September 18, 2007

Honorable Mayor and Members of
the Hermosa Beach City Council

Regular Meeting of
September 25, 2007

HERMOSA STRAND INFILTRATION TRENCH PROJECT, PHASE 1

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the City Council complete the environmental review process for the Hermosa Strand Infiltration Trench Project, Phase 1 by adopting the attached resolution entitled

"RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HERMOSA BEACH TO ADOPT AN ENVIRONMENTAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE HERMOSA STRAND INFILTRATION TRENCH, PHASE I, TO DIVERT STORM WATER RUN-OFF TO AN INFILTRATION TRENCH INSTALLED BELOW-GRADE AGAINST THE OCEAN SIDE OF THE STRAND WALL."

Summary:

On June 26, 2007, the City Council approved this resolution for an Environmental Negative Declaration along with approving the agreement with the State to receive Clean Beach Initiative Grant funding for this project. Subsequent to this approval staff was informed that projects receiving State Grant Funding are required to have a 30-day review period with the State Clearinghouse, as compared to a 21-day review period for non-grant funded projects. The 30-day period previously ended on July 3, 2007, after Council's approval. Therefore, staff re-noticed and posted the site on July 31, 2007 and the 30-day period ended on August 31, 2007.

On June 14, 2007, the Environmental Review Committee (ERC) held a public hearing in regard to the proposed Hermosa Strand Infiltration Trench, Phase I Project. At that meeting, the Staff ERC, based on the Initial Study, recommended an Environmental Negative Declaration for the proposal. There were no concerns raised by residents at that time, and the Negative Declaration has been noticed and circulated through the State Clearinghouse for the required 30-day comment period. The following comments were received:

1. Native American Heritage Commission: Concerns were that excavation could potentially disturb an historical or archaeological resource. Staff's response (see attached letter) determined that no historical or archaeological resources will be affected based upon detailed investigations conducted for the EIR for the TyCom installation, which looked at the entire length of beach frontage.
2. Department of Toxic Substances Control: Concern was that excavation may uncover toxic substances. The response was that the risk of this occurring was low (see attached letter).

Fiscal Impact:

The fiscal impacts were discussed in the June 26, 2007 meeting agenda.

Attachments: 1. Draft Resolution
2. Letter to Native American Heritage Commission
3. Letter to Department of Toxic Substances Control

Respectfully submitted,

Richard D. Morgan, P.E.
Director of Public Works/City Engineer

Concur:

Ken Robertson
Acting Community Development Director

Noted for fiscal impact:

Viki Copeland
Finance Director

Concur:

Stephen R. Burrell
City Manager

F:\B95\PWFILES\CCITEMS\infiltration trench 9-25-07.doc

RESOLUTION NO. 07-

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HERMOSA BEACH TO ADOPT AN ENVIRONMENTAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE HERMOSA STRAND INFILTRATION TRENCH, PHASE I, TO DIVERT STORM WATER RUN-OFF TO AN INFILTRATION TRENCH INSTALLED BELOW-GRADE AGAINST THE OCEAN SIDE OF THE STRAND WALL

The City Council of the City of Hermosa Beach does hereby resolve and order as follows:

Section 1, An application was filed by the City of Hermosa Beach seeking approval of an Environmental Negative Declaration for the Hermosa Strand Infiltration Trench Project Phase I (PROJECT), to divert storm water run-off to an infiltration trench installed below-grade against the ocean side of the Strand wall.

Section 2, Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the City's local CEQA Guidelines, the Staff Environmental Review Committee prepared an Initial Study of the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. Based upon the Initial Study the committee determined that there was no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the City, that the project would have a significant effect on the environment as long as certain mitigation measures are incorporated into the project to address parking issues. City staff thereafter prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project and duly provided public notice of the public comment period and of the intent to adopt the Negative Declaration. In response to comments received, City staff made findings that there was no potential for disturbance of Historical or Archaeological resources and also that there are no toxic substances anticipated to be encountered during excavation within the Project area. A copy of the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

PASSED, APPROVED and **ADOPTED** this 25th day of September, 2007, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_____
PRESIDENT of the City Council and MAYOR of the City of Hermosa Beach

