Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)

Rocky Nook Park-Building Demolition

DRAFT

GS-D44102-2016-001
April 15, 2016

Owner/Applicant
County of Santa Barbara
Board of Supervisor's
105 East Anapamu Street, 4th Floor
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Agent
Community Services Department-
Parks Division
123 East Anapamu Street
Paddy Langlands, Deputy Director
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Engineer
N/A

For More Information Contact Paddy Langlands, Parks Division, Deputy Director (805) 568-2475

1.0 REQUEST/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Demolition Scope

This project proposes to demolish the 1,800 square foot aging structure originally constructed in early 1928 as a caretaker's cottage which became a park ranger's residence when the property was transferred to county ownership in May of 1928 and subsequently altered over the years to convert the building into County Parks Headquarters. The original structure was 1,170 square feet with an addition of 630 square feet completed in 1984. An exterior porch was also subsequently enclosed at some point which resulted in the structures final size of 1,800 square feet. While the core of the building is older than 50 years, the subsequent alterations are not and have, as a consequence removed or significantly altered the architectural integrity of the original structure. The caretakers/ranger structure is not the original Oliver residence constructed on the property in the late 1880s.

As a result of merging and consolidations within the departments that made up the Housing & Community Development and Parks Departments into a newly created Community Services Department; the executive and management functions of the remnant Parks Department were relocated to downtown Santa Barbara and the Rocky Nook facility vacated. It has remained vacant since December 2014. Parks operations no longs has a need for the facility and therefore proposes to demolish the structure. In addition, the structure has significant seismic resistant issues that prevent its use until the building can be retrofitted. The cost to retrofit the building exceeds the useful value and remaining building life which is why the department proposes to demolish the facility.

Background

Rocky Nook Park is located within the unincorporated area of the County adjacent to the north-east boundary of the City of Santa Barbara just a few hundred yards from the national historic landmark Mission Santa Barbara on Mission Canyon Road. The park with its main entrance at 610 Mission Canyon Road is comprised of 9.29 acres of land in an irregular elongated shape whose southern property lines follows the path of Mission Creek and remaining boundary are adjacent to low density housing or other recreational uses. In 1955 an additional 10.30 acre parcel was added to the original 9.29 to increase the park to its current size of 19.59 acres. Except for the cottage structure there are other minor structures; restrooms, storage and shade covers. These elements have been added over the years to make the rural park setting more useable to the community. The 10.30-acre parcel added to the original 9.29 acre site does not contain the same deed restricts of park and park/arts related development. The 1955 parcel has a number of facilities that support public functions, the first: County Fire Station 15 and dorm facilities constructed in the 1970s (station) and Staff Dorm (constructed in the 1990s). There is also a City of Santa Barbara parcel (023-240-001) that is land locked between the two county parcel and therefore gains its access over county parcels 001 and 007).

Prior to county ownership, the 9.29 acre property was owned by George S. J. Oliver and his wife Frances Dabney Oliver, holding title between 1881 and 1926. The original residence that the Oliver's had constructed was removed from the property after the death of Mrs. Oliver in 1926. The property was owned for a short time by Sam Stanwood, then by County National Bank and finally by the County of Santa Barbara. Upon the transfer for a 10 dollar gold coin by the County, the County became the owner. The Grant Deed holds a restriction that the 9.29 acre site be perpetually held in public trust and its use restricted to parks and open space. A development restriction also exists that holds any facility development to structures for parks, arts or related buildings. The cottage predates this restriction and was constructed during the time that Stanwood owned the parcel.

There are significant natural stone deposits and physical land features on the site created by flood or man-made alterations from pre-historic times when the Native Americans inhabited the area (Rogers, p82: Dixie) from 9,000 years ago to A.D. 1542. Within the general area there are significant deposits of material relating to the various peoples that inhabited the area during this time.

After the death of Mr. Oliver in 1904, his surviving wife had constructed from some of the above surface sandstone, perimeter walls, watering trough and other stone features in remembrance of her husband. These features remain today. She also contributed to the reconstruction of the bridge over Mission Creek after the original wood bridge burned.

2.0 PROJECT LOCATION

The subject site is located within the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County known as Mission Canyon at 610 Mission Canyon Road. The park entrance is located near the intersection of Mission Ridge and Mission Canyon Roads at the boundary line of the City of Santa Barbara and County of Santa Barbara. The site is comprised of a single parcel with the subject structure placed upon it. This parcel is located within the First Supervisorial District.

