

CITY OF MILL VALLEY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
26 CORTE MADER AVE
MILL VALLEY, CA 94941

Initial Study Checklist
(form updated January 2019)

1. **Project Title:** SLP Woodbine Dr. to Greenwood Way (Reynolds)
2. **Property Owner:** City of Mill Valley, Paula Reynolds
3. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** City of Mill Valley Department of Public Works, 26 Corte Madera Ave, Mill Valley, CA 94941
4. **Representative:** Antony Boyd, City of Mill Valley DPW Project Manager
5. **City Contact Person, Phone Number and Email:** Sean Kennings, Contract Planner, (415) 533-2111, sean@lakassociates.com
6. **Project Location and APN:** Woodbine Dr. to Greenwood Way, via 'Wake Robbin Lane', a 10 foot wide utility public right-of-way
7. **General Plan Description:** SFR-2 (Single-Family Residential 2) and CF (Community Facilities)
8. **Zoning:** Single Family Residential, RS-10 and RS-7 .5
9. **Project Description:** Build an evacuation trail and steps between Woodbine Drive and Greenwood Way. Structures would include wooden steps, rails, footbridge, and fence.

Project Description

The proposed project is to develop a public step/path/lane (identified in City documents as SLP 221) to connect Woodbine Dr. to Greenwood Avenue. This SLP will serve as both a public right-of-way as part of the City's network of SLPs as well as an emergency evacuation route. The trail consists of two segments. The upper segment of the trail traverses from Greenwood Avenue through a parcel donated to the City by Paula Reynolds (APN 29-624-62) and then connects to the lower segment of trail which follows a public utility right-of-way from this City property down to Woodbine Drive (APN (See Exhibit A: Vicinity Map)). The upper segment of the SLP traverses an existing parcel that is an undeveloped, wooded parcel adjacent to the Blithedale Summit Preserve, an open space owned and maintained by Marin County Open Space. The lower section runs between developed parcels in a single family residential neighborhood, with the lowest portion of this right-of-way coinciding with a private driveway. Project construction would only occur between July 15 and October 15.

The trail will include the following components:

Between 225 - 250 ground contact steps made from 6X6" Eucalyptus treads;

- Natural surface footpaths, approximately 100' in length;
- One foot bridge, approximately 15' in length and under 30" in height from ground level;
- A handrail will be built adjacent to all steps.

There are no plans to change the existing elevated stairway of approximately 20 steps at the Greenwood Ave. entrance. The lower segment along the City right-of-way is more complex due to an encroachment on the right-of-way by a neighboring property owner. City staff are presently negotiating a solution that involves an easement over a private driveway and a donation of a small section of private property. The lower section will include the following components:

- Solid wood fencing at select sites where the right-of-way meets private property boundaries;
- Two elevated stairways: 20-25 steps and 8-10 steps;
- One bridge, 15' in length and over 30" in height from ground level, to include a handrail;
- Improvements to the debris rack in front of downstream culvert and addition of stone rip-rap at base of rack (approximately 3" to 6" stones).

Other construction details:

- All steps will be backfilled with native soils.
 - Erosion control measures will include jute cloth over any disturbed soils.
 - The project is not adding plants.
 - All components will be made from salvaged redwood, except for ground contact Eucalyptus stair treads, which are also from salvaged trees.
- (See Exhibit B)

Steps, Paths, and Lanes CSLP) Background

Mill Valley's Steps, Lanes and Paths (SLP) play a critical role in emergency preparedness as alternate evacuation routes during potential disasters such as wildfires and earthquakes. The devastating Oakland hills fire in 1991 proved that paths and steps could be the key to saving lives here in Mill Valley in the event of such a catastrophe. The City and volunteers have invested many hours and hundreds of thousands of dollars to plan a network of emergency evacuation routes servicing all neighborhoods, especially those accessed by higher elevation roadways.

