

**MARIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
PLANNING DIVISION**

**INITIAL STUDY**

*Easkoot Creek Sediment Removal*

**I. BACKGROUND**

- A. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Marin County Dept. of Public Works  
3501 Civic Center Dr., Room 304  
San Rafael, CA 94903
- B. Lead Agency Name and Address: Marin County Dept. of Public Works  
3501 Civic Center Dr., Room 304  
San Rafael, CA 94903
- C. Contact Person and Phone Number: Kallie Kull, Senior Planner, (415) 499-6532

**II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

- A. Project Title: Easkoot Creek Sediment Removal
- B. Type of Application(s): Flood Control Project
- C. Project Location: Bridge crossings over Easkoot Creek on Arenal Ave., Calle del Pinos, Calle del Pradero, Calle del Sierra, Calle del Onda, and Calle del Arroyo, within the Town of Stinson Beach.
- D. General Plan Designation: The project site is located within the mapped Coastal Recreation Corridor of the Marin Countywide Plan (CWP) and has a land use designation of C-SF3 (Coastal, Single Family, one unit per one acre to five acres). The CWP Environmental Quality Element designates the Stinson Beach area as an important Environmental Corridor and Resource Conservation Area.
- E. Zoning: C-MF2 1-4 units per acre
- F. Description of Project:

**Existing Project Site**

The project area is on Easkoot Creek, which runs through the town of Stinson Beach and discharges into the Bolinas Lagoon downstream of its intersection Calle del Arroyo. Sediment will be removed from the creek channel immediately upstream and downstream of six bridge crossings of Easkoot Creek with Arenal Ave., Calle del Pinos, Calle del Pradero, Calle del Sierra, Calle del Onda, and Calle del Arroyo. The area to be dredged will be no more than 400 square feet at each crossing, extending no more than 20 feet up or downstream from the bridge crossings and the amount of material removed will be no more than 20 cubic yards per crossing.

**Background**

In the early 1950's a large landslide occurred in a canyon just above Stinson Beach on Golden Gate National Recreation (GGNRA) lands, which deposited a vast amount of loose material in the bed of one of the tributaries to Easkoot Creek. This material began washing down the steep canyon and into the flat reach of Easkoot Creek, where it promptly deposited out, thereby greatly reducing the capacity of the

creek to convey high flows during winter storms. Thereafter, to maintain the channel capacity and reduce flooding in the town of Stinson Beach, accumulated sediment has been removed periodically from the creek by County Public Works, State Division of Beaches and Parks, and the Corps of Engineers. The creation of Marin County Zone 5 Flood Control District was based solely on this observed need for sediment removal from Easkoot Creek.

On January 1, 2006, a large quantity of sediment washed down into Easkoot Creek during the New Year's Eve flood, causing great concern for further flooding of the adjacent residences in the town of Stinson Beach. In October 2006, in order to address this concern, the County of Marin Public Works Department removed sediment from the channel under five bridge crossings of Easkoot Creek with Calle del Pinos, Calle del Pradero, Calle del Sierra, Calle del Onda, and Calle del Arroyo. The objective of this work was to increase channel capacity and thereby reduce the potential frequency of flooding. This work, completed in October 2006 was permitted under a California State Fish and Game 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement, with a Statutory Exemption under CEQA Section 15269 Emergency Projects as per declaration of the site as a disaster area by the Governor of California.

### **Proposed Project Description**

Since October 2006, sediment has continued to wash down into the creek channel from the upper landslide into the already severely aggraded channel. The Marin County Flood Control Zone 5 Advisory Board has requested, and the community expressed a need for, the County Public Works crews to remove accumulated sediment in the channel before the 2007-2008 rainy season begins. The objective of the proposed work is to lower the aggraded channel bed and increase flow capacity at the bridge crossings during high storm events. The County of Marin Public Works Department is proposing to remove sediment at six locations, under the bridge crossings of Easkoot Creek with Arenal Ave., Calle del Pinos, Calle del Pradero, Calle del Sierra, Calle del Onda, and Calle del Arroyo. The proposal is for a one year sediment removal effort coupled with monitoring by Marin County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, to assess the effectiveness of this activity on channel bed elevation and flood flow capacity.

The following conditions will be met during the proposed sediment removal project:

- The project will take place during late summer, no later than Oct. 31, at times of lowest water, so as to minimize any potential impact on salmon and steelhead that may be present in the project area. Should any fish be present on site, a State and/or NMFS certified fisheries biologist will be on-site to block net the creek and relocate the fish upstream. A creek biologist from the County will also be on-site the entire time during the project to ensure that the work is being done according to conditions set forth in the California Fish and Game 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement conditions.
- Sediment removal will take place only immediately upstream and downstream of the crossings of Easkoot Creek with Arenal Ave., Calle del Pinos, Calle del Pradero, Calle del Sierra, Calle del Onda, and Calle del Arroyo. Work will begin at the lowest crossing, moving upstream, to minimize the effects of turbidity on upstream reaches.
- All work will be done from the bank and no equipment will be placed in the creek.
- At each location the total area involved, both up and downstream, will be no more than 400 square feet, extending no more than 20 feet up or downstream from the bridge crossing, and the amount of material removed will be no more than 20 cubic yards per crossing.
- All sediment removed from the creek will be transported to a legal upland spoils disposal site.