2.1 Site Information	
Comprehensive Plan Designation	*Recreation/Open Space*
Zoning District, Ordinance	*Recreational*
Site Size	*9.29 Acres (combined with an additional 10-acre site in 1955) Total 19.29a*
Present Use & Development	Recreational/Open Space (County Park)
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	North: Res 1.0 South: City of Santa Barbara Boundary East: City of Santa Barbara Boundary West: Res 1.0
Access	Mission Canyon Road (610 Mission Canyon Road)
Public Services	Water Supply City of Santa Barbara-Public Works Sewage: County Public Works-CSA 12 Fire: County Fire Station 15 Other: N/A

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 PHYSICAL SETTING

Slope/Topography: *The site slopes as a plain toward the south with gentle surface undulation combined with steep drops around the banks of Mission Creek.*
Fauna: *include a variety small creatures such as: raccoons, rats, mice, rabbits and feral cats. Given the location of the park near an urban boundary the possibility of larger wild creatures is likely but none documented.*
Flora: *Includes coastal live oaks, sycamores and eucalyptus trees. Also among the plant life on-site are low ground covers or shrubs along the creek bed.*
Archaeological Sites: *The nearest documented site (Rogers p82: Dixie) lay on the National History Museum site across Mission Canyon Road and some few hundred yards from the subject parcel. There are no known mapped sites located on the subject site although the possibility is very strong that such archaeological resources could exist.*
Soils:
Surface Water Bodies: *there are no standing ponds or bodies of water on site. There is a segment of the Mission Creek that travels the southern boundary of the site which exists the site near the public access point and continues under a stone bridge on its way south to the Pacific Ocean. The creek experiences heavy flows during rain events during the later winter and spring months (November to May). From time to time there are light flows in the creek due to either natural spring sources further upstream from the site or run-off from area residential uses.*
Surrounding Land Uses: *The combined park site is situated within an urban/rural area with residential sites of an acre or larger. North of the site is more rural than the southern area. The site itself is zoned recreational/open space and has been since the County acquired the parcel in 1929.*
Existing Structures: *While there are two general sites (9.29 acre and 10.30 acre) the parcel with the cottage/Park Office is the subject of this Initial Study.*

Structures on the 9.29 acre (023-280-007) consist of the cottage/Park office, restroom, storage shed and group picnic areas. There are a number of developed fire pit sites in the park with a paved access road that connects these improvements to the park entry.
Structures on the 10.30 acre site include Fire Station 15 and its associated staff dorm.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

The Rocky Nook Park has been a County Park since 1928 and while the majority of the site has remained unchanged, there have been minor, minimal changes to the site during this time. There are park facilities that include a restroom, park office, storage shed, picnic areas and paved road ways and parking spaces.

Peppered over the entire site are live oaks, sycamores, bay trees and other trees and small shrubs. There are limited areas of wild ground covers where there is adequate sun exposure to support growth. The slope of the site is general level with grade changes that fall generally toward the Pacific Ocean some two-miles to the south. Mission Canyon Creek runs along a portion of the eastern property boundary as it descends south then transitions to the west on its continued path to the Pacific Ocean as well.

Sprinkled over the site are a variety of sandstone boulders that found their position on site due to floods from historic times. In the 1920s some of these boulders where harvested to construct site walls, cisterns and bridge over Mission Canyon Creek. With very minor alterations to accommodate parking or other improvements these boulders have remained in their current location and position for 1,000s of years.

The micro site where the cottage/office structure is located is nestled among mature oaks and sandstone boulder outcroppings. There is an existing small paved parking area adjacent to the structure with a paved "driveway" to reach this area.

Mission Canyon Creek flows when there is rain and intermittently during the remaining months of the year.

4.0 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS CHECKLIST

The following checklist indicates the potential level of impact and is defined as follows:

Potentially Significant Impact: A fair argument can be made, based on the substantial evidence in the file, that an effect may be significant.

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation: Incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a Potentially Significant Impact to a Less Than Significant Impact.

Less Than Significant Impact: An impact is considered adverse but does not trigger a significance threshold.

No Impact: There is adequate support that the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the subject project.

Reviewed Under Previous Document: The analysis contained in a previously adopted/certified environmental document addresses this issue adequately for use in the current case and is summarized in the discussion below. The discussion should include reference to the previous documents, a citation of the page(s) where the information is found, and identification of mitigation measures incorporated from the previous documents.