ATTEST:

_____
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____
City Attorney

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title** "Hermosa Strand Infiltration Trench—Phase I": Proposition 50 Clean Beaches Initiative Recommended Project No. 10153

2. **Project Location:** Hermosa Strand at Pier Avenue

3. **Project Sponsor:** Department of Public Works, City of Hermosa Beach

4. **Lead Agency :** City of Hermosa Beach
   1315 Valley Drive
   Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

5. **Contact Person:** Ken Robertson, Senior Planner - (310) 318-0242

6. **General Plan Designation:** Open Space (OS) 7. **Zoning:** OS

8. **Description of Project:** The Hermosa Strand Infiltration Trench Project (Project) is being proposed in order to eliminate shoreline water quality exceedances of bacteria standards for human body contact recreational activities such as swimming and surfing (REC-1) attributed to storm drain discharges during summer dry weather. The project will also eliminate odor and vector problems caused by standing water in the Pier Avenue storm drain and should achieve measurable reductions in winter dry weather REC-1 exceedances.

   Year-round dry-weather flows from the Pier Avenue storm drain will be diverted to an infiltration trench constructed of prefabricated modular cells. The trench system will be installed below-grade against the ocean side of the cutoff wall that supports the Strand walkway that extends more than 14 feet deep and is located approximately 300 feet from the shoreline. Three to four feet of unsaturated native sand below the trench will provide filtration and treatment of the urban runoff before it reaches the saline water table below. The drain is subject to tidal influence so a diversion manhole with a berm and removable tide gate will be constructed in the Pier Avenue storm drain to prevent seawater from entering the system during operation and to direct low flow urban runoff into a pump well equipped with a trash basket and absorbent boom. The pump will divert low flow urban runoff into the adjoining infiltration trench.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:** The subject site is located at the westerly end of Pier Plaza where it terminates at the Strand walkway. The project is adjacent to the commercial downtown district which is an urban setting. The commercial downtown district consists of eating and drinking establishments, retail uses, business services, and some nonconforming residential uses. Public parking lots A (11th Street) and C (13th Street) are located nearby. The beach on which the subject site is located extends north and south of the site and is a popular recreational beach.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

    - Coastal Development Permit, California Coastal Commission
    - Los Angeles County Flood Control District
    - California State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Financial Assistance, Proposition 50 Clean Beaches Grant Program

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Transportation/Circulation	☐ Public Services
☐ Population and Housing	☐ Biological Resources	☐ Utilities and Service Systems
☐ Geological Problems	☐ Energy and Mineral Resources	☐ Aesthetics
☐ Water and Water Quality	☐ Hazards	☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Air Quality	☐ Noise	☐ Recreation
	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION.

(To be completed by the Lead Agency.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. ☒

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, that 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 environmental, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. ☐

_____ _____

Signature Date

_____ _____

Printed Name For

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	**LAND USE AND PLANNING.** *Would the proposal:*				
a)	Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Be incompatible with existing land use in vicinity?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low income or minority community)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

I-a thru e: The project site is designated open space and the project will be compatible with the surroundings (see project description).

II.	**POPULATION AND HOUSING.** *Would the proposal:*				
a)	Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructures?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	☐	☐	☐	☒

II. a-c The project will result in no impact on population and housing.

III.	**GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS.** Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a)	Fault rupture?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Landslides or mudflows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g)	Subsidence of the land?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h)	Expansive soil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i)	Unique geologic or physical features?	☐	☐	☐	☒

III-a-i The project will not be overlain by any structures but will be adjacent to the strand wall. Collapse or destruction of the infiltration trench in the event of severe storm, tsunami or seismic event is not expected to have any direct effect on the stability of the strand wall under these conditions.

III-b During the life of the project it may be subject to a major earthquake, which may cause damage to the project but would not be expected to endanger people.

III-d There is no potential for either seats or volcanic activity at the subject site. The project will not impact or increase the hazards associated with a tsunami.

III-e The project site is in a developed area which is characterized by low topographic relief. Landslides and mudflows are thus not considered to be hazards in the project area.