- The Marin County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, will conduct monitoring to assess the effectiveness of this activity on channel bed elevation and flood flow capacity.
- The overall impact to the channel in the project reach will be monitored by staff of the Marin County Flood Control District, who will collect channel topography data in order to assess whether sediment removal on an annual basis is warranted for flood control purposes. Changes in channel morphology will be documented at three points in time: 1) before any sediment removal has occurred, 2) immediately after the work has been completed and before the onset of winter storms, and 3) following the winter rainy season of 2007-2008.
- A long term, comprehensive solution to the flooding issue in the Community of Stinson Beach is being developed by the County of Marin Flood Control District in collaboration with the Community of Stinson Beach and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

### III. CIRCULATION AND REVIEW

#### A. Responsible Agencies: *(agencies whose approval is required and permits needed)*

- California Department of Fish and Game- 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement

### DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

- 1) Marin Countywide Plan, CDA- Planning Division (1994)
- 2) Easkoot Creek Restoration at Stinson Beach- Environmental Assessment U.S. Dept of the Interior National Park Service; Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
- 3) California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Agreement for Sediment Removal in Easkoot Creek (October 2006)
- 4) Conversation with Jeremy Sarrow, Department of Fish and Game biologist. August 22, 2007
- 5) National Marine Fisheries Service Protected Resources- Marin County database.

### IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and the County EIR Guidelines, Marin County will prepare an Initial Study for all projects not categorically exempt from the requirements of CEQA. The Initial Study evaluation is a preliminary analysis of a project which provides the County with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration. The points enumerated below describe the primary procedural steps undertaken by the County in completing an Initial Study checklist evaluation and, in particular, the manner in which significant environmental effects of the project are made and recorded.

- #### A.
- The determination of significant environmental effect is to be based on substantial evidence contained in the administrative record and the County's environmental database consisting of factual information regarding environmental resources and environmental goals and policies relevant to Marin County. As a procedural device for reducing the size of the Initial Study document, relevant information sources cited and discussed in topical sections of the checklist evaluation are incorporated by reference into the checklist (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Each of these information sources has been assigned a number which is shown in parenthesis following each topical question and which corresponds to a number on the data base source list provided herein as Attachment 1. See the sample question below. Other sources used or individuals contacted may also be cited in the discussion of topical issues where appropriate.

- B. In general, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when either the Initial Study demonstrates that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have one or more significant effects on the environment. A Negative Declaration shall also be prepared if the Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects, but revisions to the project made by or agreed to by the applicant prior to release of the Negative Declaration for public review would avoid or reduce such effects to a level of less than significance, and there is no substantial evidence before the Lead County Department that the project as revised will have a significant effect on the environment. A signature block is provided in Section VII of this Initial Study to verify that the project sponsor has agreed to incorporate mitigation measures into the project in conformance with this requirement.
- C. All answers to the topical questions must take into account the whole of the action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. Significant unavoidable cumulative impacts shall be identified in Section VI of this Initial Study (Mandatory Findings of Significance).
- D. A brief explanation shall be given for all answers except "Not Applicable" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead County Department cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "Not Applicable" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "Not Applicable" answer shall be discussed where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- E. "Less-than-significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is found to be less-than-significant based on the project as proposed and without the incorporation of mitigation measures recommended in the Initial Study.
- F. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated" applies where the incorporation of recommended mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less-than-significant Impact." The Lead County Department must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section V, "Earlier Analyses", may be cross-referenced).
- G. "Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the Lead County Department lacks information to make a finding that the effect is less-than-significant. If there are one or more effects which have been determined to be significant and unavoidable, an EIR shall be required for the project.
- H. The answers in this checklist have also considered the current California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines and the Initial Study Checklist contained in those Guidelines.

**V. ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources, see Attachment A)):**

**1. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the proposal:***

<p><b>a) Conflict with applicable Countywide Plan designation or zoning standards?</b> (source #(s): Countywide Plan (1994)</p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X ]

The determinations of policy consistency as discussed in this Initial Study section represent County staff interpretation of policies. However, this Initial Study does not determine policy consistency. The County decision-makers make the formal policy consistency determinations.

Policy inconsistencies may not necessarily indicate significant environmental effects. Section 15358(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that “effects analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change in the environment.” Therefore, only those policy inconsistencies that would lead to a significant effect on the physical environment are considered significant impacts pursuant to CEQA. Where potentially significant environmental impacts are raised in the discussion below, they have been mitigated to a less-than-significant impact and, therefore, project activities are determined to be consistent with the relevant policies cited. Mitigations are addressed further in the topical impact sections following plan policy analyses.

**LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

Land use designations and development of the project site are governed by the objectives and policies of the Marin Countywide Plan (CWP), the Local Coastal Program (LCP), Unit I, the Stinson Beach Community Plan (Community Plan), and Title 22 (Zoning) of the Marin County Code.

