

**City of Rancho Palos Verdes**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**



**1. Project title:**

Planning Case No. ZON2015-00326  
Rancho Palos Verdes Peafowl Management Plan

**2. Lead agency name/ address:**

City of Rancho Palos Verdes  
Community Development Department  
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard  
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

**3. Contact person and phone number:**

Ara Mihranian, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director  
City of Rancho Palos Verdes  
(310) 544-5228

**4. Project location:**

City of Rancho Palos Verdes  
County of Los Angeles

**5. Project sponsor's name and address:**

City of Rancho Palos Verdes  
Community Development Department  
30940 Hawthorne Boulevard  
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

**6. General Plan designation:**

Varies

**7. Coastal Plan designation:**

While some of the management policies of Peafowl Management Plan may apply in the areas of the City within the coastal zone, the trapping activities are not planned to occur in those areas.

**8. Zoning:**

Varies

**9. Description of project:**

The project consists of the adoption of a plan to humanely manage the Peafowl population within the boundaries of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes. Through the adoption and implementation of a Peafowl Management Plan (PMP), the City intends to reduce and maintain the Peafowl population within the City at the levels identified in the 2000 Peafowl Census Report. The PMP will support the coexistence of peafowl within the semi-rural areas of the City by using the following methods:

- Public Education & Deterrent Measures (potentially City wide).
- Humane Trapping & Relocation of up to 150 birds per year in order to maintain the 2000 peafowl population (only in certain focus areas of the City, as discussed below).

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

The methods listed above to manage the City's Peafowl population is based on best known researched management practices and management tools described in the PMP.

Trapping is envisioned to occur only in the Portuguese Bend, Crestridge, Sunnyside Ridge, Grandview, and Malaga Adjacent areas, as shown in the maps attached hereto in Exhibit A. Trapped birds will be relocated to areas outside of the City to approved locations in California.

The project does not include amendments to the General Plan, Zoning, Local Coastal Plan or other City ordinances.

**10. Description of project site (as it currently exists):**

The City of Rancho Palos Verdes was incorporated in 1973 and consists of a total area of about 13.6 square miles with 7.5 miles of coastline. Elevations range from sea level to 1,480 feet. The population of the City is over 42,000 and the character of the community is primarily residential with about 15,000 single-family residences, 40 multi-family properties and 155 commercial/institutional parcels. The City is largely built out, with most development activity in the City's single-family neighborhoods consisting of the expansion and/or redevelopment of existing residences, with the occasional development of new residences on existing vacant lots. There are few large contiguous parcels remaining to be subdivided for single-family residential use. There are also significant areas of the City, particularly around the Portuguese Bend area of the City, that have been acquired for and maintained as natural open space.

**11. Surrounding land uses and setting:**

	<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Significant Features</b>
On-site and adjacent to the City's Coastal Zone	Existing residential, commercial, institutional and open space land uses in the City of Rancho Palos Verdes	Residential development, natural open space, golf course and hotel development, and the dramatic coastal bluffs and beach areas comprise the significant features of the coastal zone.
Northeast, East & Southeast of the City	The cities of Lomita and Los Angeles (Harbor City, Wilmington and San Pedro)	The cities of Lomita and Los Angeles serve as gateways to the Port of Los Angeles and the harbor area. They are developed with a mixture of single- and multi-family residential, commercial and industrial uses.
South & Southwest of the City	Pacific Ocean	The Pacific Ocean borders the City of Rancho Palos Verdes for roughly 7.5 miles, and includes tidepools and sandy beaches. There is a State marine reserve at Abalone Cove.
Northwest	The City of Palos Verdes Estates	The City of Palos Verdes Estates is the

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

	<b>Land Uses</b>	<b>Significant Features</b>
of the City		oldest city on the Palos Verdes Peninsula. It is primarily developed with single-family residential neighborhoods, with commercial and multi-family development at Lunada Bay and Malaga Cove. Given issues with Peafowl, Palos Verdes Estates previously adopted a peafowl management plan for areas of that City.
North of the City	The cities of Rolling Hills Estates and Rolling Hills	The cities of Rolling Hills Estates and Rolling Hills were both incorporated in the 1950s, and both emphasize a semi-rural equestrian lifestyle. The major commercial center on the Palos Verdes Peninsula is located in the City of Rolling Hills Estates. The City of Rolling Hills is gated and contains no commercial development.