III f-g Erosion and subsidence as well as other potential geotechnical hazards will be evaluated and addressed by geotechnical studies required as part of the plan review process. It is expected that any such hazards can be addressed through routine engineering design employed in the area.

III-h The potential for encountering expansive soils at the project site is considered to be low, as sandy soils, such as those characterizing the project area, are not considered expansive.

III-i The project site contains no unique geologic or physical features.

Sources:
City or Hermosa Beach General Plan, Seismic Safety Element

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	**WATER AND WATER QUALITY.** *Would the proposal result in:*				
a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f)	Storm water system discharges from areas for materials storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage delivery or loading docks, or other outdoor work areas?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	A significantly harmful increase in the flow rate or volume of storm water runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	A significantly harmful increase in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?	☐	☐	☒	☐
i)	Storm water discharges that would significantly impair the beneficial uses of receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefits (e.g. riparian corridors, wetland, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j.)	Harm to the biological integrity of drainage systems and water bodies?	☐	☐	☐	☒
k)	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	☐	☐	☒	☐
l)	Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	☐	☐	☒	☐
m)	Impacts to groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
n)	Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

otherwise available for public water supplies?

IV. b The project will reduce the exposure of people to hazards associated with the discharge of urban runoff by diverting low, non-storm flows into subsurface saline groundwater and filtering the flow through several hundred feet of sand before it reaches the wave wash. The tide gate will be inserted only when the pump system is operating and not during rain events so that there should be no changes in the conveyance of storm water during a rain event.

IV.c The project will improve water quality of near-shore marine waters by providing natural sand filtration of urban runoff prior to discharge.

IV.e-h The project will create less than significant changes in the course and direction of water movement by directing urban runoff to subsurface discharge through several hundred feet of native sand providing filtering and dispersal of the discharge(discharge that would otherwise be to the ocean through a sand plug at the end of a storm drain pipe).

The project will include a monitoring plan to demonstrate the effectiveness of native sand filtration for treating indicator bacteria in urban runoff. The monitoring program will consist of a line of well points to monitor saline groundwater elevation and quality before and after installation of the infiltration trench. The monitoring plan will also include sand cores to document that the infiltration trench does not cause re-growth of indicator bacteria in unsaturated sand nor pose an increased risk to public health over the current method of discharge.

If the system does not provide the public benefits that are expecte,d the system can be easily abandoned and discharge of urban runoff can be returned to pre-project configuration. So the project does not create irreversible changes or conditions.

IV. i. The saline groundwater to which the project will discharge is not a potable supply because it is saline groundwater in hydrologic contact with coastal marine waters. The subsurface discharge of low flow urban runoff via the infiltration trench is not expected to create a measurable change in seawater intrusion rates or gradients; however the well points will allow measurement in changes in the elevation of saline groundwater to confirm this assumption.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. AIR QUALITY. *Would the proposal:*					
a)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any chance in climate?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Create objectionable odors?	☐	☐	☒	☐

V-a-c No impacts anticipated

V-d The project is expected to reduce or eliminate odors in the near by commercial district caused by standing water in the Pier Avenue storm drain system. The project itself is not expected to result in the generation of objectionable odors as long as it is properly maintained and operated.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.					
	Would the proposal result in:				
a)	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f)	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VI-a-g The proposed project does not increase the intensity of use and will not create any barriers for bicyclists or pedestrians along the strand. Access structures for maintenance of the system will create minor impediments on the beach immediately along the strand wall, however this is a less than significant impact on recreational activity.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a)	Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	☐	☐	☒	☒
b)	Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees) ?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Locally designed natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VII-a-e *The project is expected to have less than significant biological impacts during construction and no impact upon completion. To the south of the project, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service designated ten (10) acres of critical wintering habitat for the Pacific coast population of the western snowy plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus) pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973. This area, known as Subunit CA 21D, encompasses 0.25 linear miles of sandy open beach extending from 2nd Street to 6th Street in Hermosa Beach. It is not anticipated that the Project will extend into the designated critical habitat area. Although the draft recovery plan has not yet been finalized, the final rule designating critical habitat describes the primary threats that may require special management in this subunit as: disturbance from human recreational use as well as beach raking which removes the wrack line and reduces food resources. Since the completed project will be installed below ground and against the strand wall, long-term impacts on wintering habitat will be avoided should the snowy plover stray northward from the designated habitat into the project area.*

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.