The City of Mill Valley Evacuation Map was developed to show suggested evacuation routes out of the City. It includes primary and secondary street routes, our Steps, Lanes and Paths system and evacuation assembly areas. The City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) is currently working on recommendations for renovation of existing SLPs and strategic placement of new SLPs. The development of SLP's is consistent with the City's General Plan, including policies related to creating evacuation routes for emergency egress (MV2040 General Plan Policy HZ.5-2); and policies related to sustainable transportation and minimizing vehicle trips (M.3, M.4, and M.5-2, M.12).

The proposed project would serve as an evacuation route has been identified to connect Woodbine Dr. to Greenwood A venue. SLP 221 will be made possible through a donation of property from a Mill Valley resident, Paula Reynolds, and construction funding from she and other Mill Valley residents.

10. **Describe the environmental setting and surrounding land uses.** Single Family Residential (SFR-2) surrounds the project on all sides. Marin County Open Space District lands are located farther north of the project area.
11. **Other agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement). Discretionary approval required by Mill Valley consists of a building permit. The proposed project would also require various ministerial approvals by the City including, but not limited to building permits, grading permits, encroachment permits (for any work conducted within the County right-of-way). A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required to meet San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board standards and is administered by DPW.

The project does not propose any development within the drainage areas, however, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife have been consulted as part of the project. Avoidance and Minimization Measures documented via correspondence has been incorporated into the project as a requirement.

Responsible (R) and Trustee (T) Agencies

12. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resource, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

A cultural resource archival query was conducted in April 2022 via letter request to the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University. The query request indicated that there is a moderate potential for resources located within the project area. The City of Mill Valley sent a letter to the Graton Rancheria of Federated Indians on May 27, 2022 to formally begin the consultation process. As of publication of this document, the Tribe has not yet responded requesting updated consultation.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND BASIS OF CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions and recommendations contained herein are professional opinions derived in accordance with current standards of professional practice. They are based on a review of the project design, the other sources of information listed in the file, and the comments received, conversations with knowledgeable individuals; the preparer's personal knowledge of the area; and, where necessary, a visit to the site. For further information, see the environmental background information contained in the permanent file on this project.

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Name: Sean Kennings, Contract Planner
Mill Valley Department of Public Works

I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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/b/c. The proposed project would not be located within an area which would damage any known scenic vista, or damage scenic resources, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. The site is not visible from a scenic highway or any scenic routes.

The proposed trail project between Woodbine Dr. and Greenwood Ave. utilizes both an existing city owned property and an existing 10' wide utility easement. Trail improvements are rustic in nature and will be made from reclaimed wood from redwood and eucalyptus trees that were donated to the City from development projects or vegetation management projects. This is consistent with the goals of the General Plan, which include maintaining the natural beauty of the City. The proposed change of use and minor site work will not create any adverse effects on a scenic vista or degrade the existing visual character of the neighborhood as there are no proposed changes that are structurally substantial or higher than six feet tall. There would be no impact.

d. The proposed project will not result in increases in the nighttime lighting. There would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important (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) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), timberland as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526, or timberland zoned Timberland Production as defined in Government Code Section 51104(g)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use in a manner that will significantly affect timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, or other public benefits?
- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed trail project between Woodbine Dr. and Greenwood Avenue will have no effect on agricultural and forestry resources as there are no agricultural resources or designated forest areas within the City of Mill Valley. The project site is located within a developed, hilly, residential neighborhood. The project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Important as shown on the Mill Valley General Plan map. The project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract.
- c/d. The project site is zoned RS 20 (Residential – 20,000 sq ft min), which allows uses similar to public pathways and/or landscaping improvements. Although the project area is mostly wooded, the proposed project does not require tree removal for path improvements and is not considered woodland or forested areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.
- e. The project site is surrounded by single family residential development and the area has been designated for residential development. The project will not result in the conversion of existing farmland.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