*The proposed project is maintenance in nature, and will not change the Land Use Designations at the project site or conflict with zoning standards or the objectives of the above mentioned plans in any way, therefore the project will be consistent with Applicable Countywide Plan designation or zoning standards.*

<p><b>b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by Marin County?</b> Countywide Plan (1994)</p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

The Marin Countywide Plan

Specific Countywide Plan policies which pertain to the proposed project include the following subjects:

- (1) Protection of riparian systems; (Policy EQ-2.1)
- (2) Protection of Stream Conservation Areas; (Policies EQ 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.11)
- (3) Species and habitat preservation; (Policies EQ-2.87, 2.88, 3.6)
- (4) Prevention of air, water, and noise pollution; (Policy EQ 3.2)
- (5) Avoidance of hazards; (Policy EQ- 3.7)
- (6) Protection of trees; (Policy EQ 3.14)
- (7) Minimization of grading activities; (Policy EQ-3.16)
- (8) Protection of archeological resources; (Policy EQ-3.29)
- (9) Compliance with the Stinson Beach Community Plan and Local Coastal Program elements.

## 1) Protection of Riparian Systems

*Policy EQ-2.1 Value of Riparian Systems. Riparian systems, streams and their riparian and woodland habitat are irreplaceable and should be officially recognized and protected as essential environmental resources, because of their values for erosion control, water quality, fish and wildlife, aesthetics, recreation, and the health of human communities.*

### Consistent:

As discussed in Sections V. 4. (c) and V. 7. (a., b, c), the proposed sediment removal will be confined to the stream channel itself and all work will be conducted from the bridges and top of bank, avoiding encroachment into the riparian corridor. All native riparian vegetation will be protected and not disturbed by heavy equipment or dredging activities. A biologist from the County will be present at the project site during the operation to ensure that no heavy equipment enters into the riparian corridor and that all sediment removed from the channel is disposed of in an upland spoils storage site. Therefore the project will be consistent with Policy EQ-2.1.

## (2) Protection of Stream Conservation Areas

*Policy EQ-2.2, Streamside Conservation Areas; states that all perennial and intermittent streams, which are defined as natural watercourses shown as solid or dashed blue lines on the most recent appropriate USGS quad sheet, should be subject to stream and creekside protection policies. A perennial stream is further defined as: "a watercourse that flows throughout the year (except for infrequent or extended periods of drought), although surface water flow may be temporarily discontinuous in some reaches of the channel such as between pools."*

*Policy EQ 2.4 defines permitted land uses within the SCA, including:*

- all currently existing structures and uses including reconstruction and repairs;
- necessary water supply projects
- flood control projects
- projects to improve fish and wildlife habitat
- grazing of livestock and other agricultural uses
- maintenance of water channels for erosion control and other purposes;
- road and utility crossings
- water monitoring installations
- trails

Consistent: Easkoot Creek is by definition a blue line stream (see attached USGS Quad map) and as such, is subject to protection under the Stream Conservation Area protection policies as set forth in the Countywide Plan. As discussed in V Section 3. (c) and V. 11. (d, e), the proposed project is a flood control project entailing maintenance of a water channel for flood control purposes, and thus is a permitted activity within the SCA, as set forth in the Countywide Plan EQ 2.4. Therefore the project will be consistent with Policy EQ-2.4.

*Policy EQ-2.5 Prohibited Land Uses in Stream Conservation Areas (SCAs). The following new uses are prohibited in the SCA:*

- roads and utility lines, except at crossings
- confinement of livestock
- dumping or disposal of refuse
- use of motorized recreational vehicles
- any structural improvement (excluding repairs) other than those identified in Policy EQ-2.4, including residences, barns, and storage buildings, unless allowed by a development permit in Policy EQ-2.6.

Consistent: The proposed project does not implement any of the activities listed as prohibited within the SCA. Therefore the project will be consistent with Policy EQ-2.5.

*Policy EQ-2.11 Modifications of natural channels within SCAs for flood control, etc., should be done in a manner that retains and protects the vegetation forming ground cover and shade. Special attention should be given to the protection of riparian vegetation.*

Consistent. As discussed in Section 3. (b, c), 4. (b, c), V. 7 (a, b, c), and V. 11 (d,e), all sediment removal will be confined to the stream channel itself and all work will be conducted from the bridges and top of bank, avoiding encroachment into the riparian corridor. All native riparian vegetation will be protected and not disturbed by heavy equipment or dredging activities. A biologist from the County will be present at the project site during the operation to ensure that no heavy equipment enters into the riparian corridor and that all sediment removed from the channel is disposed of in an upland spoils storage site. Therefore the project will be consistent with Policy EQ-2.11.

### **(3) Species and Habitat Preservation**

*Policy EQ-2.87 Species Preservation in the Environmental Review Process. Environmental review of development applications shall consider the impact of the proposed development on species and habitat diversity.*

*Policy EQ-2.88 Protection of Special Status Species. Development shall be restricted or modified in areas which contain special status species and migratory species of the Pacific Flyway and/or significant natural areas, wetlands, riparian habitats, and freshwater habitats, to ensure the continued health and survival of these species and areas*

*Policy EQ-3.6 Wildlife, Vegetation, and Habitats. A diversity and abundance of wildlife and marine life shall be maintained. Vegetation and animal habitats shall be preserved wherever possible.*

Consistent: As discussed in detail in Sections V. 7 (a, b, c), the proposed project, will adhere to the conditions outlined in that section, ensuring that the project would have less-than-significant impacts on all special-status species, wildlife and habitat diversity. Therefore the project will be consistent with Policy EQ-2.87, 2.88, and 3.6.