Would the proposal:

a)	Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful an inefficient manner?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Results in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒

VIII-a The proposed project would be required to be constructed to comply with energy conservation standards in the State's Uniform Building Code.

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

VIII-b The size of the project and the nature of the use will not involve significant or wasteful use of non-renewable resources. Application of the existing regulations is considered adequate to ensure that non-renewable resources would not be used in an inefficient or wasteful manner.

VIII-c There have been no significant mineral deposits identified at this site, or in the City of Hermosa Beach.

Source: City of Hermosa Beach General Plan, Conservation Element

IX. HAZARDS. *Would the proposal involve:*

a)	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	☐	☐	☐	☒

IX-a, c,d The proposed project does not increase risks due to hazards above those which are existing risks associated with discharges from the storm drain system. The project diverts and disperses those discharges below ground and should therefore reduce the risks of exposure to existing health hazards associated with storm drain discharges.

IX-b The project would not interfere with City-wide emergency response and evacuation plans..

IX-e The area is not characterized by existing flammable brush, grass, or trees, and the project would be constructed in compliance with fire safety standards.

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

a)	Increases in existing noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

X-a The proposed project is expected only to negligibly affect the pattern and volume of existing noise levels. Construction noise will temporarily impact noise levels. Long term impacts associated with intermittent operation of the below-ground pump station are expected to be less than significant..

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

X-b No impact anticipated.

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

a)	Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Other governmental services?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XI-d The project will create an expansion of the public storm drain system and will require ongoing operation and maintenance, however this impact is expected to be less than significant because it will be offset by improved public aesthetics and commercial business revenues due to elimination of odors associated with standing water in the existing storm drain system and reduced need for cleaning of the storm drain.

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

a)	Power or natural gas?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Communications systems?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Sewer or septic tanks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Storm water drainage?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Solid waste disposal?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Local or regional water supplies?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XIII. AESTHETICS. *Would the proposal:*

a)	Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Create light or glare?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XIII-a. Since the project is located below ground against the strand wall, and only minor appurtenances will be visible above ground level, the project will have no impact on scenic beach and ocean vistas..

XIII-b: The project will have a less than significant aesthetic impact, and to the contrary will likely have a positive aesthetic effect by reducing odors in the downtown area.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:*

a)	Disturb paleontological resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Disturb archaeological resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Affect historical resources?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XIV-a-e There are no known cultural resources associate with this project site.

XV. RECREATION. *Would the proposal:*

a)	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Affect existing recreational opportunities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XV-a-b The Project is expected to enhance existing recreational opportunities by reducing the frequency of beach postings, and it may have a small but less than significant increase in demand for beach use if the water quality of the beach is perceived by the public to be of higher quality than other nearby beaches.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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?				
b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

XVII. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES.

a) **Supporting Information Sources.** (The following are sources used and referred to in the initial study, and are incorporated herein by reference. All are available for review in the Community Development Department, Planning Division of the City of Hermosa Beach)

1. General Plan for the City of Hermosa Beach (Land Use Element revised 1994)

2. City of Hermosa Beach Municipal Code

City of Hermosa Beach

Civic Center, 1315 Valley Drive, Hermosa Beach, California 90254-3885

September 25, 2007

Ms. Maureen F. Gorsen, Director
Department of Toxic Substances Control
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, CA 90630

RE: Negative Declaration for the Hermosa Strand Infiltration Trench Clean Beaches Initiative Project No. 10153 (SCH# 2007061008)

Dear Ms. Gorsen:

The City of Hermosa Beach received your letter of July 9, 2007 inquiring about potential current or historic uses at the subject project site that may have resulted in the release of hazardous wastes/substances which could potentially affect the project. This letter provides a response to your comments.