III.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project site is in Marin County, which is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB). The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for assuring that the Federal and California Ambient Air Quality Standards are attained and maintained in the SFBAAB. The SFBAAB exceeds the state air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter (respirable particulate matter PM10 and fine particulate matter PM2.5). The area is designated nonattainment for national standards of 8-hour ozone, 24-hour PM2.5, and state standards for 24-hour and annual PM10, and annual PM2.5. For projects, the determination of a significant cumulative air quality impact should be based on the consistency of the project with the Bay Area’s most recently adopted Clean Air Plan. A project would be consistent with the 2010 Clean Air Plan if the project would not exceed the growth assumptions in the plan. The primary method of determining consistency with the 2010 Clean Air Plan growth assumptions is consistency with the General Plan land use designations and zoning ordinance zoning designations for the site. If the General Plan growth forecast was adopted prior to the adoption of the 2010 Clean Air Plan, then it can be safely assumed that the 2010 Clean Air Plan incorporates the growth forecast from the General Plan.

The Mill Valley 2040 General Plan provides a framework and policies and programs to reduce potential impacts specific to Air Quality in the City. The MV 2040 General Plan included a number of goals and policies that are consistent with the measures identified in the San Francisco Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan, including goals and policies that aim to reduce the City’s carbon footprint, using clean energy, monitoring greenhouse gas emissions, promoting sustainable transportation through pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and transit access, and development that reduces

vehicle miles traveled. Furthermore, the MV 2040 General Plan does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan as evaluated by the the MV 2040 General Plan EIR. As such, the MV 2040 General Plan's goals and policies do not conflict with the applicable provisions of the 2010 Clean Air Plan.

- a/b. The proposed trail project between Woodbine Dr. and Greenwood Avenue will have no significant impact on air quality as it will not subject sensitive receptors to pollutants nor will it result in the alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature. The construction of new pedestrian pathways may improve air quality by improving the pedestrian network and providing alternatives to vehicle transportation within the City. Consistent with the findings of the MV 2040 General Plan, the SLP project would not have an adverse effect pertaining to potential conflicts with, or obstruction of implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- c. In the short term, potential air quality impacts are most likely to result from construction activities required for project construction. However, construction activities would likely include manpower construction with hand tools and small power tools as opposed to heavy machinery and equipment that result in sources of potential air pollution. Impacts from excessive grading or earthmoving activities would not occur as a result of the project, and there would be no impact.

BAAQMD recommends incorporating feasible control measures as a means of addressing construction impacts. If the proposed project adheres to these relevant best management practices identified by the BAAQMD and the City's standard conditions of project approval, construction-related impacts will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and are considered less than significant:

- d. The BAAQMD defines public exposure to offensive odors as a potentially significant impact, pedestrian pathways do not contribute uses known for operational producers of pollutants capable of causing substantial negative impacts to sensitive receptors. The project will not create pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, Coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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?

Discussion:

The project sponsor, City of Mill Valley Department of Public Works has consulted with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and entered into a Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement) between CDFW and the City of Mill Valley (Permittee). Accordingly, the Agreement includes Administrative Measures and Avoidance and Minimization Measures to ensure consistency with CDFW policies and regulations. In addition, pursuant to the determinations in the Mill Valley General Plan EIR, a project is required to implement existing regulatory requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code that provide for the protection of active nests of migratory and other birds and bats. Implementation of these regulatory requirements would avoid and/or reduce impacts to sensitive status species to levels of less than significant.