### **(4) Prevention of Air, Water, and Noise Pollution**

*Policy EQ-3.2. Air, Water, and Noise Pollution. Air, water, and noise pollution shall be prevented or minimized.*

#### Air Pollution

The affects on air quality are from exhaust coming from heavy equipment during dredging. The impacts are short term and temporal, lasting less than a week and moving between six different locations during that time. Consequently the proposed project is consistent with Policy EQ-3.2, and the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts on air quality.

#### Water Pollution

There will be a temporary increase in turbidity in the creek as sediment is disturbed from the dredging process. These impacts will be short-term and localized, expected to last less than a day in any one location. The work will begin at the most downstream crossing and continue upstream to minimize impacts to the aquatic environment from siltation. Given these circumstances, the impacts from siltation to the creek are expected to be less-than-significant.

## Noise

The noise associated with sediment removal activities is limited to the sound of heavy equipment working during normal working hours. The project is short term (less than one week), and the work is located in the creek zone, a distance away from the nearest residence.

Consistent. As discussed in Sections 3. (b), V. 4 (b, c), and V. (a), The project would contribute minimally to air, water, and noise pollution to the extent analyzed in this Initial Study. No significant effects related to air, water, or noise pollution are identified. Therefore, the project would be consistent with this policy. Therefore the project will be consistent with Policy EQ- 3.2.

## **(5) Avoidance of Hazards**

*Policy EQ-3.7 Avoidance of Hazards from Earthquake, Erosion, Landslide, Floods, and Fires.*

Consistent. As discussed in Section V. 3. (a)The project is maintenance in nature, lasting less than a week in duration, therefore the likelihood of impacts from an earthquake, flood or fire are minimal. The project will be implemented during the dry season, thus avoiding potential impacts from the landslide in the upper watershed. Since the project is a flood control project, removal of aggraded sediment should have a positive effect on the avoidance of flood flows into adjacent neighborhoods. Therefore the project will be consistent with Policy EQ-3.7.

## **(6) Protection of Trees**

*Policy EQ-3.14 Protection of Trees. The County shall strive to protect large trees, trees with historical importance, and oak woodland habitat, and prevent the untimely removal of trees through implementation of tree preservation ordinance.*

Consistent. No large trees, trees with historic importance, or oak woodland habitat will be removed during the project. As discussed in Sections V. 4. (c) and V. 7. (a., b, c), the proposed sediment removal will be confined to the stream channel itself and all work will be conducted from the bridges and top of bank, avoiding encroachment into the riparian corridor. All native riparian vegetation will be protected and undisturbed by heavy equipment or dredging activities. Therefore the project will be consistent with Policy EQ- 3.14.

## **(7) Minimization of Grading Activities**

*Policy EQ-3.16. Minimize Excavation, Grading, and Filling. New development in the County shall adhere to the standards of the Department of Public Works in order to minimize excavating, grading, and filling, while allowing for adequate access.*

Consistent. As discussed in Sections V. 3 (a, b, c), the objective of the proposed project is flood control only, and is not subject to a development or grading permit. However, the area to be excavated at each site is limited to no more than 400 square feet in area, extending no more than 20 feet up or downstream from the bridge crossing, and the amount of material removed will be no more than 20 cubic yards per crossing. This is the minimal area needed to clear the bridges of sediment aggradation, while not extending the dredging further up or downstream from the bridges. The excavated area will be confined to the channel bottom itself and will not encroach into the streamside area or impact native riparian vegetation in any way. Therefore the project is consistent with Policy EQ-3.16.

## **(8) Protection of Archeological Resources**

*Policy EQ-3.29. Review Sensitivity Maps. The Planning Department shall review the archaeological sensitivity map for all development applications in order to determine potential impacts.*

Consistent. As discussed in Sections V. 14 (a, b), the proposed project will disturb only aggraded sediment that has been carried from the upper watershed down through the stream system, and the area to be dredged has been dredged numerous times before in the same locations, with no known artifacts found. Should any cultural resources be discovered during this round of dredging, all work shall immediately be stopped and the services of a qualified archaeologist from Sonoma State University Cultural Resources Department shall be engaged to assess the value of the resource and to develop appropriate mitigation measures. These measures will ensure that the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts to cultural resources and, therefore, be consistent with Policy EQ-3.29.

## **(9) Compliance with Local Community Plan and Local Coastal Program**

### Stinson Beach Community Plan (1985)

The Stinson Beach Community Plan contains specific goals, policies, and programs that govern conservation and development in the unincorporated community of Stinson Beach. The principle goals of the plan include the following:

THEREFORE THE FOLLOWING THREE GOALS ARE OF PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE (Stinson Beach Community Plan 1984). :

- a. The rural atmosphere and individualistic character of the town must be preserved as a prime consideration;
- b. The relative safety, security, and privacy of the residents must be maintained and improved;
- c. The Stinson Beach Village Association, a monitor organization, must actively pursue the general goals and specific policies of this plan and endeavor to represent the best interests of the town.

Consistent. The proposed project is consistent with the Stinson Beach Community Plan Goals (1985) as described below. The project serves to fulfill Goal #2, as a flood control project helping to maintain the relative safety and security of the residents of Stinson Beach. Therefore the proposed project would be consistent with all relevant Stinson Beach Community goals.