The City is proposing to construct a stormwater diversion for an existing County-owned storm drain which outfalls just south of the Hermosa Pier. Dry weather nuisance flows from the storm drain will be diverted into an infiltration trench to be constructed below-grade, on the beach, and against the ocean side of the cutoff wall that supports The Strand walkway. The City of Hermosa Beach holds title to the beach above the mean high tide and has held that title since the City's incorporation in 1907 with the restriction that the beach be held as a playground free from commerce. The City has managed the beach accordingly—the only permanent structures adjacent to the project on the beach are The Strand, the Los Angeles County Lifeguard station, the Hermosa Fishing Pier and the below-grade storm drains which are the subject of the project. The project is being undertaken in order to maintain the beneficial recreational uses of the beach.

Construction of The Strand was undertaken shortly after 1901 as a board walk. Title to The Strand was transferred to the City with the City's incorporation in 1907. High tides occasionally washed away portions of the boardwalk and in 1914 part of it was replaced by cement sidewalk. An additional 2,000 feet of cement strand was completed in 1926. Today the entire length of the strand is concrete supported by the afore-mentioned cutoff wall. From time-to-time portions of The Strand have been reconstructed as the need arose, most recently near Second Street and near Longfellow Avenue.

torn down and replaced with a new pier 1,000 feet long constructed of concrete. The pier was apparently destroyed again by storms sometime between 1956 and 1959 as evidenced by aerial photos provided with the Phase I records search. The pier was rebuilt in 1964 and later renovated in 1988 with a FEMA grant following another round of storm damage. Aerial photos dating from 1956 and 1959 show additional recreational structures immediately south of the pier against The Strand which were reported to have included a small aquarium. These structures had been completely removed by 1963.

The City ordered a California Phase I records search of the property and the surrounding vicinity to confirm its understanding of the project site. The records search conducted by BBL Environmental Information was a "California Phase I Combination Report" centered on the intersection of Pier Avenue and The Strand and included:

- a database search exceeding the requirements of ASTM E-1527,
- detailed status information on any sites identified,
- USGS Topographic Map,
- aerial photo search,
- historical tenant report for the block of Pier Plaza immediately adjacent to the project site, and
- fire insurance map search.

The database search sought to identify any current or historic uses of the project site that could have resulted in a release of hazardous wastes. The search accessed Federal and State databases including those of the National Priorities List, CalSites, RCRA (RCRIS), CERCLA (CERCLIS), SWIS, LUST, HWIS, and UST.

No listings within a one mile radius of the project site were identified in the NPL, CERCLIS, FEDFAC, HMIRS, CDETS, C-Docket, ICIS, RCRA, Federal Enforcement Docket, CORTESE, WIP, WQ databases. No listings within one-half mile radius of the project site were identified in the VCP/DTSC, FE/SMBRPD, REF/SMBRPD, LUR/SMBRPD, HWMP/DTSC, SARA Title III-313, NRC, PCB/TSCA, FFIS, or CICIS databases.

There was a single listing associated with the project site at County of Los Angeles Lifeguard Station (1201 The Strand). Approximately 0.84 tons of asbestos-containing waste (presumably construction debris) was removed in 1994/95 during the renovation of the Lifeguard station.

The database search returned 32 nearby sites identified as known environmental concerns; although none were immediately adjacent to the property, ten (10) of these were located within ¼ mile of the property and are summarized as follows:

- A newspaper press now closed but formerly located at 34 14th Street, $^{1}/_{10}$ of a mile north of the site was listed for asbestos and lead under ERNS. Lead presumably from printing ink was found in the sandy soil and cleaned up by SCS Engineers prior to the construction of a hotel on the property.

- Five (5) of the ten sites were CALSITES listings with no further action required.

- Two (2) of the sites within ¼ mile radius of the project site were former Leaking Underground Storage Tank locations now listed as case closed.

- One (1) site within ¼ mile radius of the project site was a listing for Leaking Underground Storage Tank at 1325 Hermosa Avenue located 0.1 mile northeast of the site where contaminated soil from a leaking underground storage tank had been excavated and disposed in an approved disposal site. The project was last reviewed on April 23, 1996, however the notation for the record indicates that additional assessment is needed. The site is also listed as a currently permitted underground storage tank location.