**12. Other public agencies whose approval is required:** none

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

**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.

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics               | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources        | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources            | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning        | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing       | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic   | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems     | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature:  Date: July 8, 2015

Printed Name: Ara Mhuranian, Deputy Director For: City of Rancho Palos Verdes

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</b>					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?					X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historical buildings, within a state scenic highway?					X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> a-d) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping and relocation of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely. The proposed project would not result in significant physical modifications or alterations of land or construction of any structures that could impact aesthetic resources. As such, there will be no significant aesthetic impacts as a result of the adoption and implementation of the PMP.</p>					
<b>2. AGRICULTURE &amp; FOREST RESOURCES<sup>1</sup>. Would the project:</b>					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use?					X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as					X

<sup>1</sup> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?					
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> a-e) Although properties in the City are not specifically zoned or otherwise officially designated for agricultural use, in the Residential-Single-Family, 1 DU/acre (RS-1) zone noncommercial agricultural uses of one-acre or less are permitted by right and when greater than one-acre, a conditional use permit is required. Because the adoption and implementation of the PMP will have no expected effect upon agricultural resources, there will be no environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project with respect to agricultural resource issues.</p>					
<p><b>3. AIR QUALITY<sup>2</sup>. Would the project:</b></p>					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?					X
c) 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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?					X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b>  a – e) The City of Rancho Palos Verdes is located within a five-county region in southern California that is designated as the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). Air quality management for the SCAB is administered by the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to address federal and state air quality standards. Although high level of air quality is prevalent in Rancho Palos Verdes given the prevailing wind patterns and the ocean influence, the adoption and implementation of the PMP, including peafowl trapping and relocation, will not result in emission discharge. Therefore,</p>					

<sup>2</sup> Where available, the significant criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control districts may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
there will be no air quality impacts resulting from adoption of the proposed PMP.					
<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					X
c) 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?					X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?					X
e) Conflict with any local polices or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?					X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?					X
<b>Comments:</b> a-f) The City of Rancho Palos Verdes participates in the Natural Community Conservation Planning Act (NCCP) which is a state program adopted by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service that helps identify and provide for the area-wide protection of natural wildlife while allowing for compatible and appropriate local uses. There are various types of vegetation communities identified in the City's NCCP and the General Plan. These vegetation communities include, but are not limited to, Coastal Sage Scrub,					

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Chaparral and Grasslands. As for natural wildlife, there are various species identified in the City's NCCP and General Plan, such as gnatcatcher, cactus wren, Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly, or the El Segundo Blue Butterfly.</p> <p>Although peafowl may reside and forage in areas included in the NCCP preserves, significant impacts to those areas have not been observed in the past. Further, the Management Plan is intended to reduce and maintain the peafowl population at levels where no impacts to biological resources would occur.</p> <p>The peafowl themselves are not a species that is native to the area, having been introduced to the Peninsula by man. Peafowl are not identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in a local or regional plan, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife. Although not subject to special protections, the PMP contemplates exclusive use of human trapping and relocation practices. Trapped peafowl will be relocated to homes that have been screened by the City and the trapping vendor to ensure the individuals adopting the peafowl have some avian experience and have adequate space for peafowl to roam freely.</p> <p>The PMP does not envision the use of any chemical controls, which could have the potential to impact other bird species.</p> <p>Therefore, there will be no impact to any species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural community, wetlands, biological resources or to any adopted habitat conservation plan as a result of adoption of a PMP.</p>					
<p><b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b></p>					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?					X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?					X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?					X
d) Disturbed any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> a-d) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely. The proposed project would not result in significant physical modifications or alterations of land that could impact cultural resources. As such, there will be no significant cultural resource impacts as a result of the adoption and implementation of the PMP.</p>					
<p><b>6. GEOLOGY/SOILS. Would the project:</b></p>					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault,					X

