

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST**
(To Be Completed by Planning Department)

1. **Project Title:** 4057 Jefferson Avenue Subdivision
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2011-00044
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** San Mateo County Planning Department, 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** James A. Castañeda, AICP 650/363-1853
5. **Project Location:** 4057 Jefferson Avenue, Emerald Lake Hills; 900 Fallen Leaf Way, Emerald Lake Hills
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 068-211-270 (3.93 acres) and 068-211-020 (0.60 acres); 4.53 acres combined
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Jefferson 10 Investors, LP, Attention: Eric Zweig
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** Eric Zweig
9. **General Plan Designation:** Low Density Residential (0.3-2.3 dwelling units/acres)
10. **Zoning:** RH/DR (Residential Hillside/Design Review)
11. **Description of the Project:** Jefferson 10 Investors, LP has applied for a Major Subdivision, Grading Permit, Lot Line Adjustment, and Street Name Assignment to subdivide a 3.88-acre lot into 9 new parcels at the former horse ranch located at 4057 Jefferson Avenue in unincorporated Emerald Lake Hills in San Mateo County. The project involves approximately 9,887 cubic yards of grading (8,970 cubic yards (cy) for the lots; 1,017 cy for the private road). The proposal includes the addition of a new cul-de-sac (private street), and pads for nine new single-family homes. The project also involves a Lot Line Adjustment to acquire 6,312 sq. ft. from the adjacent parcel (APN 068-211-020). All existing structures will be demolished. Site improvements will include new underground water, sewer gas, communications, and storm drain lines. The project will preserve the existing stream channel (Arroyo ojo de Agua), including a large willow thicket. A portion of willow thicket will be removed and the streambed upstream of the willow thicket will be enhanced with new willow and indigenous riparian tree, shrub and ground cover planting. Sixty-three trees (61 are protected) will be removed and replaced with primarily with indigenous trees.
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The site is surrounded by single-family residences in the unincorporated community of Emerald Lake Hills. It is within the Redwood City sphere of influence, which includes areas under the jurisdiction of San Mateo County that may be serviced by Redwood City.

13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None
14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?:** No California Native American tribe has requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1.

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” or “Significant Unless Mitigated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Energy		Public Services
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Recreation
X	Air Quality	X	Hydrology/Water Quality	X	Transportation
X	Biological Resources	X	Land Use/Planning		Tribal Cultural Resources
X	Climate Change		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
	Cultural Resources	X	Noise	X	Wildfire
	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		Mandatory Findings of Significance

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. 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.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. 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 for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not within any County- or State-designated Scenic Corridor. Though largely undeveloped, the property is located within a residential area. The property is not located in adjacent to scenic vistas, public lands, water bodies, or designated scenic roads. The proposed and future development of this site is consistent with the Low Density Residential General Plan land use designation. Future single-family residential development is subject to the Emerald Lake Hills Design Review standards, which will include a public hearing.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, County Maps</p>				

1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not within a State-designated Scenic Corridor. Existing vegetation on the property consists of mature trees typically found within the area. No rock outcroppings are present on the property nor are any historic buildings present.</p> <p>Source: County Maps, California Office of Historic Preservation</p>				
1.c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, such as significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
<p>Discussion: The parcel is located within an urbanized area and zoned Residential Hillside/Design Review. Though no buildings are proposed, earthwork includes 9,887 cubic yards. The Emerald Lake Hills Design Review district discusses minimizing tree removal and alteration of natural topography to the extent possible. The project involves 10,887 cy, thus minimizing land alterations. The majority of trees will be removed in order to accommodate relocation of existing utilities (e.g., storm drain pipes), construction of new biotreatment areas and detentions pipes, and driveways to serve future residences. Tree replacement will occur as the project is constructed, at times of year that ensure the success of tree plantings by minimizing stress, i.e., October through March. The earthwork and tree replacement are consistent with the Emerald Lake Hills Design Review district and General Plan Policies 4.29 (<i>Trees and Vegetation</i>) and 4.16 (<i>Supplemental Design Guidelines for Communities</i>). Future residential development, including landscaping, is required to undergo Design Review permitting.</p> <p>Source: Site Plans, Zoning Regulations, General Plan</p>				
1.d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed subdivision would not create a new source of significant light or glare. Any future development of the property with single-family homes would require a design review process. However, the project site is located in a neighborhood characterized by single-family houses. Any future development will not emit more light than any other houses in the area.</p> <p>Source: Project Description.</p>				

1.e.	Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not within, nor adjacent to a State- or County-designated Scenic Corridor.</p> <p>Source: County Maps</p>					
1.f.	If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is located in a Design Review District. While the applicant has not proposed development of any structures on the site under this subdivision application, future development of the property will need to comply with the County's Design Review regulations in the San Mateo County Zoning Code. As previously discussed in 1.c., above, the current proposal is consistent with the Design Review district for tree removal and earthwork.</p> <p>Source: County Maps.</p>					
1.g.	Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?			X	
<p>Discussion: See the discussion provided to Question 1.a. above.</p> <p>Source: County Maps</p>					