### **Local Coastal Program, Unit I**

Consistent. The Countywide Plan specifies that land use in the Coastal Zone shall be subject to the provisions of the LCP in addition to the Countywide Plan land use designations (CWP Policy CD-8.10). As discussed above in Section V. 1 (a), the land use designations will not be altered because of this project, therefore the proposed project would be consistent with relevant policies in the Marin County Local Coastal Plan (LCP), Unit I.

<b>c) Affect agricultural resources, operations, or contracts (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, impacts from incompatible land uses, or conflicts with Williamson Act contracts)?</b> (source #(s): Countywide Plan (1994)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*The project does not involve nor is associated with any form of agricultural resources, operation or conflicts; therefore this is a less-than-significant impact.*

d) <b>Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?</b> (source #(s): Countywide Plan (1994))	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
---	-----------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]
-----	-----	-----	-------

*The nature of the project will not divide or affect the physical arrangement of the established community; therefore this is a less-than-significant impact.*

e) <b>Result in substantial alteration of the character or functioning of the community, or present or planned use of an area?</b> (source #(s): Countywide Plan (1994))	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
---	-----------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]
-----	-----	-----	-------

*The nature of the project will not alter the character or function of the community and will actually be a benefit to the community by reducing the potential frequency of flooding, therefore, the project will result in less-than-significant impacts.*

f) <b>Substantially increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities, or affect existing recreational opportunities?</b> (source #(s): Countywide Plan (1994))	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
--	-----------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]
-----	-----	-----	-------

*The project is maintenance in nature and will not increase demand for parks or other facilities; therefore this is a less-than-significant impact.*

**2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the proposal:***

a) <b>Increase density that would exceed official population projections for the planning area within which the project site is located as set forth in the Countywide Plan and/or community plan?</b> (source #(s): Countywide Plan (1994))	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
--	-----------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]
-----	-----	-----	-------

*The project will not have an effect on population due to the fact that it is maintenance in nature; therefore this is a less-than-significant impact.*

b) <b>Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?</b> (source #(s): Countywide Plan (1994))	Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	Not Applicable
--	-----------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------

[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]
-----	-----	-----	-------

*The project will not have an effect on growth due to the fact that it is maintenance in nature, consequently, the project will result in less-than-significant impacts.*

c) <b>Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?</b> (source #(s): Countywide Plan (1994))	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*The project does not displace existing housing of any kind; therefore, the project will result in a less-than-significant impact.*

**3. GEOPHYSICAL. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:**

a) <b>Location in an area of geologic hazards, including but not necessarily limited to: 1) active or potentially active fault zones; 2) landslides or mudslides; 3) slope instability or ground failure; 4) subsidence; 5) expansive soils; 6) liquefaction; 7) tsunami ; or 8) similar hazards?</b> (source #(s):	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[X ]	[ ]

*Review of resource maps maintained by the Marin County Community Development Agency indicate that the subject property is not located in an area of geologic hazards as indicated on Geologic Hazards Map for Unit I of the Local Coastal Program. In addition, the subject property is not located within the delineated boundaries of the San Andreas Fault zone as identified by the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act. Consequently, the project will result in less-than-significant impacts.*

b) <b>Substantial erosion of soils due to wind or water forces and attendant siltation from excavation, grading, or fill?</b> (source #(s):	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*The only sediment that will be excavated is below water line and will be removed to a designated upland spoils location area, and thus will not be exposed to erosive forces such as wind or water. There will be no excavating or grading of adjacent streambanks, and no fill involved in the project. There will be a temporary increase in turbidity in the creek as sediment is disturbed from the dredging process. These impacts will be temporary and expected to last less than a day in any one location. The work will begin at the most downstream crossing and continue upstream to minimize impacts to the aquatic environment from siltation. Given these circumstances, the impacts from siltation to the creek are expected to be less-than-significant.*

c) <b>Substantial changes in topography from excavation, grading or fill, including but not necessarily limited to: 1) ground surface relief features; 2) geologic substructures or unstable soil conditions; and 3) unique geologic or physical features?</b> (source #(s)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*A localized change in channel topography will occur through the removal of sediment on both sides of the bridges in six locations. The long term objective of the project is to lower the channel bed elevation in the project reach to increase flow capacity and decrease the potential frequency of flooding. The County is*

proposing to monitor channel conditions before and after the activity to assess whether this long term objective is being met. Given the nature of the project, the change in channel topography is a desired outcome. Given that the sediment to be removed is caused by deposition into the creek from the landslide in the upper watershed, the impact to the creek channel from excavation should be positive in nature. Consequently, the project will result in less-than-significant impacts.