- a. The project does not require the removal or disturbance of mature vegetation within the project area. Additionally, the MV 2040 General Plan EIR establishes implementation of Avoidance and Minimization measures for sensitive special-status species under the Federal and State Endangered Species Acts, the California Fish and Game Code, the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, and Section 3500 of the California Fish and Game Code. Consistency with the MV 2040 General Plan EIR will ensure a project does not result in significant adverse impacts. Furthermore, the project shall implement the Measures To Protect Fish And Wildlife Resources as outlined in the Agreement (Attachment A), to be implemented prior to the start of any construction activities at the site. Project implementation of the Avoidance and Minimization Measures included in the Agreement would reduce potential impacts to less than significant and no further mitigation is required.
- b/c. The project area contains mature vegetation and trees, but no riparian vegetation or potential sensitive habitats have been identified. The Project will be implemented with hand tools and will not remove any trees. Although no trees are required for removal as part of the project, the project shall implement the Measures To Protect Fish And Wildlife Resources as outlined in the Agreement (Attachment A), to be implemented prior to the start of any construction activities at the site. Project implementation of the Avoidance and Minimization Measures included in the Agreement would reduce potential impacts to less than significant and no further mitigation is required.
- d. As noted above, the project area contains mature vegetation and trees, however, no trees are required for removal as part of the project. The Study Area does not contain seasonal wetlands although project improvements will span an unnamed tributary to Arroyo Corte Madera del Presidio. The project has been designed to avoid site disturbance within the banks of the drainage way including installation of two 2-foot-wide, 3-foot-deep concrete piers outside of the top-of-bank. The Project will be implemented with hand tools and will not remove any trees. Therefore, the impacts area considered less than significant and no further mitigation is required.
- e. The project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation or the City's Tree Removal Regulations. The project does not conflict with any City ordinance or requirement to preserve existing trees, and therefore is considered as not having potential for a significant impact thereto.
- f. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans. There are no plans applicable to the subject parcel.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §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 CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. No prehistoric or historic-era resources were identified during the archival query review by the Northwest Information Center. As such, the proposed project would have no significant impact on any historical resource and no mitigation is required. The area of the proposed development is vacant and does not contain any structures. There are no historical resources on the site as the parcel is vacant, and the site is not included on the California Register of Historical Resources. The project will remove small amounts of soil to place wood steps and posts. There is no evidence of the potential to directly or indirectly change or destroy archeological resources within the project area.
- b. The project will remove small amounts of soil to place wood steps and posts. There is no evidence of the potential to directly or indirectly change or destroy archeological resources within the project area. However, based on the Mill Valley General Plan EIR, areas in Mill Valley were occupied by native peoples known as the Coast Miwok. There is no information in the City's files that would indicate that there is a potential for occurrence of these resources. However, the archival query review by the Northwest Information Center determined that there is a moderate potential for unknown resources to be located within the project area. The NWIC recommends that prior to construction a pedestrian survey of the Project Area be conducted to identify the possibility of cultural resources and further assess the sensitivity for buried archaeological deposits. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 listed below would reduce the potential impact to less than significant. During construction, any disturbance of archeological materials found will immediately stop the project and mitigation measures will be employed. If archaeological or cultural resources are found during grading of the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the Mitigation Measure CULT-2 listed below. Implementation of these mitigation measures would result in a less than significant impact.
- c. No human remains have been encountered on the property and no information has been encountered that would indicate that construction of this project would encounter human remains. However, if resources are found during project grading, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist would be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the Mitigation Measure CULT-3 listed below. Implementation of these mitigation measures would result in a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure CULT-1: Archaeological Site Survey Prior to Construction: The project sponsor shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist to conduct a field study to identify cultural resource prior to start of construction. The field study should include, but is not limited to, hand auger sampling, shovel test units, or geoarchaeological analyses as well as other common methods used to identify the presence of archaeological resources. If archaeological resources are encountered during the field survey, the qualified professional archaeologist shall document the conditions, notify the appropriate Tribal representative and provide appropriate recommendations.

Mitigation Measure CULT-2: Protect Archaeological Resources Identified during Construction: The project sponsor shall ensure that construction crews stop all work within 100 feet of the discovery until a qualified archaeologist can assess the previously unrecorded discovery and provide recommendations. Resources could include subsurface historic features such as artifact-filled privies, wells, and refuse pits, and artifact deposits, along with concentrations of adobe, stone, or concrete walls or foundations, and concentrations of ceramic, glass, or metal materials. Native American archaeological materials could include obsidian and chert flaked stone tools (such as projectile and dart points), midden (culturally derived darkened soil containing heat-affected rock, artifacts, animal bones, and/or shellfish remains), and/or groundstone implements (such as mortars and pestles). If archaeological resources are encountered during construction, work should be temporarily halted in the vicinity of the discovered materials and workers should avoid altering the materials and their context until a qualified professional archaeologist has evaluated the situation and provided appropriate recommendations. Project personnel should not collect cultural resources.

