

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
<p>a) <i>Physically divide an established community?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The project site is a former middle school athletic field and an existing recreation area/dog park located behind a shopping center with hillside housing on two sides and school facilities to the east. The proposed Red Hill Park project would revitalize this site, keeping uses consistent with the existing dog park and sports uses. The project would not physically divide an established community.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>b) <i>Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The General Plan designation for the Red Hill Park area is Single Family Residential (R-1H)/Special Use Area. The site is zoned Preliminary Planned Development District (PPD R-1). The General Plan provides Objectives for future reuse of public and private school sites. The Red Hill Park site, a portion of the former Red Hill Middle School, is publicly owned. The General Plan Objective 19 stipulates that future use or reuse of the Red Hill school site should be single-family residential if the site ceases to be used for school purposes. The proposed Red Hill Park project would continue the existing public recreational use and is consistent with the land use designation and zoning. There would be no conflict with Town Plans and Policies.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3, 4</p>				X
<p>c) <i>Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</i></p> <p>Discussion: There are no established habitat conservation plans. Therefore, there would be no conflict.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				X
II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
<p>a) <i>Induce substantial growth in an area either directly, e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses, or indirectly, e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Red Hill Park project would significantly upgrade the existing conditions at the site and update and improve infrastructure including storm drainage, sanitary sewer, and parking layout. The project would not induce substantial growth because it is a continuation of an existing recreational use and the surrounding areas are developed.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>b) <i>Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i></p> <p>Discussion: No housing would be displaced by the project. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>c) <i>Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Red Hill Park project would not displace people nor affect any housing because it involves reconstruction of an existing recreational facility. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) <i>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</i>				
<p>i) <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?</i></p> <p>Discussion: There are no known active faults within the immediate area and the project is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The closest fault system is the San Andreas fault located approximately 10 miles to the west (as the crow flies). The Miller Pacific Engineering Group Geotechnical Investigation for this project states that the potential for fault surface rupture at the site is remote. The proposed project consists of sports fields with a small building for concession/restroom use and a small storage shed. These structures would be designed and constructed according to the most recent Building Code. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 3, 5</p>			X	
<p>ii) <i>Strong seismic ground shaking?</i></p> <p>Discussion: Strong seismic ground shaking could occur depending upon the location and intensity of an earthquake event along the San Andreas Fault or other North Bay faults. Design and construction of the sports field facilities and the small, proposed structures would be in accordance with the latest Building Code requirements. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 5</p>			X	
<p>iii) <i>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Miller Pacific Engineering study states that the geologic formations at the site do not contain any appreciable deposits susceptible to liquefaction. Their</p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>subsurface exploration also did not encounter potential liquefiable soils. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 5</p>				
<p>iv) <i>Landslides?</i></p> <p>Discussion: As described in the Miller Pacific Engineering Study, the topography of the site consists of some slopes along the north, south and west edges with inclinations of 3:1 or steeper. Field reconnaissance of these slopes did not indicate any signs of potential instability. No signs of distress to existing structures, such as pavement cracking, related to earth movement were observed. Therefore, the risk of slope instability is considered to be low. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 5</p>			X	
<p>b) <i>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Miller Pacific Engineering Study indicates that the surficial site soils are generally silty or sandy and are susceptible to erosion. The potential for erosion is increased further where surface water is concentrated, vegetation is disturbed or removed, and the slopes are steep. The design for the proposed recreational facilities (dog park, soccer/baseball field and sports court) involves grading to create level playing surfaces and incorporates new drainage facilities, landscaping and irrigation. The design of these facilities would minimize the potential for soil erosion over the long term and impacts from short-term construction activities would be mitigated through implementation of standard best management practices as required by the Town Building Department. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 5</p>			X	
<p>c) <i>Be located on 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?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussions above in III.a. 1) and 3).</p> <p>Source: 5</p>			X	