No Fire Insurance Maps are available for the area surrounding the subject site — according to BBL, lack of coverage of the site indicates an area of little commercial development prior to 1950. The historical tenant report for the first block of Pier Avenue/Pier Plaza closest to the property goes back as early as 1931 and reveals only restaurants and a single auto supply retail store which operated during the 1940s and 50s at 19 Pier Avenue.

Based on the information summarized above, our responses to your comments are as follows:

1. No current or historic uses of the project site which are likely to have resulted in the release of hazardous wastes/substances were discovered in the records search or are known to the City. The adjacent LA County lifeguard station is a newly constructed facility and the former facility which was found to contain asbestos was previously remediated and the waste properly disposed during demolition.

2. No known or potentially contaminated sites were identified within the proposed project area.

3-5. The records search did not indicate likely contamination at the site which would warrant an environmental investigation, sampling or remediation of the project site.

6. No property adjacent to the site has been identified as being currently contaminated with hazardous chemicals (the asbestos at the lifeguard station having been remediated). The nearest site of potential concern identified in the records search is a leaking underground storage site located $^{1}/_{10}$ of a mile northeast of the property. The leaking underground tank and soils at this site were reportedly excavated and removed under the oversight of a Local Agency. Presumably some residual soil and groundwater contamination may remain, but

at a distance of $^{1}/_{10}$ mile from the project site it is unlikely to pose a significant hazard to construction.

7. No buildings or other structures are planned for demolition as part of this project.

8. The project does propose to excavate beach sand and will also include construction of a monitoring well for purposes of project assessment. Excavated uncontaminated sand will be returned to the beach. If for some unforeseen reason evidence of contamination is discovered during excavation or well installation, proper measures will be taken to contain, sample and properly dispose of contaminated sands. No import of soil to the site is proposed.

9. Standard precautions to protect human health and the environment from the hazards of routine construction activity will be taken. Standard precautions will be taken during construction to identify and respond to unexpected and previously unidentified sources of hazardous materials.

10-13. The project is not expected to generate hazardous wastes. Construction vehicles and equipment will be staged and maintained in a manner to prevent release of motor fuels and lubricants and to avoid contamination of beach sand. Any small amounts of sand or other materials which become contaminated with motor fuels or lubricants will be promptly drummed, managed and properly disposed in accordance with California Hazardous Waste Control Law.

14. The project is being conducted to infiltrate runoff from a storm drain and is being conducted in partnership with the Los Angeles County Flood Control District/Department of Public Works to comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads for Bacteria issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, and with funding from a grant from the State Water Resources Control Board. The storm drain which is the subject of this project is operated under an NPDES MS4 permit issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board.

15. If evidence of sand and/or saline groundwater contamination is suspected during construction of the project, construction will cease and appropriate health and safety procedures will be implemented.

16. The site is unsuitable for agricultural activities and contamination with pesticides or agricultural chemical wastes is not likely.

17. CalSites database was reviewed as part of the records search as described above.

Environmental conditions at any site can not be known with absolute certainty, however based on the records search, the City believes that the potential for environmental hazards at the site is comparatively low. We welcome any further advice you may have

in this matter and enclose a copy of the Environmental Records Search for your reference.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have further questions or advice in this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Morgan, P.E.
Director of Public Works/City Engineer

Enclosure

City of Hermosa Beach

Civic Center, 1315 Valley Drive, Hermosa Beach, California 90254-3885

September 25, 2007

Mr. Dave Singleton, Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission
915 Capitol Mall, Room 364
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: CEQA Notice of Completion; Negative Declaration for Hermosa Strand Infiltration Trench Phase I

Dear Mr. Singleton:

The City of Hermosa Beach received your letter of June 28, 2007 regarding your concerns that construction on our project site would cause "a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical [or] archaeological resource..." The City of Hermosa Beach provides the following response to your concerns.

The City of Hermosa Beach is proposing to construct a stormwater diversion trench for an existing County-owned storm drain which outfalls just south of the Hermosa Pier. Construction for the trench will take place on the beach against the ocean side of the cutoff wall that extends approximately 14 feet deep and supports The Strand walkway.