4.1 AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public or the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?				✓	
b. Change to the visual character of an area?			✓		

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
c. Glare or night lighting which may affect adjoining areas?				✓	
d. Visually incompatible structures?				✓	

Existing Setting: *The project site is located north of the intersection of Mission Ridge and Mission Canyon Roads, in a semi-rural area bounded by low density residential use and characterized by largely under developed open space. Public views from this site are dominated by a forest of oaks, sycamores and other native landscape with the occasional glimpse of residential structures. The primary public view shed for this project is largely undeveloped open space and the rear elevation of the adjacent property structure. Views from and to this site are limited to the immediate neighboring properties with no wide vista visible.*

County Environmental Thresholds. *The County's Visual Aesthetics Impact Guidelines classify coastal and mountainous areas, the urban fringe, and travel corridors as "especially important" visual resources. A project may have the potential to create a significantly adverse aesthetic impact if (among other potential effects) it would impact important visual resources, obstruct public views, remove significant amounts of vegetation, substantially alter the natural character of the landscape, or involve extensive grading visible from public areas. The guidelines address public, not private views.*

Impact Discussion (a, c & d):
No project components, including structures, land alterations or lighting, would be visible from any public viewing place, such as roads, highways, railroads, public and other open spaces, trails, beaches or other recreation areas. Structures are not visually incompatible and the project does not adversely alter the character of the landscape or topography. The project would not affect neighboring areas with glare or night lighting.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

Impact Discussion (b): *The proposed removal of the 1928 cottage/park office would exposed the rear elevation of the adjacent private structure (Women's Club Facility) to those using the park. The rear elevation of the adjacent building can be seen from other vantage points in the park and the proposed removal of the cottage/park office will not adversely affect the existing views. The installation of a fence along the north-west property line would screen the rear of the adjacent property's building and improve the visual impact on park users.*

Cumulative Impacts: *The implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial change in the aesthetic character of the area. Thus, the project would not cause a cumulatively considerable effect on aesthetics.*

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the project's aesthetic impacts to a less than significant level:

1. Extend, replace or install a wooden fence along the northern property line to screen the adjacent property building from view of park users.

Plan Requirements: Include diagram and details for installation of the new/extended fence in the demolition bid package.

Timing: The new/extended fence to be installed prior to final payment to demolition contractor.

Monitoring: General Services or Parks Division Staff shall verify that the fence has been installed prior to the authorization of final payment to contractor.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.

4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
a. Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use, impair agricultural land productivity (whether prime or non-prime) or conflict with agricultural preserve programs?				✓	
b. An effect upon any unique or other farmland of State or Local Importance?				✓	

The project site does not contain a combination of acreage and/or soils which render the site an important agricultural resource. The site does not adjoin and/or will not impact any neighboring agricultural operations.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: *No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.*

4.3 AIR QUALITY

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
a. The violation of any ambient air quality standard, a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, or exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (emissions from direct, indirect, mobile and stationary sources)?				✓	
b. The creation of objectionable smoke, ash or odors?				✓	
c. Extensive dust generation?			✓		
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
d. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				✓	
e. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				✓	

Impact Discussion (a, b, d & e):

The project would not result in significant new vehicle emissions (i.e., new vehicular trips to or from the site would be fewer than 100). It would not involve new stationary sources (i.e., equipment, machinery, hazardous materials storage, industrial or chemical processing, etc.) that would increase the amount of pollutants released into the atmosphere. The project would also not generate additional smoke, ash, odors, or long term dust after construction. The project's contribution to global warming from the generation of greenhouse gases would be negligible.

a-c. *<u>Potential Air Quality Impacts</u>*

Short-Term Construction Impacts. Project-related construction activities would not require grading or would require grading that has been minimized to the extent possible under the circumstances. Earth moving operations at the project site would not have the potential to result in significant project-specific short-term emissions of fugitive dust and $PM_{10,}$ with the implementation of standard dust control measures that are required for all new development in the County.

Emissions of ozone precursors (NO_x and ROC) during project construction would result primarily from the on-site use of heavy earthmoving equipment. Due to the limited period of time that grading activities would occur on the project site, construction-related emissions of NO_x and ROC would not be significant on a project-specific or cumulative basis. However, due to the non-attainment status of the air basin for ozone, the project should implement measures recommended by the APCD to reduce construction-related emissions of ozone precursors to the extent feasible. Compliance with these measures is routinely required for all new development in the County.

