovery and covered with soil. The DPR Sector Superintendent (or State Representative) will notify the County Coroner, in accordance with §7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, and the Native American Heritage Commission (or Tribal Representative). If a Native American monitor is on-site at the time of the discovery, the monitor will be responsible for notifying the appropriate Native American authorities.
- If the coroner or tribal representative determines the remains represent Native American interment, the NAHC in Sacramento and/or tribe would be consulted to identify the most likely descendants and appropriate disposition of the remains. Work will not resume in the area of the find until proper disposition is complete (PRC §5097.98). No human remains or funerary objects would be cleaned, photographed, analyzed, or removed from the site prior to determination.
- If it is determined the find indicates a sacred or religious site, the site will be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Formal consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and review by the Native American Heritage Commission/Tribal Cultural representatives would also occur as necessary to define additional site mitigation or future restrictions.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

MITIGATION MEASURE GEO-1

- DPR North Coast Redwoods District Road Re-contouring BMPs will be used in all areas to control soil and surface water runoff, including re-contouring to restore natural drainage patterns, placement of geotextiles or biodegradable reinforcement, and drainage and slope erosion control methods, as appropriate.
- If storms are anticipated during construction, “winterizing” will occur, including the covering of any stockpiled soils and the use of temporary erosion control methods to protect disturbed soil.
- Other temporary erosion control measures will also be used as needed, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - Fill compaction to stabilize material, including tractor walking all placed fill material.
 - Standard erosion control measures on all areas of ground disturbance, silt fences, weed-free straw bales, weed-free straw or rice wattles, and/or sediment detention basins to prevent soil loss and siltation.
 - Weed-free straw mulch will be applied to the site at 3,000-4,000 pounds per acre.
 - All disturbed areas will be seeded with a mixture of non-invasive grasses. This grass, once established during the first year following construction, will prevent rilling.
 - Plant duff and organic soil will be removed from graded areas and stored. After grading is complete the stored material will be spread over disturbed areas intended for re-vegetation.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

MITIGATION MEASURE HAZMAT-1

- All equipment will be inspected for leaks immediately prior to the start of construction, and regularly inspected thereafter until equipment is removed from park premises.
- The contractor(s) will prepare an emergency spill response plan prior to the start of construction and maintain a spill kit on-site throughout the duration of the project. This plan will include a map that delineates construction staging areas, where refueling, lubrication, and maintenance of equipment may occur. In the event of any spill or release of any chemical in any physical form on or immediately adjacent to Julia Pfeiffer Burns SP during construction, the contractor will immediately notify the appropriate DPR staff (e.g., project manager or supervisor)
- Equipment will be cleaned and repaired (other than emergency repairs) outside the park boundaries. All contaminated water, sludge, spill residue, or other hazardous compounds will be disposed of outside park boundaries, at a lawfully permitted or authorized destination.

MITIGATION MEASURE HAZMAT-2 FIRE MANAGEMENT/CONSTRUCTION

- A safety plan will be developed and reviewed by all project staff prior to the start of any work. Job site characteristics to reduce the potential for fire will be included.
- Spark arrestors or turbo-charging (which eliminates sparks in exhaust) and fire

extinguishers will be required for all heavy equipment.

- Construction crews will be required to park vehicles away from flammable material, such as dry grass and brush. At the end of each workday, heavy equipment will be parked over mineral soil, asphalt, or concrete to reduce the chance of fire.
- The project manual shall specify that equipment operators assigned to this project shall have documented previous experience on steep terrain and in confined areas.
- Park staff will be required to have a State Park radio or cell phone on site, which allows direct contact to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and centralized dispatch center, to facilitate the rapid dispatch of control crews and equipment in case of a fire. Fire suppression equipment will also be available on park grounds.