An extensive EIR was previously conducted for TyCom Corporation as a preliminary step to TyCom's installation of communication cables in the area of Hermosa Beach that includes our project site. Their EIR analyzed the entire length of Hermosa Beach and much of King Harbor in Redondo Beach. The cable-installation process is a significantly more invasive process than the installation of our Infiltration Trench; their analysis, therefore, covered a broader range than would be required for our project. Relevant information found in the Cultural Resources portion of the TyCom EIR is provided as follows:

- "Statistical Research, Inc., (SRI) conducted an assessment of cultural resources in the vicinity of the project. Methods of data collection used in the assessment included a review of relevant literature, an archaeological records check, archival

review, interviews with knowledgeable individuals, and a brief 'windshield' survey of the project site...The cultural resources assessment was designed to

- ❖ Identify and record prehistoric and historic cultural resources in the terrestrial and marine portions of the project;
- ❖ Evaluate the significance of any identified resources to the extent possible based on available data;
- ❖ Determine whether significant or potentially significant cultural resources might be subject to adverse impacts from the project; and
- ❖ Recommend measures to mitigate identified impacts.

The terrestrial portion of the assessment included a records check at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System located at California State University, Fullerton; a review of relevant literature and archival sources; Native American consultation; and a field check of the project cable landing areas and routes. The marine portion of the assessment consisted of a literature review, a shipwreck inventory review, and the analysis of sidescan sonar data collected by Seafloor Surveys International, Inc., (SSI) on behalf of TyCom Transpacific..."

- The survey did not find any known prehistoric or historic artifacts within the project area of potential effect of the proposed Infiltration Trench Phase I.

- "The Strand was a feature of Hermosa Beach even before the City's inception in 1906. The first official survey was made in 1901 for the board walk on The Strand, between Hermosa Avenue and Santa Fe Avenue (since renamed Pier Avenue). Construction of The Strand was undertaken shortly after 1901.

  Title to The Strand was transferred to the newly-created city in a deed from the Hermosa Beach Land and Water Company. It came with restrictions that stated it was to be held in perpetuity as "a beach playground, free from commerce, for the benefits of the residents of Hermosa and for the sea lovers of Southern California." High tides sometimes washed portions of this walk away and in 1914, part of it was replaced by cement sidewalk. The remaining 2,000 feet (610 meters) on the north end was completed in cement in 1926. Although The Strand is more than 50 years old, the surface of The Strand and the wall along portions of The Strand are of recent construction according to the City of Hermosa Beach. The Strand near Second Street and near Longfellow Avenue have been reconstructed since 1990."

- "The first pier in Hermosa Beach was built in 1904. It was constructed entirely of wood and extended 500 feet (152 meters) out into the ocean. In 1913, this pier was partly washed away; it was later torn down and a new one built to replace it. This new pier was constructed of concrete and was 1,000 feet long, paved with asphalt the entire length. The current Hermosa Beach Municipal Pier represents

the next generation. As was the previous version, it is owned by the city of Hermosa Beach and is located at the foot of Pier Avenue. It was built in 1964 and renovated in 1988 with a FEMA grant after storm damage. ('California Public Piers' in California State Historic Resources Inventory #19-150438)."

The City of Hermosa Beach holds title to the beach above the mean high tide and has held that title since the City's incorporation in 1907. The proposed project is located on the beach directly adjacent to The Strand wall in the vicinity of the pier and lifeguard station. It is our belief that the area of potential effect of the proposed Infiltration Trench Phase I has been so heavily disturbed during the construction of the concrete Strand wall, as well as multiple reconstructions of the pier and lifeguard station, that it is highly unlikely for artifacts of any significance to remain at the shallow depths of unconsolidated sand which the project will disturb. Additionally, the project does not contemplate any adverse impact on either the Strand or the pier.

Based on the foregoing information, the City does not find evidence that the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archaeological resource within the area of potential effect. Therefore, the City does not believe that mitigation for historical or archaeological resources is warranted.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Morgan, P.E.
Director of Public Works/City Engineer