Cumulative Impacts:

The County's Environmental Thresholds were developed, in part, to define the point at which a project's contribution to a regionally significant impact constitutes a significant effect at the project level.

In this instance, the project has been found not to exceed the significance criteria for air quality. Therefore, the project's contribution to regionally significant air pollutant emissions, including GHGs, is not cumulatively considerable, and its cumulative effect is less than significant (Class III).

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The following mitigation measures would reduce the project's air quality impacts to a less than significant level:

1. *Implementation of standard conditions placed on the grading plan as implemented through Chapter 14 (Grading Ordinance) of the County Code, along with standard APCD conditions would reduce potential short-term dust impacts to a less than significant level. The project would not result in significant project-specific long-term air quality impacts. No further mitigation measures are required.*

Plan Requirements: Include standard dust mitigation requirements in demolition bid package.
Timing: Demolition contractor to implement mitigation measures during project mobilization and maintain measures during life of the project and until demobilization.
Monitoring: General Services or Parks Division Staff shall verify mitigation measures are in place and maintained during project.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
Flora					
a. A loss or disturbance to a unique, rare or threatened plant community?				✓	
b. A reduction in the numbers or restriction in the range of any unique, rare or threatened species of plants?				✓	
c. A reduction in the extent, diversity, or quality of native vegetation (including brush removal for fire prevention and flood control improvements)?				✓	
d. An impact on non-native vegetation whether naturalized or horticultural if of habitat value?				✓	
e. The loss of healthy native specimen trees?				✓	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
f. Introduction of herbicides, pesticides, animal life, human habitation, non-native plants or other factors that would change or hamper the existing habitat?				✓	
Fauna					
g. A reduction in the numbers, a restriction in the range, or an impact to the critical habitat of any unique, rare, threatened or endangered species of animals?				✓	
h. A reduction in the diversity or numbers of animals onsite (including mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish or invertebrates)?				✓	
i. A deterioration of existing fish or wildlife habitat (for foraging, breeding, roosting, nesting, etc.)?				✓	
j. Introduction of barriers to movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species?				✓	
k. Introduction of any factors (light, fencing, noise, human presence and/or domestic animals) which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

No natural plant communities or habitats exist on the site and no sensitive wildlife species are known to inhabit the premises or use the site for breeding or foraging. Additionally, no native or specimen trees are located in the area of project disturbance. As a result, no impacts to biological resources are anticipated.

Mitigation and Residual Impact[1]: No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
Archaeological Resources					
a. Disruption, alteration, destruction, or adverse effect on a recorded prehistoric or historic archaeological site (note site number below)?				✓	
b. Disruption or removal of human remains?				✓	
c. Increased potential for trespassing, vandalizing, or sabotaging archaeological resources?				✓	
d. Ground disturbances in an area with potential cultural resource sensitivity based on the location of known historic or prehistoric sites?				✓	
Ethnic Resources					
e. Disruption of or adverse effects upon a prehistoric or historic archaeological site or property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic group?				✓	
f. Increased potential for trespassing, vandalizing, or sabotaging ethnic, sacred, or ceremonial places?				✓	

[1] May require payment of fees to the California Department of Fish and Game

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
g. The potential to conflict with or restrict existing religious, sacred, or educational use of the area?				✓	

Impact Discussion:
Based on records on file at the CCIC (Central Coast Information Center of the University of California, Santa Barbara), no cultural resources are recorded within the proposed project area. Additionally, the proposed project does not include any ground disturbance. As a result, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

4.6 ENERGY

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Substantial increase in demand, especially during peak periods, upon existing sources of energy?				✓	
b. Requirement for the development or extension of new sources of energy?				✓	

Impact Discussion: The County has not identified significance thresholds for electrical and/or natural gas service impacts (Thresholds and Guidelines Manual). Private electrical and natural gas utility companies provide service to customers in Central and Southern California, including the unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County. The proposed project consists of the removal of an existing structure and therefore the elimination of energy use by that structure:

Cumulative Impacts:

The project's contribution to the regionally significant demand for energy is not considerable, and is therefore has no impact.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