<p>d) <i>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 – 1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The site is not located on expansive soils. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 5</p>				X
<p>e) <i>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</i></p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

<p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park Concession and Restroom facility would be connected to the sanitary sewer system. There would be no impact upon septic systems.</p> <p>Source: 5</p>				
<p>IV. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) <i>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would have very limited impacts upon water quality and sanitary systems due to the type of use for recreation. Water use would be limited to irrigation of landscape areas on the slopes surrounding the artificial turf play fields, the concession stand and restroom. Best management practices would be utilized regarding application of any fertilizers in order to minimize pollutants in surface runoff from the site. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>			X	
<p>b) <i>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Red Hill Park facilities would replace outdated recreational facilities from the former Red Hill Middle School. Operation of the proposed park facilities would not involve wells. Water use for the Concession/Restroom facility and limited landscape irrigation would not involve groundwater supplies. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>c) <i>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park facilities would not involve significant change to the existing topography. The project proposes to upgrade existing drainage facilities at the site, connecting with the Town's storm drain system. No substantial erosion or siltation would occur with the project. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>d) <i>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?</i></p>			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a developed section of San Anselmo. The site occupies the former alignment of a natural drainage channel that has been backfilled with soil and diverted into a 36-inch diameter storm drain that runs under the site. Additionally, the property has an elevation of about +60 feet and slopes downward to the west. There is a risk of localized flooding from blocked drain inlets, but the potential for widespread flood damage is low. This is a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 5</p>				
<p>e) <i>Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would upgrade existing drainage facilities and connect with the storm drainage system. The proposed Park would continue the existing use of the area for recreational purposes and these improvements would meet modern code requirements. Therefore, the project would not cause storm drainage system capacity to be exceeded nor create substantial sources of polluted runoff. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1</p>				X
<p>f) <i>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in IV. a, above.</p> <p>Source: 1,2</p>				X
<p>g) <i>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard Delineation map?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The project does not include housing and is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>h) <i>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in IV. g. above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>i) <i>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The risk of flooding from storm runoff in the surrounding watershed is very limited due to the existence of storm drainage facilities in the vicinity (e.g., at the Sunny Hills and the Ross Valley School District complexes). Within</p>			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>the project site, new storm drainage facilities would further reduce the potential for flooding during a major storm event. No upstream dams or levees exist. There would not be a significant risk of exposing people and structures to flooding given these circumstances. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				
<p>j) <i>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The project site would not have the potential for inundation by seiche or tsunami given its inland location. The potential for mudflow would be less-than-significant as discussed in Section III. iv), above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 5</p>			X	
<p>V. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) <i>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park improvements would enhance the area's value for recreational activities from its present use, primarily as a dog park, by providing soccer, baseball, basketball and tennis facilities as well as an enhanced dog park. Thus, more types of sports activities would occur with the project and more people would be expected to use the site than at present. Air quality impacts from operation of the Park would be minor based upon the project traffic study that estimates approximately 141 new trips would occur on weekdays and on weekends, 255 new trips. This would be a fairly modest increase over the existing use of the site as a dog park.</p> <p>Air quality impacts from temporary construction activities, such as dust and construction vehicle exhaust, would be limited and controlled as part of the project construction management plan, administered by the Town Building Department.</p> <p>The moderate increase in car trips associated with Red Hill Park would not conflict with implementation of the regional air quality plan. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3, 6</p>			X	
<p>b) <i>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion above in Section V. a.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3, 6</p>			X	