**4. WATER. Would the proposal result in:**

- |   |                           |   |                                     |                          |
|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>a) Substantial changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (source #(s):</b> | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b>    |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

*Drainage patterns and rate of surface run-off into the creek from the upper watershed and adjacent neighborhoods will remain unaltered. The removal of sediment from the channel will increase channel ability to carry surface run-off during high flood flows. If the channel has greater capacity, and the creek remains in its channel during high flows, the flooding pattern should improve in the adjacent Stinson Beach neighborhoods. Consequently, the project will result in less-than-significant impacts.*

- |  |                           |   |                                     |                          |
|--|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards, including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) flooding; 2) debris deposition; or 3) similar hazards ? (source #(s):</b> | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b>    |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

*By removing sediment from the channel at each bridge crossing, the channel bed elevation will be lowered, thus improving flow capacity and decreasing the threat of potential flooding in adjacent neighborhoods. The project will also improve the passage of wood and other debris under the bridges, aiming to avoid flood hazards caused by debris deposition at the bridges during high flows. The overall impact of the project on flood hazards and debris deposition is a beneficial effect of the project. Consequently, the project will result in less-than-significant impacts.*

- |   |                           |   |                                     |                          |
|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>c) Discharge of pollutants into surface or ground waters or other alteration of surface or ground water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (source #(s):</b> | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b>    |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

*There will be a temporary increase in turbidity in the creek as sediment is disturbed from the dredging process. These impacts will be short-term and localized, expected to last less than a day in any one location. The work will begin at the most downstream crossing and continue upstream to minimize impacts to the aquatic environment from siltation. Any fish in the project area will have been relocated upstream before work begins, and thus not subject to turbid conditions. Given these circumstances, the impacts from siltation to the creek are expected to be less-than-significant.*

- |   |                           |   |                                     |                          |
|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>d) Substantial change in the amount of surface water in any water body or ground water either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through intersection of an aquifer by cuts or excavations? (source #(s):</b> | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b>    |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input type="checkbox"/>                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

*The amount of surface water in the channel will remain unaltered. No addition or withdrawal will occur due to the project. Consequently, the project will result in less-than-significant impacts.*

e) <b>Substantial changes in the flow of surface or ground waters, including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) currents; 2) rate of flow; or 3) the course or direction of water movements? (source #(s):</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*The natural direction and rate of flow of the creek will remain unchanged. There may be a decrease in flood flows coming from the creek into the adjacent neighborhood, as the channel capacity is increased, which is the objective of the project. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

f) <b>Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies? (source #(s):</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*The project will not reduce water supply amount, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

**5. AIR QUALITY. *Would the proposal:***

a) <b>Generate substantial air emissions that could violate official air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (source #(s):</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]

*The only air pollutants that will be produced will come from the exhaust fumes from the heavy equipment used for the project. Since the work will occur out in the open air and over a short duration (2-3 days), the impact on air quality will be less-than-significant. Consequently, the project will result in less-than-significant impacts.*

b) <b>Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, such as noxious fumes or fugitive dust? (source #(s):</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]

*The only air pollutants that will be produced will come from the exhaust fumes from the heavy equipment used for the project. Since the work will occur out in the open air and over a short duration (2-3 days), the impact to sensitive receptors will be less-than-significant.*

c) <b>Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? (source #(s):</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*No alterations in climate will occur as a result of sediment removal activities, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

d) <b>Create objectionable odors?</b> (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*The only odors that will be produced will come from the exhaust fumes from the heavy equipment used for the project. Since the work will occur out in the open air and over a short duration (2-3 days), the impact from objectionable odors will be less-than-significant.*

**6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. *Would the proposal result in:***

a) <b>Substantial increase in vehicle trips or traffic congestion such that existing levels of service on affected roadways will deteriorate below acceptable County standards?</b> (source #(s): <b>Countywide Plan (1994)</b> )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*Each bridge crossing may be temporarily closed for a limited number of hours during sediment removal activities. Ingress and egress to the neighborhood during sediment removal activities is available on adjacent streets within the Town of Stinson Beach. Alternative routes will be marked clearly with County of Marin traffic control signs. The level of service on affected roadways will not drop below acceptable County standards. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

b) <b>Traffic hazards related to: 1) safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections); 2) barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists; or 3) incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? (source # (s) <b>Countywide Plan (1994)</b>)</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*Each bridge crossing roadway may be closed off during work with standard County Public Works signage. Ingress and egress to the neighborhood during sediment removal activities is available on adjacent streets within the Town of Stinson Beach. Alternative routes will be marked clearly with County of Marin traffic control signs. Neighbors will have access to their properties during the maintenance period. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

c) <b>Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?</b> (source #(s):	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*Ingress and egress to the neighborhood during sediment removal activities is available on adjacent streets within the Town of Stinson Beach. Alternative routes will be marked clearly with County of Marin traffic control signs. Emergency vehicles will have continual access to local residences during the maintenance period. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

d) <b>Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?</b> (source #(s):	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*Due to the temporary maintenance nature of the project, no additional parking will be required; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

e) <b>Substantial impacts upon existing transportation systems, including rail, waterborne or air traffic systems?</b> (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*Due to the temporary maintenance nature of the project, no substantial impacts upon existing transportation systems will occur on or around the site. Minor road closures may be required during the project, with the community being properly notified and no access to property denied during the sediment removal process. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

**7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal result in:***

a) <b>Reduction in the number of endangered, threatened or rare species, or substantial alteration of their habitats including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) plants; 2) fish; 3) insects; 4) animals; and 5) birds listed as special-status species by State or Federal Resource Agencies?</b> (source #(s): #2,3,4,5)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]

The channel in its existing condition is highly aggraded, filled in with material from the landslide on GGNRA lands in the upper watershed. The existing aggradation is likely having a number of negative effects, including compromising habitat by filling of pools, impacting macro-invertebrate populations and decreasing available shelter for fish and other aquatic inhabitants. The build-up of sediment below each bridge crossing increases the likelihood that wood and other debris would get caught on the bridges during high flows and thus be removed from the system by emergency crews. The removal of woody debris has a negative impact on the stream ecosystem by reducing stream complexity and shelter, as well as eliminating pool forming elements.