4.7 FIRE PROTECTION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Introduction of development into an existing high fire hazard area?				✓	
b. Project-caused high fire hazard?				✓	
c. Introduction of development into an area without adequate water pressure, fire hydrants or adequate access for fire fighting?				✓	
d. Introduction of development that will hamper fire prevention techniques such as controlled burns or backfiring in high fire hazard areas?				✓	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
e. Development of structures beyond safe Fire Dept. response time?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

The project is not located within a High Fire Hazard Area, and/or does not involve new fire hazards. The project is located in an area with an adequate response time from fire protective services.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

1.8 GEOLOGIC PROCESSES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, soil creep, mudslides, ground failure (including expansive, compressible, collapsible soils), or similar hazards?				✓	
b. Disruption, displacement, compaction or overcovering of the soil by cuts, fills or extensive grading?				✓	
c. Exposure to or production of permanent changes in topography, such as bluff retreat or sea level rise?				✓	
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic, paleontologic or physical features?				✓	
e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?				✓	
f. Changes in deposition or erosion of beach sands or dunes, or changes in siltation, deposition or erosion which may modify the channel of a river, or stream, or the bed of the ocean, or any bay, inlet or lake?				✓	
g. The placement of septic disposal systems in impermeable soils with severe constraints to disposal of liquid effluent?				✓	
h. Extraction of mineral or ore?				✓	
i. Excessive grading on slopes of over 20%?				✓	
j. Sand or gravel removal or loss of topsoil?				✓	
k. Vibrations, from short-term construction or long-term operation, which may affect adjoining areas?				✓	
l. Excessive spoils, tailings or over-burden?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

The proposed project site does not have substantial geological constraints or slopes exceeding 20%. The proposed project would not result in excessive grading. As such, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to geological resources.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

4.9 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/RISK OF UPSET

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
a. In the known history of this property, have there been any past uses, storage or discharge of hazardous materials (e.g., fuel or oil stored in underground tanks, pesticides, solvents or other chemicals)?				✓	
b. The use, storage or distribution of hazardous or toxic materials?				✓	
c. A risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (e.g., oil, gas, biocides, bacteria, pesticides, chemicals or radiation) in the event of an accident or upset conditions?				✓	
d. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?				✓	
e. The creation of a potential public health hazard?				✓	
f. Public safety hazards (e.g., due to development near chemical or industrial activity, producing oil wells, toxic disposal sites, etc.)?				✓	
g. Exposure to hazards from oil or gas pipelines or oil well facilities?				✓	
h. The contamination of a public water supply?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

There is no evidence that hazardous materials were used, stored or spilled on site in the past, and there are no aspects of the proposed use that would include or involve hazardous materials at levels that would constitute a hazard to human health or the environment.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

4.10 HISTORIC RESOURCES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Adverse physical or aesthetic impacts on a structure or property at least 50 years old and/or of historic or cultural significance to the community, state or nation?			✓		
b. Beneficial impacts to an historic resource by providing rehabilitation, protection in a conservation/open easement, etc.?			✓		

Existing Setting:
Onsite development includes demolition of the 1929 cottage/park office, the core of which is over 50 years old. A historic report addressing the importance of the onsite resources was prepared by community representative Fran Gault on March 8, 2016. The cottage/park office is not part of the original development undertaken by the landowners (George and Fanny Oliver). The core building dated to 1929 was originally designed as a plaster red-tiles cottage to serve as a care takers residence and then used as a ranger residence until the structure was converted into office space in 1984. The original structure and its addition were not designed by any notable architect.

Environmental Threshold: *The threshold for determination of whether the structure at greater than 50-years old holds historic value under CEQA is a Section 106 Review with a filter of Historic Resource impacts as determined through use of the County's Cultural Resources Guidelines. A significant resource a) possesses integrity of location, design, workmanship, material, and/or setting; b) is at least fifty years old, and c) is associated with an important contribution, was designed or built by a person who made an important contribution, is associated with an important and particular architectural style, or embodies elements demonstrating outstanding attention to detail, craftsmanship, use of materials, or construction methods. In order for a CEQA Section 106 review to be undertaken a National Register of Historic Places determination is required to be completed and a subsequent review by the California Department of Parks, State Office of Historic Preservation made.*

Impact Discussion (a, b):
To determine if a particular project proposal that affects a structure of 50-years or older, documentation must be evaluated and the threshold of that documentation is first initiated under the California Health and Safety Code Section 18950. It is this code that allows the use of the Historic Building Code and its application to the subject proposal. Although the proposed project involves alterations in the form of demolition to a potentially historic structure, in accordance with the conclusions of the aforementioned historic report, the existing structure does not hold any particularly historic significance.