<p>c) <i>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, including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors?</i></p>			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Discussion: The Red Hill Park project would continue the existing use of this site for recreational purposes and therefore does not represent a change in land use type. Proposed Park improvements would generate additional trips to the site because of the expanded and enhanced sports facilities and renovated dog park. The net increase in new trips over existing trips would not be sufficient to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 6</p>				
<p>d) <i>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</i></p> <p>Discussion: Red Hill Park is situated between the Red Hill shopping center and the Ross Valley School District administrative offices with residential uses in the vicinity, including the Sunny Hills Apartments to the northwest, across Sunny Hills Drive and single family homes to the south along Grove Hill Avenue and upper Sequoia Drive. The commercial and office uses would not be considered sensitive receptors. However, residential uses could be sensitive receptors depending upon their proximity to the access/parking areas for the site. In this case, the apartment buildings are situated approximately 20 feet from the edge of Sunny Hills Drive at the closest point but over 400 feet from the first parking space proposed for Red Hill Park on the north side of the Park. The closest single-family home is approximately 800 feet from the end of the parking lot on the south side of the Park. The distance between parking areas and existing residential uses, as well as the facts that total automobile trips to the site will be split between the two access drives and this project would continue an existing use of this site for recreational purposes, indicates that exposure of sensitive receptors (i.e., nearby residences) to substantial pollutant concentrations would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>With regard to pollutant concentrations associated with the construction phase of this project, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) recognizes that construction equipment emits pollutants but that such emissions are temporary and are generally accounted for in the projections that provide the basis for regional air quality plans. The BAAQMD does not consider air quality impacts resulting from construction activities significant if appropriate construction control measures are implemented. Such measures would be required as a standard condition of approval by the Town. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 6</p>			X	
<p>e) <i>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial</i></p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>number of people?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed recreational uses, including a small concession stand, would not be expected to create objectionable odors. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				
<p>VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) <i>Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections?</i></p> <p>Discussion: A Traffic Study was prepared for the proposed Red Hill Park project in June 25, 2004 by W-trans. A report update was prepared on July 13, 2005 to consider whether small modifications to the proposed plans would affect the conclusions of the earlier report (i.e., a second access from Shaw Drive and additional sports use), and updated again on September 16, 2005 to consider whether new signals at Sunny Hills and Shaw Drive (with Bella Vista signal removed) would be warranted given the additional traffic from the project and the circulation issue of drivers diverting through the Red Hill Shopping Center to exit at the Bella Vista Avenue traffic signal.</p> <p>The 2004 study examined the intersection of Sunny Hills Drive and Sir Francis Drake Blvd. and concluded that there are several warrants indicating the potential need for a traffic signal at Sunny Hills-Sais (and retaining the Bella Vista signal), as the Level of Service (LOS) would be expected to increase to LOS B; however, there are some potentially significant negative impacts associated with adding a signal between the shopping center and San Francisco Blvd (including reducing efficiency of the coordinated operation along SFDB resulting in increased overall congestion and delay, and the fact that drivers divert through the shopping center), so a second signal was not recommended.</p> <p>The July 2005 report reviewed the addition of a second access to the project site from Shaw Drive, and the addition of basketball and baseball facilities, and concluded that the additional sports may result in a minimal increase in peak hour trips; however, with two access roads, rather than just Sunny Hills Drive, the trips would be spread out and impacts reduced.</p> <p>The September 2005 report noted that many drivers leaving the project site already divert through Red Hill Shopping Center to exit at the Bella Vista signal and that number would likely increase. If the shopping center diversion was not available, the approach volumes at the project access intersections would be higher and would likely be adequate</p>			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>to warrant replacing the Bella Vista signal with signals at both Sunny Hills Drive-Sais Avenue and Shaw Drive. This report also states that the operation of the Bella Vista signal alone has substantial capacity for additional traffic from the minor approaches. However, this condition has the disadvantage that public travel occurs over the private shopping center property.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Red Hill Park project would have a less-than-significant impact upon traffic load and the capacity of the street system. Project traffic would cause an increase in delay at the Sunny Hills Drive intersection during both P.M. peak and midday peak periods of approximately 6 seconds in both cases. This increase in delay would cause a minor drop in midday peak LOS from "A" to a "B". The project would therefore not cause a substantial increase in relation to existing traffic based upon trip estimates in the report.</p> <p>Source: 1, 6</p>				