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? <sup>3</sup>					
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?					X
iv) Landslides?					X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?					X
c) Be located on a geological 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?					X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), thus creating substantial risks to life or property?					X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?					X
<b>Comments:</b> a-e) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures; thus, there are no impacts to geology and soils conditions. As such, there will be no significant exposure to geological risks as a result of the adoption and implementation of the PMP.					
<b>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:</b>					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?					X
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?					X
<b>Comments:</b> a-b) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within					

<sup>3</sup> Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>the City. The project will not result in any emissions of greenhouse gasses since the proposed PMP intends to reduce and maintain the City's peafowl population to the levels in the 2000 Peafowl Census Report subject to certain parameters to ensure trapping and relocation is conducted humanely. As such, there will be no greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the adoption and implementation of the PMP.</p>					
<p><b>8. HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</b></p>					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?					X
b) 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?					X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?					X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?					X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					X
f) 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?					X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?					X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized					X

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?					
<p><b>Comments:</b> (a-h) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The project will not result in the exposure of hazardous material warranting appropriate remediation and mitigation. There are no airports located within or in close proximity of the City of Rancho Palos Verdes. Since the project does not involve any development, but rather intends to reduce and maintain the City's peafowl population to the levels in the 2000 Peafowl Census Report subject to certain parameters to ensure trapping and relocation is conducted humanely, as its proposed, the project will not interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Further, the project will not result in the exposure to people or structures to any adverse risks. Therefore, there would be no impact caused by the proposed project.</p>					
<p><b>9. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</b></p>					
a) Violate any water quality standards or wastewater discharge requirements?					X
b) 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 (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)?					X
c) 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?					X
d) 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?					X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?					X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?					X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal					X

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate map or other flood hazard delineation map?					
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?					X
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?					X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> (a-j) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures, thereby not impacting hydrology or water quality. As such, there will be no impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality as a result of the proposed project.</p>					
<p><b>10. LAND USE/PLANNING. Would the project:</b></p>					
a) Physically divide an established community?					X
b) 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 plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					X
c) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> (a-c) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project will not result in a physical division of land, nor any conflicts with City documents, such as the City's General Plan, Municipal Code or Coastal Specific Plan to name a few. Additionally, peafowl are not considered a protected indigenous species and are therefore not subject the City's NCCP or HCP. As such, there will be no impacts with respect to land use and planning as a result of the adoption and implementation of the PMP.</p>					
<p><b>11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b></p>					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?					X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a					X

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?					
<p><b>Comments:</b> a-b) According to the Natural Environment Element of the General Plan, areas in Rancho Palos Verdes were quarried for basalt, diatomaceous earth, and Palos Verdes stone between 1948 and 1958. However, the proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts to mineral resources associated with adoption of a PMP.</p>					
<p><b>12. NOISE. Would the project result in:</b></p>					
a) 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?					X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?					X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					X
f) 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?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> a-f) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures and thus no noise production will result from the proposed project. Moreover, the trapping and relocation of peafowl is intended reduce and maintain the City's peafowl population to the levels in the 2000 Peafowl Census Report which will likely result in a reduction of ambient noise levels within certain residential neighborhoods. As such,</p>					

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
there will be no significant noise impacts associated with the adoption and implementation of the PMP.					
<b>13. POPULATION/HOUSING. Would the project:</b>					
a) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?					X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					X
<b>Comments:</b> (a-c) The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project will not have any impacts to population or housing, and no existing housing or persons would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact upon population and housing.					
<b>14. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b>					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:					
i) Fire protection?					X
ii) Police protection?					X
iii) Schools?					X
iv) Parks?					X
v) Other public facilities?					X
<b>Comments:</b> The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project will not result in the need for added protection services or the need for schools, added parks, or other public facilities. As such, there will be no environmental impacts resulting from the adoption and implementation of the PMP with respect to public services issues.					