According to the County of Marin’s biological database, derived from the Department of Fish and Game’s California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and additional data derived from an Environmental Assessment prepared by the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for restoration of Easkoot Creek, the only threatened or endangered species known to exist in the immediate project area include steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). Per conversation with local Fish and Game biologist Jeremy Sarrow (8/22/07) and use of the National Marine Fisheries Service on-line database for fishery distribution in Marin County, coho salmon are not recognized as present in Easkoot Creek, although a very small number of fish may have occasionally strayed into the creek from the Bolinas Lagoon. No Northern Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) are known to occur within the project area. No endangered plant species are known to exist on or around the immediate site either. In addition, no California red- legged frogs (*Rana aurora draytonii*), California fresh water shrimp (*Syncaris pacifica*) or Northwestern pond turtles (*Clamnys marmorata marmorata*) are known to exist on or near the immediate site. No occurrences for these species were noted during the CNDDDB review.

In order to avoid any potential impact on salmonids that may be present in the creek, the following condition will be met. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

- All work will take place during October, at time of lowest water, but no later than October 31<sup>st</sup> in order to minimize exposure to potential rain storms.
- Work will begin at the most downstream crossing, moving upstream, to minimize the effects of turbidity on upstream reaches.



c) <b>Loss of significant mineral resource sites designated in the Countywide Plan from premature development or other land uses which are incompatible with mineral extraction? (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i>;</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*No significant mineral resources are found on the project site, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

**9. HAZARDS. *Would the proposal involve:***

a) <b>A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) oil, pesticides; 2) chemicals; or 3) radiation)? (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i>.</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*No hazardous substances are known to exist on the project site nor will any be used during the sediment removal activities, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

b) <b>Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (source #(s): .</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*The sediment removal activities will not interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan. Bridge crossings will be closed temporarily during the day. In case of emergency all heavy equipment will be removed from the roadway immediately in order to allow vehicles to enter or leave the adjacent neighborhood. Heavy equipment deployed on the bridges can be removed in a matter of a few minutes during an emergency or evacuation. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

c) <b>The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? (source #(s):</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*The removal of sediment from the creek will not create any health hazards; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

d) <b>Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (source #(s):</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*The removal of sediment from the creek will not expose people to existing sources of health hazards; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

e) <b>Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? (source #(s):</b>	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

The project will have no effect on the fire hazard to the surrounding area; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

**10. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:**

a) <b>Substantial increases in existing ambient noise levels?</b> (source #(s):	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

There will be a temporary increase in ambient noise levels during normal working hour, from the heavy equipment used to remove sediment from the creek. The duration of the impact will be for a few days and the location of the increased noise will move from crossing to crossing as the work progresses. The noise impact is limited to the creek channel are, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

b) <b>Exposure of people to significant noise levels, or conflicts with adopted noise policies or standards?</b> (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

There will be an increase of noise levels during the one week of maintenance activities, but only for a temporary time as with any maintenance project. The increase in maintenance related noise levels would only occur during the County's adopted noise policy from 7am-6pm, Mon.-Fri. and not on holidays. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

**11. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government service in any of the following areas:**

a) <b>Fire protection?</b> (source #(s):	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

The sediment removal project will not have an effect on fire protection; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

b) <b>Police protection?</b> (source #(s)	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

The sediment removal project will not have an effect on police protection; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

c) <b>Schools?</b> (source #(s):	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

The sediment removal project will not have an effect on the local school; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

- |   |                           |   |                                     |                       |
|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| d) <b>Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?</b><br>(source #(s): | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b> |
|   | [ ]                       | [ ]   | [X ]                                | [ ]                   |

The proposed project will positively affect the maintenance of County road crossings since it will increase the free board below each of the bridges and will decrease the risk of debris catching on the bridges, which can cause harm to the structures during high stream flows. The project should also decrease the potential frequency of flooding and consequential impacts on County roads; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

- |   |                           |   |                                     |                       |
|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| e) <b>Other governmental services?</b><br>(source #(s): | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b> |
|   | [ ]                       | [ ]   | [X ]                                | [ ]                   |

The County of Marin Flood Control District Zone 5 was established in Stinson Beach to assist the town in implementing flood control measures to protect residential and public facilities during high storm events. The County Flood Control District has historically achieved this objective by periodically removing sediment from Easkoot Creek when it has aggraded to the point of compromising flood carrying capacity. Enactment of the project will allow the Flood Control District the ability to provide these critical services for the Town of Stinson Beach residents. Therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

**12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:**

- |   |                           |   |                                     |                       |
|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| a) <b>Power or natural gas?</b><br>(source # (s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> ) | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b> |
|   | [ ]                       | [ ]   | [ ]                                 | [ X ]                 |

No alterations to power or natural gas will be required for the project; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

- |   |                           |   |                                     |                       |
|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| b) <b>Communications systems?</b><br>(source # (s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> ) | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b> |
|   | [ ]                       | [ ]   | [ ]                                 | [ X ]                 |

No alterations to communications systems will be required by the project, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.