<p>b) <i>Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Traffic Study indicates that based on existing traffic volumes, the controlled northbound and southbound approaches to Sir Francis Drake Blvd. operate unacceptably at a LOS F during both peak hours evaluated, however, the intersection is operating acceptably at LOS D overall based on the total average delay. The addition of the project trips, conservatively estimated at 141 weekday trips and 255 weekend trips, would not change the overall LOS D, which is considered acceptable under the Town's adopted standard of significance. The increase in traffic volumes at the signalized intersection at Bella Vista (Red Hill Shopping Center), currently operating at LOS B during peak periods, would also be expected to result in less-than-significant impacts.</p> <p>Source: 1, 6</p>			X	
<p>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</p> <p>Discussion: No change in air traffic patterns would occur with implementation of the Red Hill Park project.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses, e.g., farm equipment?</p> <p>Discussion: The Red Hill Park project would not change any access roadway alignments and therefore would not increase hazards due to a design feature. The W-Trans Traffic Study notes that there is a slight curvature along Shaw Drive at the southwest entrance to the project site</p>			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>that would require low-level landscaping in order to achieve and maintain adequate sight distance. The proposed Redwood trees shown on the project Landscape Plan at the southwest corner of the baseball field would be planted below grade and would not interfere with sight distance along the Shaw Drive entrance to the parking lot. Otherwise, the parking areas provide sufficient aisle width to allow safe movement of cars within them.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				
<p>e) <i>Result in inadequate emergency access?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Ross Valley Fire District reviewed the proposed plans and indicated that the plans are acceptable. Therefore, emergency vehicle access to the site meets the requirements of the Fire District and there would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 2</p>				X
<p>f) <i>Result in inadequate parking capacity?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The plan provides a restriped parking area for 46 cars in the existing parking lot at the end of Shaw Drive and 26 new parking spaces on Sunny Hills Drive adjacent to the proposed field and dog park. This new parking area would require dedication of an access easement from Sunny Hills School. Proposed parallel on-street parking for 12 cars would be located adjacent to the ball fields along Sunny Hills Drive. The proposed project would provide a total of 84 parking spaces, including two handicapped spaces located adjacent to the north and south parking lot ramps that would allow wheelchair access to the site. The W-Trans Traffic Study estimates the combined parking demand for the various sports facilities and dog park to be 74 spaces. Thus, the proposed project would provide 10 additional parking spaces and there would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 6</p>				X
<p>g) <i>Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks?</i></p> <p>Discussion: Bicycle racks would be provided at key locations at the Park. Bicycle racks that accommodate six bikes each (for a total of 18 bicycles) would be located near the baseball dugout and the two picnic areas. The proposed project does not include bus turnouts because it is not located on a bus route. Bus service is available along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard near the intersection of Sunny Hills Drive. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a) <i>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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed project would redevelop recreational fields and tennis courts that were constructed for the former Red Hill Middle School. Although the original school construction involved culverting an existing stream and filling above it to create level surfaces for athletic fields, the proposed Red Hill Park project would not make significant changes to the existing field surfaces. Limited grading and filling are proposed to construct new drainage facilities and access improvements. The existing site would not be expected to support special status species because of the site's historic use as athletic turf fields. Even though the use of the site has diminished over the years, it continues to be used as a dog park, thus the predominant plants at the site are weeds and thistles that would not be considered significant wildlife habitat. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>			X	
<p>b) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in VII. a., above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>			X	
<p>c) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</i></p> <p>Discussion: No impact upon wetlands would occur with implementation of the project. The site does not collect water nor support wetland plants.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>d) <i>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?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in VII. a., above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>e) <i>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Design Development Planting Plan (Sheet 8) indicates that 13 Monterey Pine and Eucalyptus trees on the southwest edge of the baseball field and along the southeastern property line are proposed for removal. The Monterey Pine trees are near the end of their lifespan and would be removed for safety purposes. This is also true for the non-native Eucalyptus trees that pose a safety hazard due to limb drop. Removal of the proposed trees would not conflict with Town policies. Both Eucalyptus and Monterey Pine trees area considered “nuisance trees”. The landscape plan proposes 60 new trees that would provide a consistent landscape planting design and replace removed trees at a ratio of more than 4:1. The plan identifies three types of trees to be used: Native Oaks, Canopy Trees (e.g., London Plane, Chinese Pistache), and Conifer Trees (Coast Redwood Removal of the proposed trees would not conflict with Town policies. Both Eucalyptus and Monterey Pine trees area considered “nuisance trees”). There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				X
