Vista Mar Project
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Errata Sheet
September 2020

This errata sheet presents, in ~~strike-through~~ and double-underline format, the revisions to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Vista Mar Project (proposed project). The revisions to the IS/MND reflected in this errata sheet do not affect the adequacy of the previous environmental analysis contained in the IS/MND. Because the changes presented below would not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact identified in the IS/MND, recirculation of the IS/MND is not required.

Based on an updated Arborist Survey Report prepared by WRA, Inc., dated January 2020, City staff has initiated the following changes to the IS/MND for clarification purposes. In addition, in response to a comment letter, the air quality and GHG sections of the IS/MND have been updated based on minor revisions to the project modeling.

Page 5 of the IS/MND is hereby revised as follows:

> In 1980, the City of Pacifica adopted the City of Pacifica General Plan. In March of 2014, the City of Pacifica released a Draft General Plan Update and associated Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). However, the Draft General Plan Update and associated Draft EIR have not yet been adopted or certified by the City. Therefore, the analysis contained within this IS/MND relies on the guidelines and information contained within the adopted 1980 General Plan. ~~It should be noted that the 2014 Draft General Plan Update did not propose any policy or designation changes related to the project site.~~

The foregoing revisions remove reference to an inapplicable draft General Plan and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented within the IS/MND.

Page 13 of the IS/MND is hereby revised as follows:

> **Construction Details**
> For the purposes of this analysis, construction is assumed to begin in April 2020 and occur over an approximately 18-month period. Because the site does not contain any existing structures, demolition would not be required. However, the project would require the removal of up to seven ~~23~~ heritage trees and 50 ~~34~~ non-protected trees. Any of the seven ~~23~~ heritage trees to be removed would require a tree removal permit. The project would include site preparation, grading, paving, and building construction.

The foregoing revisions correct the number of heritage trees, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented within the IS/MND.

Page 13 of the IS/MND has been updated, as shown below, to provide greater clarity regarding the construction phasing:

While the exact timing and length of each phase cannot be determined at this time, the following phase lengths have been assumed for the purposes of this analysis based on available project information:

- Site preparation: two weeks;
- Grading: two months;
- Paving: one week; ~~and~~
- Building construction: 14 months~~.~~; and
- Architectural Coating: 14 months.

The foregoing revision clarifies the inputs used in the emissions modeling and reproduces information that was available in Appendix A of the IS/MND.

In addition, the bottom of page 13 is hereby revised as follows:

Discretionary Actions

The proposed project would require City approval of the following:

- Tentative Subdivision Map;
- Site Development Permit;
- Use Permit
- Logging Operations; and
- Removal of seven ~~23~~ Heritage Trees.

The foregoing revisions correct the number of heritage trees and local discretionary actions, and do not affect the analysis or conclusions presented within the IS/MND.

Page 24 of the IS/MND is hereby revised as follows:

Accordingly, the proposed project's modeling assumes the following project and/or site-specific information:

- Construction would begin in April 2020;
- Construction would occur over an approximately 16-month period;
- The CO_2 intensity factor was adjusted to reflect PG&E's progress towards the State renewable portfolio standards goal by the operational year (anticipated to be 2021);
- A total of 0.7 acres of land would be graded;
- A total of 100 CY of material would be exported during site prep and 3,000 CY during grading;
- The proposed residences would not include wood-burning hearths or fireplaces;
- Project would exceed Title 24 by 15 percent;
- 24kWh of on-site renewable energy would be used;
- Water conservation strategies would be applied to 30 percent of indoor and 60 percent of outdoor water use; and
- The proposed project's required compliance with the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards listed in the California Building Standards Code was assumed.

Based on the above, only minor text changes are required to the IS/MND, and the analysis presented within the IS/MND remains valid.

Based on the updated modeling, Table 3 on page 25 of the IS/MND is hereby revised as follows:

Table 3 Maximum Unmitigated Construction Emissions (lbs/day)			
Pollutant	**Proposed Project Emissions**	**Threshold of Significance**	**Exceeds Threshold?**
ROG	2.96	54	**NO**
NO_X	~~18.69~~18.71	54	**NO**
PM_{10} (exhaust)	0.91	82	**NO**
PM_{10} (fugitive)	5.36	None	**N/A**
$PM_{2.5}$ (exhaust)	0.88	54	**NO**
$PM_{2.5}$ (fugitive)	2.92	None	**N/A**
Source: CalEEMod, ~~June 2019~~ September 2020 (see Appendix).			

As shown in the table above, the change to haul truck information results in an increase in maximum daily construction emissions of 0.02 lbs/day. Thus, the change to haul truck information represents a minor revision, and emissions remain well below the BAAQMD's thresholds significance. The conclusions presented within the IS/MND remain valid.