Although the proposed project involves the demolition of a structure which is greater than 50 years in age, in accordance with the conclusions of the aforementioned historic report, this structure does not meet the County's criteria for historical significance. No project components, including structures, landscaping, other land alterations would affect known or potential historical resources onsite, nor would any project component significantly alter the setting or character of known historic resources in the vicinity. Therefore, the impacts resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant. The removal of the non-historic cottage would benefit the overall condition of the site.

Cumulative Impacts:
Since the project would not result in any substantial change in the historic character of the site, it would not have any cumulatively considerable effect on the region's historic resources. The park structure is only visible

from an adjacent private parking lot and its proposed demolition would not alter the general context of the neighborhood architectural fabric.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified. No mitigations are necessary.

4.11 LAND USE

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
a. Structures and/or land use incompatible with existing land use?				✓	
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✓	
c. The induction of substantial growth or concentration of population?				✓	
d. The extension of sewer trunk lines or access roads with capacity to serve new development beyond this proposed project?				✓	
e. Loss of existing affordable dwellings through demolition, conversion or removal?				✓	
f. Displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓	
g. Displacement of substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓	
h. The loss of a substantial amount of open space?				✓	
i. An economic or social effect that would result in a physical change? (i.e. Closure of a freeway ramp results in isolation of an area, businesses located in the vicinity close, neighborhood degenerates, and buildings deteriorate. Or, if construction of new freeway divides an existing community, the construction would be the physical change, but the economic/social effect on the community would be the basis for determining that the physical change would be significant.)				✓	
j. Conflicts with adopted airport safety zones?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

The proposed project does not cause a physical change that conflicts with adopted environmental policies or regulations. The project is not growth inducing, and does not result in the loss of affordable housing, loss of open

space, or a significant displacement of people. The project does not involve the extension of a sewer trunk line, and does not conflict with any airport safety zones. The project is compatible with existing land uses.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

12 NOISE

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Long-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds (e.g. locating noise sensitive uses next to an airport)?				✓	
b. Short-term exposure of people to noise levels exceeding County thresholds?		✓			
c. Project-generated substantial increase in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas (either day or night)?			✓		

Setting/Threshold: Noise is generally defined as unwanted or objectionable sound which is measured on a logarithmic scale and expressed in decibels (dB(A)). The duration of noise and the time period at which it occurs are important values in determining impacts on noise-sensitive land uses. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and Day-Night Average Level (L_{dn}) are noise indices which account for differences in intrusiveness between day- and night-time uses. County noise thresholds are: 1) 65 dB(A) CNEL maximum for exterior exposure, and 2) 45 dB(A) CNEL maximum for interior exposure of noise-sensitive uses. Noise-sensitive land uses include: residential dwellings; transient lodging; hospitals and other long-term care facilities; public or private educational facilities; libraries, churches; and places of public assembly.

The proposed project site is located outside of 65 dB(A) noise contours for roadways, public facilities, airport approach and take-off zones.

Impact Discussion:

a., c.) The proposed project consists of demolition of an existing structure. Long-term noise generated onsite would not: 1) exceed County thresholds, or 2) substantially increase ambient noise levels in adjoining areas. Noise sensitive uses on the proposed project site would not be exposed to or impacted by off-site noise levels exceeding County thresholds. Impacts would be less than significant.

b.) The proposed project would potentially result in construction activities generating short-term noise impacts exceeding County thresholds. Impacts are potentially significant.

Cumulative Impacts:
The implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in any substantial noise effects. Therefore, the project would not contribute in a cumulatively considerable manner to noise impacts.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: The following mitigation measures would reduce the project's noise effects to a less than significant level:

1. Limit demolition activities to 9 a.m. to 3 p.m.

Plan Requirements: Include mitigation requirements in demolition bid package.
Timing: Demolition contractor to implement mitigation measures during project mobilization and maintain measures during life of the project and until demobilization.
Monitoring: General Services or Parks Division Staff shall verify mitigation measures are in place and maintained during project.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.