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>15. RECREATION.</b>					
a) Would the project increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project will not result in the physical deterioration of park grounds or facilities. As such, the proposed project would have no impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.</p>					
<b>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:</b>					
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?					X
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?					X
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?					X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?					X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?					X

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures and thus no traffic generation will result from the project. As such, the proposed project would have no impacts related to traffic and transportation.</p>					
<p><b>17. UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</b></p>					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?					X
b) 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?					X
c) 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?					X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?					X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?					X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?					X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?					X

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>Comments:</b> The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City and will not result in requiring added utilities to the City. Thus, there will be no increase in demand for utilities or service systems as a result of the adoption and implementation of the PMP.</p>					

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. Peafowl are not considered a protected indigenous species and are therefore not considered protected wildlife. As such, the adoption and implementation of the PMP will not significantly degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The proposed project will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history. Therefore, the effects of the proposed project will have no impact upon the natural environment and cultural resources.</p>					
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? <sup>4</sup>					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. The proposed project does not include any physical modifications or alterations of the existing land or structures, and the approval of the proposed project will not grant any entitlement to develop. As such, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.</p>					
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?					X
<p><b>Comments:</b> The proposed project involves the adoption and implementation of the PMP which includes the trapping of peafowl subject to specific parameters to ensure the trapping and relocation is conducted humanely within the City. As discussed above, all of the potentially environmental effects of the proposed project are expected to have no impacts. As such, the project does not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.</p>					
<b>19. EARLIER ANALYSES.</b>					

<sup>4</sup> "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

**Environmental Checklist**  
**Case No. ZON2015-00326 (Peafowl Management Plan)**  
**July 8, 2015**

Issues and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case a discussion should identify the following items:</p>					
<p>a) <b>Earlier analysis used.</b> Identify and state where they are available for review.</p>					
<p><b>Comments:</b> Not applicable.</p>					
<p>b) <b>Impacts adequately addressed.</b> Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.</p>					
<p><b>Comments:</b> Not applicable.</p>					
<p>c) <b>Mitigation measures.</b> For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions of the project.</p>					
<p><b>Comments:</b> Not applicable.</p>					
<p><b>Authority:</b> Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.</p>					
<p><b>Reference:</b> Public Resources Code Sections 21080 (c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 321094, 21151; <i>Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino</i>, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); <i>Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors</i>, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).</p>					
<p><b>20. SOURCE REFERENCES.</b></p>					
1	City of Rancho Palos Verdes, <u>Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan</u> , and associated Environmental Impact Report. Rancho Palos Verdes, California as amended through August 2001.				
2	City of Rancho Palos Verdes Zoning Map				
3	South Coast Air Quality Management District. <u>CEQA AIR Quality Handbook</u> . Diamond Bar, California: November 1993 (as amended).				
4	Official Maps of Seismic Hazard Zones provided by the Department of Conservation of the State of California, Division of Mines and Geology				
5	City of Rancho Palos Verdes Archeology Map.				
6	City of Rancho Palos Verdes, <u>Natural Communities Conservation Plan</u> . Rancho Palos Verdes, California as adopted August 2004				
7	Institute of Traffic Engineers, <u>ITE Trip Generation, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition</u> .				
8	City of Rancho Palos Verdes Geographic Information System (GIS) database and maps				
9	State of California, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, <u>Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps</u> . Sacramento, California, accessed via website, March 2008				
10	Official Maps of Tsunami Inundation Areas provided by the Department of Emergency Management of the State of California and the California Geological Survey				
11	City of Rancho Palos Verdes Municipal Code				
12	Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (i.e., "Cortese List")				
13	Cities of Rancho Palos Verdes and Rolling Hills Estates Joint Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan				
14	City of Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan Housing Element				
15	City of Rancho Palos Verdes Draft Peafowl Management Plan				