Mitigation Measure CULT-3, Discovery of Human Remains: In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the County Coroner has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27492 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of death, and the recommendations concerning treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

VI.	ENERGY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation as construction of the project would be mostly manpower with handtools and the project would not result in any operational use or consumption of energy.
- b. The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because there are no plans applicable to the subject site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Directly or indirectly cause 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) Be located on expansive soil creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? Expansive soil is defined as soil having an expansive index greater than 20, as determined in accordance with	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ASTM (American Society of Testing and Materials) D 4829.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
- f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Discussion:

- a.(i.-iv.)Soils may be disturbed as part of the construction process. The project will require a sediment control plan for stormwater and best management practices for construction to be approved by the Department of Public Works. Soils will be secured and runoff from the project monitored during rain events to prevent additional erosion to the amount occurring naturally throughout the drainage corridor.
- b. The Contractor or subcontractor is required to submit a sediment control plan per Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program best practices for soil erosion. Public Works will supply the construction manager with checklist (attached) and website for further information. Erosion and sediment control materials will be stockpiled onsite and an emergency callout plan for 24-hour notification will be provided. Work will only be allowed between June and October. Impacts would be considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.
- c/d. All proposed construction will be required to comply with all the latest building standards and codes at the time of construction. Compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Code for seismic stability would reduce any potential impacts to the maximum extent possible, resulting in less than significant impacts.
- e. The project will not require municipal water service and sewer service. There would be no impact.
- f. No paleontological resources or unique geological features were identified on the property through the archival query with the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University although a pre-construction field survey is required to confirm no presence of potential resources. If resources are found during any earth disturbing activities associated with the project, construction of the project is required to cease, and a qualified archaeologist will be retained to investigate the site in accordance with the mitigation measures listed in **Section V** above.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

VIII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Generate a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions in excess of applicable thresholds adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District or the California Air Resources Board which may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Conflict with an adopted climate action plan or another applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The City of Mill Valley has a Climate Action Plan contained in the City's General Plan and is used to identify actions that the community and local government can take to reduce emissions based on emission reduction targets set for the community and the city's government operations. The City has successfully achieved its 2020 emission reduction targets (20% below year 2000 levels) and is currently working to identify new targets and update its Climate Action Plan.

a/b. No measurable greenhouse gas emissions as a result of this project as it encourages pedestrian and non-motorized movement which is consistent with the City's General Plan. For these reasons, there would be no project impacts related to GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	f) 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"/>
	g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild-land fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not involve the transport of hazardous materials other than those amounts normally used in construction of the facility.
- b. Hazardous materials such as diesel, maintenance fluids, and paints may be used onsite during construction. Should they be stored onsite, these materials would be stored in secure locations to reduce the potential for upset or accident conditions. The proposed project consists of a pedestrian path project that would not result in use of hazardous materials during operations. Therefore, it would not be reasonably foreseeable for the proposed project to create upset or accident conditions that involve the release of hazardous materials into the environments. Impacts would be less than significant.
- c. There are no schools located within one-quarter mile from the project site. The nearest school, the Greenwood School, is approximately 1/2 miles to the south of the project site. There would be no impact.
- d. Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control database, the project site does not contain any known EPA National Priority List sites, State response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, or any school cleanup sites. The project site is not on the Cortese list or any of the lists of hazardous waste sites enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5. No impact would occur.

- e. The project site is not located within the boundaries of an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.
- f. The project includes the development of a pedestrian pathway between two residential streets in a hillside area. The project would result in increased emergency access and would not impair implementation or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- g. The project would not increase exposure of people and/or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project includes the development of a pedestrian pathway between two residential streets in a hillside area and would result in increased emergency access. The project would not expose people or structures to increased risk involving wild-fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces which would:				
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) 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"/>
	iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The proposed project will not violate any known water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project may have the potential to discharge stormwater runoff into an approved on-site storm drainage system designed to accommodate the drainage from this site. The construction project will follow the Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program's erosion and sediment control measures. Pursuant to Best Management Practices and compliance with Marin County and DPW requirements, the project does not have the potential to significantly impact water quality and discharge standards. The project will not be constructed during Marin County's rainy

season (October 15th through April 15th) and will install and maintain Best Management Practices (BMPs) before and after any rain events that may occur. A detail of BMPs for erosion and sediment control is attached to this study.