4.13 PUBLIC FACILITIES

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. A need for new or altered police protection and/or health care services?				✓	
b. Student generation exceeding school capacity?				✓	
c. Significant amounts of solid waste or breach any national, state, or local standards or thresholds relating to solid waste disposal and generation (including recycling facilities and existing landfill capacity)?				✓	
d. A need for new or altered sewer system facilities (sewer lines, lift-stations, etc.)?				✓	
e. The construction of new storm water drainage or water quality control facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

The proposed project would result in no change in public facilities within the area. Existing service levels would be sufficient to serve the proposed project. The proposed project would not generate solid waste in excess of County thresholds. The project would not cause the need for new or altered sewer system facilities as it is already in the service district, and the District has adequate capacity to serve the project. The proposed project would not create new impervious surfaces that could result in greater surface runoff from the site since there would be less open ground capable of absorbing rainwater. No additional drainages or water quality control facilities would be necessary to serve the project. Therefore, the project would have no impact to public facilities. Construction related debris are required to be recycled as county policy and therefore do not require a mitigation measure to reduce impacts of the project.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No impacts are identified. No mitigation is necessary.

4.14 RECREATION

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
a. Conflict with established recreational uses of the area?				✓	
b. Conflict with biking, equestrian and hiking trails?				✓	
c. Substantial impact on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities (e.g., overuse of an area with constraints on numbers of people, vehicles, animals, etc. which might safely use the area)?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

(a.,b.) The proposed project site is not located on or near any established recreational uses, including biking, equestrian or hiking trails. No adverse impacts would result.

(c.) The proposed project would not result in any population increase and would have no adverse impacts on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities, either in the project vicinity or County-wide.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No mitigation is required.

4.15 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement (daily, peak-hour, etc.) in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?				✓	
b. A need for private or public road maintenance, or need for new road(s)?				✓	
c. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?				✓	
d. Substantial impact upon existing transit systems (e.g. bus service) or alteration of present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?				✓	
e. Alteration to waterborne, rail or air traffic?				✓	
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians (including short-term construction and long-term operational)?				✓	
g. Inadequate sight distance?				✓	
ingress/egress?				✓	
general road capacity?				✓	
emergency access?				✓	
h. Impacts to Congestion Management Plan system?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

The proposed project is limited to the demolition of an existing structure and, as such, would not increase vehicular traffic to or from the site nor would it affect roadways; parking facilities; pedestrian, bicycle, or transit access; or any other type of transportation facility.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

4.16 WATER RESOURCES/FLOODING

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?				✓	
b. Changes in percolation rates, drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface water runoff?				✓	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
c. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?				✓	
d. Discharge, directly or through a storm drain system, into surface waters (including but not limited to wetlands, riparian areas, ponds, springs, creeks, streams, rivers, lakes, estuaries, tidal areas, bays, ocean, etc) or alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, or thermal water pollution?				✓	
e. Alterations to the course or flow of flood water or need for private or public flood control projects?				✓	
f. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding (placement of project in 100 year flood plain), accelerated runoff or tsunamis, sea level rise, or seawater intrusion?				✓	
g. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwater?				✓	
h. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or recharge interference?				✓	
i. Overdraft or over-commitment of any groundwater basin? Or, a significant increase in the existing overdraft or over-commitment of any groundwater basin?				✓	
j. The substantial degradation of groundwater quality including saltwater intrusion?				✓	
k. Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?				✓	
l. Introduction of storm water pollutants (e.g., oil, grease, pesticides, nutrients, sediments, pathogens, etc.) into groundwater or surface water?				✓	

Impact Discussion:

The project would not result in impacts on surface water quality, including storm water runoff, direction or course of surface or ground water or the direction, volume, or frequency of runoff. There is an adequate supply of water for the project and the project would not contribute to overdraft of groundwater resources.

Mitigation and Residual Impact: No mitigation is required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

With the incorporation of these measures, residual impacts would be less than significant.

5.0 INFORMATION SOURCES

5.1 County Departments Consulted *(underline):*

Police, Fire, Public Works, Flood Control, Parks, Environmental Health, Special Districts, Regional Programs, Other : _____

5.2 Comprehensive Plan *(check those sources used):*

- ✓ Seismic Safety/Safety Element
- ✓ Open Space Element
- ✓ Coastal Plan and Maps
- ___ ERME
- ✓ Conservation Element
- ✓ Noise Element
- ✓ Circulation Element
- ___