MITIGATION MEASURE HAZMAT-3 FIRE MANAGEMENT/PUBLIC USE

- Signs will be installed at entry points and along the trail advising visitors of fire dangers and avoidance measures for potential causes of accidental ignition.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

MITIGATION MEASURE HYDRO-1

- Work will be conducted during the dry season (July-October), to the extent feasible.
- No excavation work will occur on slopes greater than 10% during periods of heavy rains or when soils are saturated.

NOISE

MITIGATION MEASURES NOISE-1

- Construction activities will generally be limited to daylight hours and a Monday through Friday work week; alterations in this schedule will be made to address overriding construction considerations or worker safety.
- Internal combustion engines used for any purpose at the job site will be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. Equipment and trucks used for construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., engine enclosures, acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, intake silencers, ducts, etc.) whenever feasible and necessary.
- Stationary noise sources and staging areas will be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible. If they must be located near sensitive receptors, stationary noise sources will be muffled to the extent feasible and/or, where practicable, enclosed within temporary sheds.

CHAPTER 6 REFERENCES

California Air Resources Board (CARB) Internet address:
<http://www.arb.ca.gov/HTML/AQE&M.htm>.

California Department of Fish and Game, Habitat Conservation Planning Branch, California's Plants and Animals, Internet address:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/hcpb/species/search_species.shtml

California Natural Diversity Database, Wildlife & Habitat Data Analysis Branch, Department of Fish and Game, Government Version – Dated April 8, 2005

California State Parks, North Coast Redwoods District, Field Techniques for Forest and Range Road Removal, Spring 2001.

California State Parks, Natural Heritage Section/Cultural Heritage Section, Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park Resource Element, September 1990.

California State Parks, Natural Heritage Section/Cultural Heritage Section, Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park Resource Inventory, June 1990.

California State Parks, prepared for Monterey District by Patrick R. Vaughan, State Park Engineering Geologist, Geologic Investigation, December 10, 2004.

Department of Conservation, State of California, California Geologic Survey, Internet address:
<http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/>

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. Internet Search. Internet address:
<http://www.mbuapcd.org/>

Monterey County, Local Coastal Program, Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, February 11, 1981.

Monterey County, Monterey County General Plan, approved by Board of Supervisors September 30, 1982.

Maps on file at the Monterey District office, California State Parks, Monterey, CA.

Ownership records and parcel maps on file at the Monterey District, California State Parks, Monterey, California.

United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan, California Department of Transportation, March 2004

Report Preparation

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Jill Poudrette

Office Technician
District Environmental Coordinator
Monterey District
Monterey, California

Tom Moss

Senior State Park Resource Ecologist
Monterey District
Monterey, California

Ken Gray

Staff Park and Recreation Specialist
Monterey District
Monterey, California

Joan Carpenter

Associate Civil Engineer
Monterey District
Monterey, California

Rae Schwaderer

Associate State Archaeologist
Monterey District
Monterey, California

Jeff Frey

Assistant State Park Resource Ecologist
Big Sur Sector, Monterey District
Big Sur, California

Patrick Vaughn

Engineering Geologist
North Coast Redwoods Sector
Eureka, California

Syd Brown

Senior Geologist
Environmental Stewardship Section
Sacramento, California

APPENDIX A
MAPS, TABLES, AND CHARTS

APPENDIX B
PROJECT DESIGN GRAPHICS

APPENDIX C
CNDDDB RECORD SEARCH

APPENDIX D
LIST OF ACRONYMS

APPENDIX D

List of Acronyms

AAQS	ambient air quality standard
ADA	Americans with Disability Act
BMP	Best Management Practice
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database (Department of Fish and Game)
CRWQCB	California Regional Water Quality Control Board
DFG	California Department of Fish and Game
DPR	California Department of Parks and Recreation/California State Parks
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
IS	Initial Study
MBUAPCD	Monterey Peninsula Unified Air Pollution Control District
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
JPBSP	Julia Pfeiffer Burns State Park
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NO _x	nitrogen oxide
PM10	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less
SP	State Park
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service

APPENDIX E

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