- b. The project does not require water service. No groundwater wells are associated with this project.
- c. The project would not substantially alter the drainage pattern on site or cause a significant increase in erosion or siltation on or off the project site. Improvement plans prepared prior to the issuance of a building permit would ensure that the proposed project does not increase runoff flow rate or volume as a result of project implementation. In addition, the proposed project does not have any unusual characteristics that create sources of pollution that would degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.
- d. The site lies outside the boundaries of the 100 and 500 year flood hazard boundaries. The project area is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows. No impacts would occur.
- e. The proposed project would not conflict with a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. The proposed project would occur within an established residential community and would result in establishing increase methods of pedestrian circulation within the community. The proposed project complies with the Mill Valley General Plan, the Mill Valley Municipal Code, and all other applicable regulations. There would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<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/b. There are no known mineral resource sites in the City of Mill Valley. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XIII.	NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a/b. Construction would temporarily increase noise levels for neighbors. Title 7 of the Mill Valley Municipal Code limits hours of construction to Monday through Friday and prohibits no construction on Saturdays or Sundays. The project will include a Construction Management Plan to ensure that methods and equipment used limit noise where possible. There would be no permanent excessive noise produced by the project. All construction activity shall comply with the City's limitations on construction hours as set forth in Title 7 of the Mill Valley Municipal Code. However, for this specific project there shall be no construction activities on Saturday or Sunday. The Project sponsor will ensure that the contractor or sub-contractor is aware of the City's limited construction hours, including those for use of heavy equipment. Construction hours will be posted at the site as part of the Construction Management Plan. There would be no anticipated level of noise to occur following the completion of construction.
- c. The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XIV.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) Induce substantial unplanned 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 people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a.-b. Development of the project would not result in population growth. No new infrastructure is proposed that might induce growth by extending service outside of the boundaries of the project site. No existing housing or people would be displaced as a result of the project. Therefore,

the project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XV.	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i)	Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v)	Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a. The proposed project involves the development of a new pedestrian path for emergency egress and a saftth pedestrian path for outdoor activities. Public services, specifically fire and emergency evacuation routes, will be improved by this project by created a new, safe pedestrian path consistent with the City's General Plan. Construction of the new path and its long-term maintenance will not require new or altered government facilities.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XVI.	RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. The project would not 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. The primary goal of the trail is to provide a non-motorized evacuation route for local residents down the hill in case of natural disaster, such as a fire or earthquake. The secondary goal is to provide local residents with a safe walking path to promote health, recreation, pedestrian circulation, and lower vehicle use. Development of the project would not require construction or expansion of new recreational facilities. There would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system and/or conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-38, which seeks to maintain an adequate Level of Service (LOS) at signalized and unsignalized intersections, or reduce the effectiveness of existing transit services or pedestrian/bicycle facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature, (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with General Plan Policy CIR-14, which requires new uses to meet their anticipated parking demand, but to avoid providing excess parking which could stimulate unnecessary vehicle trips or activity exceeding the site's capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a.-f. The path construction process would have temporary impacts on local streets. A Construction Management Plan will be used to address construction access and parking. There may be occasional use of the trail by the public or City workers inspecting the site both during and after construction. Parking on Greenwood Avenue or Woodbine would be subject to Mill Valley parking enforcement. No parking will be allowed on the private drive directly between Woodbine and the lower entrance to the trail.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a/b. See Responses V(a), (b) and (c) above. The proposed project includes an archival and record search of the project area and a surrounding radius. Pursuant to AB 52, the scope of the evaluation at the project level should include consultation with Native American representatives identified by the NAHC for areas outside of reservations, and with Tribal representatives of federally recognized Tribes where projects are located near or within lands associated with federally recognized Tribes. The consultation should be undertaken and be consistent with most recent guidance provided by the Office of Planning and Research. The purpose of the consultation is to identify Tribal cultural resources and ensure that such resources are taken into consideration in the planning process. The City shall inform the construction contractor and crew regarding the potential sensitive nature of the site and potential existence of cultural materials at the site and mitigation measures that are required. During soil disturbing activities, if any human remains and/or cultural materials are found, project-related construction in the vicinity of the find shall cease in order to proceed with the testing and mitigation measures required pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California.