5.3 Other Sources *(check those sources used):*

- ✓ Field work
- ✓ Calculations
- ✓ Project plans
- ___ Traffic studies
- ___ Records
- ___ Grading plans
- ✓ Elevation, architectural renderings
- ___ Published geological map/reports
- ✓ Topographical maps
- ___ Ag Preserve maps
- ✓ Flood Control maps
- ___ Other technical references (reports, survey, etc.)
- ✓ Planning files, maps, reports
- ✓ Zoning maps
- ✓ Soils maps/reports
- ___ Plant maps
- ✓ Archaeological maps and reports
- ___ Other

6.0 PROJECT SPECIFIC *(short- and long-term)* AND CUMULATIVE IMPACT SUMMARY

The primary potential impact is the loss of a structure of 50-years older; however the quality of *the potential historic resource is below the threshold of importance. The conclusion is based upon documentation that the original cottage has been significantly altered over the years from its initial architectural form to its current form as office building. The structure was not designed by any locally recognized designer or architect; nor was it constructed by a noted contractor or builder. The structure is not unique among other structures of its type or within the general area where there are much better examples of the architecture style. The structure is not related to an important local event or persons.*

7.0 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Will the proposal result in:	**Poten. Signif.**	**Less than Signif. with Mitigation**	**Less Than Signif.**	**No Impact**	**Reviewed Under Previous Document**
1. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions or significantly increase energy consumption, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				✓	

Will the proposal result in:	Poten. Signif.	Less than Signif. with Mitigation	Less Than Signif.	No Impact	Reviewed Under Previous Document
2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?				✓	
3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects and the effects of probable future projects.)				✓	
4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				✓	
5. Is there disagreement supported by facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts and/or expert opinion supported by facts over the significance of an effect which would warrant investigation in an EIR ?			✓		

1. The proposed demolition project site is not directly adjacent to Mission Creek (some 200 yards east) and therefore the construction activity will not impact the environs of the creek corridor. The removal of the building will elimination the consumption of utilities and therefore any existing environmental impact the operation of the building creates currently. With ground surface impacts limited to 3 feet below finished grade any earthen encapsulated historic artifacts will remain untouched.
2. The long-term environmental goal is to preserve the natural undeveloped open space and the short-term demolition activities will not derail this goal.
3. There are no cumulative impacts. The limited potentially significant impacts are related to the activity of short duration construction efforts and once completed are eliminated.
4. The removal of the aged building through demolition will be have not adversely effects humankind.
5. It is a matter of opinion among community members that the cottage/park office holds architecturally significance solely due to the age of the structure and that the little building fits so well within the context of the park setting it currently is surround by. The few architectural details that may be unique to the subject structure do not rise to the level of rare or limited solely to this structure since there are other more unique and heavily detailed structures in the general area that provide examples where the architectural integrity has not been compromised by changes over the years.

8.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

With no Potentially Significant Impacts alternative project study is not applicable.

9.0 INITIAL REVIEW OF PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE SUBDIVISION, ZONING AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

10.0 RECOMMENDATION BY P&D STAFF

On the basis of the Initial Study, the staff of Planning and Development:

✓ Finds that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, recommends that a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) be prepared.

____ Finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures incorporated into the REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION would successfully mitigate the potentially significant impacts. Staff recommends the preparation of an ND. The ND finding is based on the assumption that mitigation measures will be acceptable to the applicant; if not acceptable a revised Initial Study finding for the preparation of an EIR may result.

____ Finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and recommends that an EIR be prepared.

____ Finds that from existing documents (previous EIRs, etc.) that a subsequent document (containing updated and site-specific information, etc.) pursuant to CEQA Sections 15162/15163/15164 should be prepared. Potentially significant unavoidable adverse impact areas:

____ With Public Hearing ✓ Without Public Hearing

PREVIOUS DOCUMENT:

PROJECT EVALUATOR: Robert Ooley, FAIA, County Architect **DATE:** April 15, 2016

11.0 DETERMINATION BY ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING OFFICER

✓ I agree with staff conclusions. Preparation of the appropriate document may proceed.
____ I DO NOT agree with staff conclusions. The following actions will be taken:
____ I require consultation and further information prior to making my determination.

SIGNATURE:_____ **INITIAL STUDY DATE:** _____

SIGNATURE:_____ **NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE:** 4/14/16

SIGNATURE:_____ **REVISION DATE:** _____

SIGNATURE:_____ **FINAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION DATE:** _____

12.0 ATTACHMENTS

1. Vicinity Map
2. Site Plan
3. Floor Plan and Elevations