<p>f) <i>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The San Anselmo General Plan designates the site as a Special Use Area with a school facility. Future use is shown as Single-Family Low Density with a maximum of one unit per acre. The proposed Red Hill Park project would be consistent with this use and with the policies of the Conservation Element. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
<p>a) <i>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?</i></p> <p>Discussion: No known mineral resources exist at this site. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>b) <i>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?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The San Anselmo General Plan does not indicate this site as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant with Mitigation Less than Significant Impact No Impact

IX. HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
<p>a) <i>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would upgrade and enhance an existing recreational facility. No hazardous materials would be required for this construction project and there would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>b) <i>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</i></p> <p>Discussion: No upset or accident conditions would be reasonably foreseeable through the ongoing operation and maintenance of the Red Hill Park facilities. The sports fields are proposed to consist of artificial turf. Thus, periodic application of fertilizers to the perimeter landscape plantings and sod turf dog park would be limited in scale and regulated by the Town Public Works Department, consistent with the Best Management Practices established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>			X	
<p>c) <i>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in IX. b., above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>			X	
<p>d) <i>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?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Red Hill Park site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites and there would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				X
<p>e) <i>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 for people residing or working in the project area?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>f) <i>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed project would not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>g) <i>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The project plans have been reviewed by the Ross Valley Fire Department and San Anselmo Police Department and found to be acceptable. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>h) <i>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed project does not involve residential units and therefore would not expose residences to wildland fires. The site is situated near open space and could be subject to wildland fires. However, the proposed project proposes very limited size and number of structures (a restroom/concession building and a storage shed). This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>			X	
X. NOISE. Would the project:				
<p>a) <i>Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</i></p> <p>Discussion: A Noise Assessment was prepared for the Red Hill Park project by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. on July 26, 2005. The Study evaluates existing noise conditions and estimates the future noise generated by the proposed sports facilities and dog park. Project noise would consist of high school lacrosse and soccer games and practices during the Fall and San Anselmo Baseball Association practices and games in the Spring, as well as adult softball games. Tennis and "pick-up" basketball would also occur at the sports court. Noise would also be generated by dog park users and at the parking lots. The entire park is proposed for use during daylight hours only.</p> <p>A worst-case assessment of the Park activity's noise impact upon the nearest receivers indicates average noise levels would be 53 dBA at the residential apartment units west of Sunny Hills Drive (the nearest units are at a distance of 150</p>			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>feet to the center of the Sports Court, 390 feet from the center of the soccer field and 570 feet from the dog park). If the noise of vehicular traffic in the parking lots is added to this estimate, the combined maximum noise level would be 56 dBA. When the noise estimated for the Park is added to the existing noise at the nearest apartment unit (59 dBA), the resulting worst-case noise level would be 60 dBA. This indicates that the project would increase noise levels in this location by one decibel.</p> <p>The Study indicates that the nearest single-family homes are located over 900 feet east of the park along Sequoia Drive. These residences would be located about 1000 feet from the center of the dog park, approximately 1,200 feet from the center of the soccer field and about 1,400 feet from the proposed sports court and Sunny Hills parking lot. Exterior average noise levels generated by the park would be 43 dBA at the nearest single-family homes, assuming continuous activity at the park between 7:00 am and 8:00 pm. Vehicular traffic accessing the park via Shaw Drive would generate an hourly noise level of 27 dBA at the nearest home (assuming 25 autos per hour). A composite noise level of 43 dBA is projected by the Study (park noise plus traffic noise). The noise resulting from the operation of the park (43 dBA) and the existing noise level (49 dBA) would yield a resultant noise level of 50 dBA, adding one-decibel to the noise environment at the nearest residential uses along Sequoia Drive.