- |  |                           |   |                                     |                       |
|--|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| c) <b>Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?</b><br>(source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> ) | <b>Significant Impact</b> | <b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>Not Applicable</b> |
|  | [ ]                       | [ ]   | [ ]                                 | [ X ]                 |

No alterations to water treatment or distribution will be required by the project; therefore this is a less-than-significant impact.

d) <b>Sewer or septic tanks?</b> (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*No alterations to sewer or septic tanks will be required by the project, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

e) <b>Storm water drainage?</b> (source #(s))	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]	[ ]

*The storm water drainage system that carries water into Easkoot Creek from properties and roads within the Town of Stinson Beach, will not be negatively affected by the project. The project should have a positive affect on the ability of stormwater run-off to remain in the creek, since the project's objective is to increase channel carrying capacity, especially during peak storm events, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact. See Section V. 4 Water.*

f) <b>Solid waste disposal?</b> (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan; CF II.2</i> )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*No alterations to solid waste disposal will be required by the project, therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

**13. AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:***

a) <b>Substantially reduce, obstruct, or degrade a scenic vista open to the public or scenic highway, or conflict with adopted aesthetic or visual policies or standards?</b> (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*No alterations to scenic vistas will result from the project; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

b) <b>Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect by causing a substantial alteration of the existing visual resources including, but not necessarily limited to: 1) an abrupt transition in land use; 2) disharmony with adjacent uses because of height, bulk or massing of structures; or 3) cast of a substantial amount of light, glare, or shadow?</b> (source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i> )	<b>Significant Impact</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ X ]

*No alterations to visual resources will result from the project; therefore, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

**14. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:***

<p><b>a) Disturb paleontological, archaeological, or historical sites, objects, or structures?</b>  <b>(source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan (1994)</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ X ]</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>
---	---	---	---	---

*No known cultural resources of these types are known to exist in the immediate project site, which has been periodically dredged numerous times over the years. Review of cultural resource maps maintained by the Marin Community Development Agency indicates that the subject properties are located in an area of low archaeological sensitivity. Field surveys of the subject properties did not reveal any evidence of historic domestic materials; therefore no further archaeological survey or monitoring is warranted for the proposed project. Since no human remains or archaeological resources are known on project site or immediate vicinity, this is a less-than-significant impact.*

<p><b>b) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would adversely affect unique ethnic cultural values, or religious or sacred uses within the project area?</b>  <b>(source #(s): <i>Countywide Plan(1994)</i>)</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ X ]</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>
---	---	---	---	---

*No known ethnic, religious or sacred uses are known to exist on or near the project site.*

**15. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS. *Would the proposal result in:***

<p><b>Any physical changes which can be traced through a chain of cause and effect to social or economic impacts.</b>  <b>(source #(s):</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></p> <p>[ ]</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p> <p>[ X ]</p>
---	---	---	---	---

*The restoration project will not result in any known physical changes to social or economic entities.*

**VI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.** Pursuant to Section 15065 of the State EIR Guidelines, a project shall be found to have a significant effect on the environment if any of the following are true:  
*(Please explain your answer after each question)*

- |   | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Maybe</b> |
|---|------------|-----------|--------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | [ ]        | [ X ]     | [ ]          |

*As described in Section V of this Initial Study, any potential environmental impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.*

- |  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Maybe</b> |
|--|------------|-----------|--------------|
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? | [ ]        | [ X ]     | [ ]          |

*As described in Section V of this Initial Study, any potential environmental impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.*

- |  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Maybe</b> |
|--|------------|-----------|--------------|
| c) 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). | [ ]        | [ X ]     | [ ]          |

*As described in Section V of this Initial Study, any potential environmental impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.*

- |   | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>Maybe</b> |
|---|------------|-----------|--------------|
| d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | [ ]        | [ X ]     | [ ]          |

*As described in Section V of this Initial Study, any potential environmental impacts from the proposed project would be mitigated to a level of insignificance.*

**VII. PROJECT SPONSER'S INCORPORATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES:**

Acting on behalf of the project sponsor or the authorized agent of the project sponsor, I (undersigned) have reviewed the Initial Study for the Easkoot Creek Sediment Removal, Stinson Beach, CA and have particularly reviewed the mitigation measures and monitoring programs identified herein. I accept the findings of the Initial Study, including the recommended mitigation measures, and hereby agree to modify the proposed project application4s now on file with Marin County to include and incorporate all mitigation measures and monitoring programs set out in this Initial Study.

\_\_\_\_\_

*(Project Sponsor's Name or Representative)*

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

*(Project Sponsor's Name or Representative)*

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

**VII. DETERMINATION:** Pursuant to Sections 15081 and 15070 of the State Guidelines, the foregoing Initial Study evaluation, and the entire administrative record for the project:

- I find that the proposed project WILL 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A 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.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENT A**

**INITIAL STUDY  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

**DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE**

- 6) Marin Countywide Plan, CDA- Planning Division (1994)
- 7) Easkoot Creek Restoration at Stinson Beach- Environmental Assessment U.S. Dept of the Interior National Park Service; Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
- 8) California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Agreement for Sediment Removal in Easkoot Creek (October 2006)
- 9) Conversation with Jeremy Sarrow, Department of Fish and Game biologist. August 22, 2007
- 10) National Marine Fisheries Service Protected Resources- Marin County database.