Based on the updated modeling, Table 4 on page 26 of the IS/MND is hereby revised as follows:

Table 4 Unmitigated Maximum Operational Emissions					
Pollutant	**Proposed Project Emissions**		**Threshold of Significance**		**Exceeds Threshold?**
	lbs/day	**tons/yr**	**lbs/day**	**tons/yr**	
ROG	~~0.71~~0.72	~~0.08~~0.09	54	10	**NO**
NO_X	~~0.67~~0.68	~~0.10~~0.11	54	10	**NO**
PM_{10} (exhaust)	0.31	0.00	82	15	**NO**
PM_{10} (fugitive)	~~0.36~~0.38	~~0.08~~0.06	None	None	**N/A**
$PM_{2.5}$ (exhaust)	0.31	0.00	54	10	**NO**
$PM_{2.5}$ (fugitive)	0.10	0.02	None	None	**N/A**
Source: CalEEMod, ~~June 2019~~September 2020 (see Appendix).					

As shown in the revisions to the table above, the updates to project modeling have resulted in minor changes to the anticipated emissions level. All emissions remain far below the BAAQMD's operational thresholds of significance. Accordingly, the conclusions presented within the IS/MND remain valid.

As a means of clarifying the mitigation measures included within the IS/MND, page 37 of the IS/MND is hereby revised as follows.

IV-4. *Notify USACE. Prior to initiation of construction activities, the applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a formal wetland delineation. If the ephemeral ditch is determined to be jurisdictional Water of the U.S. and State, and the impact cannot be avoided, the applicant shall obtain a permit authorization to fill wetlands under Section 404 of the federal CWA (Section 404 Permit) from USACE. The Section 404 Permit application shall include an assessment of directly impacted, avoided, and preserved acreages to waters of the U.S. Mitigation measures shall be developed as part of the Section 404 Permit to ensure no net loss of wetland function and values. Mitigation for direct impacts to waters of the U.S. associated with the proposed project would occur at a minimum of 1:1 ratio for direct impacts; however, final mitigation requirements shall be developed in consultation with*

USACE. In addition, a Water Quality Certification or waiver pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA must be obtained for Section 404 permit actions. The results of the wetland delineation and Section 404 permit actions shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to initiation of construction activities.

The foregoing revisions serve to clarify the requirements of the Section 404 permitting that would be needed if a wetland delineation identifies Waters of the U.S. within the project site. The revisions do not represent a significant alteration of the mitigation measure and impacts resulting from implementation of the project would remain less than significant.

Pages 38 through 39 are hereby revised as follows:

An arborist report was prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix C) and identified a total of 80 trees within or directly adjacent to the project site.[1] Four tree species were identified and surveyed on the site, including plume acacia (*Albizia lophantha*), Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*), California wax myrtle (*Morella californica*), and arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*). Of the trees surveyed, eight ~~26~~ are considered heritage trees as defined by the Municipal Code. Development of the project would require removal of seven ~~23~~ heritage trees and 50 ~~34~~ non-heritage trees as defined by the City. One ~~A total of three~~ heritage tree~~s~~ would remain on the project site. The heritage trees range from 58.4 ~~50.2~~ inches to 216.7 inches in circumference. The overall condition, health, and structure of the trees ranged from poor to good, with most trees ranking fair in all three categories. A total of 73 percent of surveyed trees ranked fair in general conditions.

The removal of 50 ~~34~~ trees defined by the City's logging operations ordinance would require evaluation at a public hearing in conjunction with required City permits, pursuant to Ordinance No. 636.-C.S. of the Municipal Code. Furthermore, the removal of seven ~~23~~ heritage trees would require a permit as well as potential replacement tree plantings. Thus, a *potentially significant* impact could occur. However, adherence to the Tree Removal Ordinance and Ordinance No. 636-C.S. would ensure that the removal of heritage and non-heritage trees would be performed in accordance with proper procedures. Therefore, with implementation of the mitigation measure, the proposed project would have a ***less-than-significant*** impact related to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Page 51 and 52 of the IS/MND are hereby revised as follows:

Construction of the proposed project was anticipated to occur over approximately 16 months with total emissions of ~~381.27~~381.34 $MTCO_2e$/yr. Operational emissions were determined to equal ~~94.58~~89.86 $MTCO_2e$/yr. Consequently, even if project operational and construction emissions were considered together, the total GHG emissions of ~~475.85~~471.20 $MTCO_2e$/yr would be well below BAAQMD's threshold of 1,100 $MTCO_2e$/yr. Therefore, neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would be anticipated to result in significant emissions of GHGs.

As shown in the above revisions, the changes to the emissions modeling made in response to the comments results in only minor changes to the estimate of emissions presented in the IS/MND.

Page 72 is hereby revised as follows:

XIII-~~2~~ 3 During construction of the proposed project, use of vibratory compactors/rollers shall not occur within 25 feet of the adjacent single-family residential use located

[1] WRA, Inc. *Arborist Survey Report Vista Mar Development*. ~~August 2019~~ January 2020.

southeast of the project site. This requirement shall be included via notation on the project grading plans prior to review and approval by the City of Pacifica Planning Department. Additionally, a pre-construction crack documentation and construction vibration monitoring report shall be conducted to ensure that construction vibrations do not cause damage to the adjacent single-family residence. The results of both shall be submitted for review and approval by the City of Pacifica Planning Department prior to issuance of grading permit, and any necessary minimization efforts applied during construction.

The foregoing changes are for clarification and accuracy purposes to reflect the changes made in the updated Arborist Survey Report. The changes do not alter the conclusions or mitigation measures presented in the IS/MND.