</p> <p>The Study concludes that the increase in noise resulting from the project would not be perceptible and would be considered less-than-significant.</p> <p>Noise impacts from construction noise were evaluated in the Noise Study and found to be less-than-significant. Construction activities typically do not generate significant noise impacts when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less. The Study includes a list of recommended measures to reduce the effects of temporary construction noise on adjacent residential land uses to the west and east. The list of standard noise control measures provided in the Noise Study should be adopted as a condition of project approval.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 7</p>				
<p>b) <i>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels?</i></p> <p>Discussion: Operation of the Red Hill Park would not involve generation of groundbourne vibrations. Temporary construction noise impacts would be less-than-significant as discussed in X.a., above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 7</p>			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>c) <i>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in X.a., above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 7</p>			X	
<p>d) <i>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in X.a., above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 7</p>			X	
<p>e) <i>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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>f) <i>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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:</p>				
<p><i>Fire protection?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Ross Valley Fire Department reviewed the proposed Red Hill Park plans and found them to be acceptable. No substantial adverse impacts upon fire protection services would be expected.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p><i>Police protection?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The San Anselmo Police Department reviewed the proposed Red Hill Park plans and found them to be acceptable. The Department stated that vandalism to the new facility would be a concern and could be mitigated with the use of strategically located lighting. This would be a</p>			X	

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
less-than-significant impact. Source: 1, 2				
<i>Schools?</i> Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park would serve as a refurbishment of former athletic fields associated with Red Hill Middle School. The site is owned and would be operated by a Joint Powers Agency comprised of the Tamalpais Union High School District and the Town of San Anselmo. Construction of the project would have a beneficial impact upon the District's students and residents of San Anselmo who would have the use of the proposed modern and attractive recreational fields and a dog park. There would be no impact. Source: 1, 2				X
<i>Parks?</i> Discussion: See discussion in "Schools", above. Source: 1, 2				X
<i>Other public facilities?</i> Discussion: No other public facilities would be impacted by the proposed Red Hill Park project. Source: 1, 2				X
XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) <i>Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i> Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities due to the minor service requirements it would have. The project's water/wastewater requirements would be limited to the Concession/Restroom facility and irrigation for the sod turf dog park and perimeter landscaping. All new landscape and irrigation systems must be designed consistent with MMWD requirements. This would be a less-than-significant impact. Source: 1, 2			X	
b) <i>Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</i> Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would involve construction of new storm water drainage facilities onsite that would tie into the Town's existing storm drain system. No offsite impacts upon these facilities would be expected because the project involves updating and				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
improving existing athletic fields. There would be no impact. Source: 1, 2				
c) <i>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</i> Discussion: The Red Hill Park project includes construction of a new Concession/Restroom building and new landscaping and irrigation facilities. These would generate new water demand from the site over the existing use of the site for a dog park and tennis. Sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the proposed project and the landscape/irrigation design would be required to meet MMWD standards. This would be a less-than-significant impact. Source: 1, 2			X	
d) <i>Result in a determination by 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?</i> Discussion: The Ross Valley Sanitary District would provide wastewater treatment for the proposed Red Hill Park facilities. Adequate capacity exists to accommodate the project's projected demand that is limited to the Concession/Restroom building. This would be a less-than-significant impact. Source: 1, 2			X	
e) <i>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</i> Discussion: The proposed project would have a very small solid waste disposal need and would have no impact on landfill capacity. Source: 1, 2				X
f) <i>Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</i> Discussion: See discussion in XII.e., above. Source: 1, 2				X
XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) <i>Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</i> Discussion: The General Plan does not identify scenic vistas in the vicinity of the project site. However, local views of the site would be beneficially impacted by the project. The proposed Red Hill Park project would revitalize existing athletic fields that have had limited maintenance and diminished use for many years. The present condition of				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>the site is unattractive with weeds and dirt replacing the former turf areas and a thick growth of thistles on the surrounding slopes. The proposed project would greatly enhance the use of the site for sports and dog park use with new facilities and enhance its visual character through good quality materials, muted colors on the Concession/Restroom building, and attractive landscaping. The landscape plan would establish a consistent line of trees along the perimeter of the site that would help soften offsite views of the Baseball field fencing that ranges in height from 8-30 feet. Proposed fencing would be black vinyl chainlink mesh with black powdercoated steel posts and rails. The black finish on the fences would help minimize their visibility. There would be no substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				
<p>b) <i>Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</i></p> <p>Discussion: No scenic resources exist near the site. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				X
<p>c) <i>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in XIII.a., above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>d) <i>Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</i></p> <p>Discussion: Use of the Red Hill Park athletic and sports facilities would be limited to daylight use. Therefore, lighting is only proposed for security purposes, not for nighttime sports activities. As a standard condition of approval, the Town would require that exterior security lighting be designed to eliminate off-site spread of light through the use of hooded, low-level, low-wattage light fixtures. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>			X	
XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
<p>a) <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?</i></p> <p>Discussion: No historical resources exist at the site. It is an existing recreational area that is presently vacant except for a tennis court. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>b) <i>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource?</i></p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Discussion: No archaeological resources are known to exist at the site which was previously developed for athletic fields as part of the Red Hill Middle School. The proposed Red Hill Park project would update and improve these facilities. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				
<p>c) <i>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</i></p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in XIV.b., above.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
<p>d) <i>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Red Hill Park project would not impact human remains because the site was formerly developed for athletic fields and the project involves renovation of these fields.</p> <p>Source: 1, 3</p>				X
XV. RECREATION. Would the project:				
<p>a) <i>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?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The Red Hill Park project would revitalize the former Red Hill Middle School athletic field and provide a variety of new sports facilities, including baseball, softball, basketball, tennis as well as a dog park. These enhanced facilities could potentially reduce impacts on other community parks and have a beneficial impact on recreation facilities in San Anselmo.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>b) <i>Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The analysis of physical impacts associated with the proposed Red Hill Park project does not indicate that there would be adverse impacts.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
<p>a) <i>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 pre-history?</i></p>				X

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

Red Hill Park, 100 Shaw Drive; APN: 006-061-14

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would revitalize the former Red Hill Middle School athletic fields into a multi-use recreational park. Because the project involves redevelopment of existing athletic fields, there is no wildlife habitat or sensitive species that would be adversely affected by the plan.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				
<p>b) <i>Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would serve the community interest in providing modern recreational facilities at a site where former athletic fields have fallen into disrepair. The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and its Conservation and Park policies. Therefore, the proposed Park would serve to achieve local policies. There would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				X
<p>c) <i>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would revitalize an existing recreation area, thereby continuing and enhancing its use by the community. The project would not have cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2</p>				X
<p>d) <i>Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly?</i></p> <p>Discussion: The proposed Red Hill Park project would provide modern sports facilities for baseball, softball, soccer, basketball and tennis as well as a dog park and related facilities at site of the former Red Hill Middle School athletic field. The project design and construction would be subject to Town Building Code requirements. Operation of the Park, which would be the responsibility of the JPA (Tamalpais Union School District and Town of San Anselmo), would not be expected to have any substantial adverse effects directly or indirectly upon human beings.</p> <p>Source: 1, 2, 3</p>				X