Although construction of the proposed project would have no impact on known tribal cultural resources, there is a possibility that previously unidentified resources and subsurface deposits are present within the Project area. If present, excavation, grading, and movement of heavy construction vehicles and equipment could expose, disturb or damage any such previously unrecorded tribal cultural resources. Because the possibility of encountering archaeological resources during construction cannot be completely discounted, the impact related to the potential disturbance or damage of previously undiscovered archaeological resources, if present, could be significant.

However, as the proposed project could have the potential to encounter unknown tribal cultural resources during ground-disturbance activities, implementation of the following mitigation measures is required. Therefore, implementation of the Mitigation Measure TRIBAL-1, as well as implementation of mitigation measures Mitigation Measure CULT-1 and Mitigation Measure CULT-2 will reduce the potential impact to less than significant levels and no further mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation Measure TRIBAL-1: Implementation of the unanticipated discovery measures outlined in Section V(b) above, address the potential discovery of previously unknown resources within the project area. If significant tribal cultural resources are identified onsite, all work would stop immediately within 50 feet of the resource(s) and the project applicant would comply with all relevant State and City policies and procedures prescribed under PRC Section 21074.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

environmental effects?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a-e. The project would not require the construction of a new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities. The project will not result in an expansion of existing stormwater facilities. The project proposal includes repair and replacement of existing utility services, including: an entry to a drainage culvert will undergo routine maintenance; an existing debris rack (bars that trap large rocks or woody debris before it could plug a culvert entrance and cause flooding) will be upgraded to a more effective design. The development of the project does not require water supplies or wastewater treatment. Construction and maintenance of the new path will not require new utilities and service systems.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XX.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a-d. There are no project features that would substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. As the project is constructing pedestrian pathways between two residential streets, the opportunity for emergency access is increased. There are currently no overhead power lines within the vicinity of the project site, nor will any new overhead power lines be constructed in the area. Project improvements would result in increased stability to the area and would not result in risks to downstream flooding, landslides, or slope instability. The project would comply with current California Department of Forestry and California Building Code requirements for

fire safety. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

XXI.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a) 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 or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a. The site is located in a residential area and does not contain any known listed plant or animal species. The project will not 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, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. As discussed in **Section IV** above a Streambed Alteration Agreement (Agreement) between CDFW the and the City of Mill Valley (Permittee) includes Administrative Measures and Avoidance and Minimization Measures to ensure consistency with CDFW policies and regulations. All potential biological related impacts would be less than significant, with implementation of the these measures. As identified in **Section V** above, no known historically sensitive sites or structures, archaeological or paleontological resources, sites of unique geological features have been identified within the project site. No historic or prehistoric resources are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project nor will the proposed project eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. However, a pre-construction survey by a professional archaeologist is required prior to construction and in the event archaeological artifacts are found, a standard condition of approval and mitigation measure would be incorporated into the project. Impacts would be less than significant.
- b. The project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. Potential air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and traffic impacts are discussed in the respective sections above. The analysis determined that all potential impacts were less than significant and would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts. The project does not propose new development that would have a significant impact on the environment or substantially change the existing conditions. With the imposition of standard and project specific conditions of approval, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c. There are no schools or hospitals housing sensitive receptors within a quarter-mile of the project site. Noise from construction that would occur with construction and installation of the proposed site improvements would be temporary, lasting approximately nine to 10 months, would be limited to day time hours, and would be subject to best management practices intended to limit fugitive dust and protect stormwater quality. Ongoing operations of the facility are also anticipated to have less than significant noise impacts on nearby residences due to distance between those residences and the proposed tasting room patio and partially enclosed work area.

Mitigation Measures: None required.