<p>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. 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 Department 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. Would the project:</p>					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a.	For lands outside the Coastal Zone, 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 Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X

<p>Discussion: According to the California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Finder, the property is mapped <i>Urban and Built-Up Land</i> and does not contain Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance.</p> <p>Source: County Maps, California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Finder</p>					
2.b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<p>Discussion: The site is not in an agricultural zone preserve. There are no Open Space Easements or a Williamson Act contract on the parcel.</p> <p>Source: County Maps</p>					
2.c.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X
<p>Discussion: The site does not contain Farmland. Forest land, as defined in PRC Section 12220(g) includes <i>land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allow for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.</i> Currently the property contains less than 10 percent tree cover and the size, location, and conditions of this parcel are not conducive to forest management given its residential location and private ownership. Thus, no impacts will occur.</p> <p>Source: Zoning Maps, California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Finder</p>					
2.d.	For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X
<p>Discussion: The subject parcel is not located within the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Source: Zoning Maps</p>					
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?				X
<p>Discussion: As mapped by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, soils within the property are rated Class 8, which are defined as <i>soils and miscellaneous areas having limitation that preclude commercial plant production.</i> No soil damage or loss of agricultural land is anticipated with this project given the soil capability of the property.</p> <p>Source: Zoning Maps, Site Visit, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey.</p>					

<p>2.f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</p> <p><i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i></p>				X
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The property is zoned Residential Hillside and allowed uses include single-family residences. The General Plan land use designation is Low Density Residential. No rezoning is proposed with this project.

Source: San Mateo County Zoning Maps, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>3.a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p>				X

The proposed project would not conflict with nor obstruct implementation of the BAAQMD *Clean Air Plan*. The *Clean Air Plan* includes increases in regional construction, area, mobile, and stationary source activities, and operations in its emission inventories and plans for achieving attainment of air quality standards. Chapter 5 of the *Clean Air Plan* contains the BAAQMD’s strategy for achieving the plan’s climate and air quality goals. This control strategy is the backbone of the *Clean Air Plan*.

The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of nine (9) new, single-family homes. The control measures in the *Clean Air Plan* do not apply to the proposed project and, therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the *Clean Air Plan*. No impact would occur.

Source: BAAQMD and MIG 2019; see Appendix A, Section 4.3.1

<p>3.b. 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?</p>		X		
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Discussion: The proposed project would not generate criteria air pollutant emissions during construction or operation of the nine proposed single-family homes that would be cumulatively considerable. As described in Section 4.3.2 of Appendix A, the proposed project would generate both short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions; however, these emissions would be far below the BAAQMD’s recommended thresholds of significance. The

BAAQMD considers any quantity of fugitive dust emissions generated during construction activities to be potentially significant, unless the project implements the BAAQMD's eight, recommended fugitive dust best management practices (BMPs), as identified in the BAAQMD's *CEQA Guidelines*. Accordingly, the County would require the project applicant implement Mitigation Measure 1, to reduce fugitive dust emissions from the proposed project's construction activities. After the implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 this impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 1: To reduce fugitive dust that would be generated during project construction activities, the County shall require the project Applicant and/or the Applicant's designated contractors, contractor's representatives, or other appropriate personnel to implement the following BAAQMD basic dust control measures.

- a. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day during construction and adequately wet demolition surfaces to limit visible dust emissions.
- b. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose materials off the project site.
- c. Use wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day to remove all visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads (dry power sweeping is prohibited) during construction of the proposed project.
- d. Vehicle speeds on unpaved roads/areas shall not exceed 15 miles per hour.
- e. Complete all areas to be paved as soon as possible and lay building pads as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. Minimize idling time of diesel-powered construction equipment to five minutes and post signs reminding workers of this idling restriction at access points and equipment staging areas during construction of the proposed project.
- g. Maintain and properly tune all construction equipment in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and have a CARB-certified visible emissions evaluator check equipment prior to use at the site.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the name and telephone number of the construction contractor and County staff person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The publicly visible sign shall also include the contact phone number for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Effectiveness: These measures would minimize and/or avoid local impacts from fugitive dust.

Implementation: The County shall include these measures on all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan (e.g., building, grading, and improvement plans) documents.

Timing: During construction activities.

Monitoring: The County shall review all appropriate bid, contract, and engineering and site plan documents for inclusion of dust control measures.

Source: BAAQMD and MIG 2019; see Appendix A, Section 4.3.2

3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?			X	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Discussion: Some people are more affected by air pollution than others. The Bay Area Air Quality

Management District (BAAQMD) defines sensitive receptors as “facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly and people with illnesses.” In general, children, senior citizens, and individuals with pre-existing health issues (e.g., asthmatics) are considered sensitive receptors. The BAAQMD considers schools, schoolyards, parks and playgrounds, daycare facilities, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential areas as sensitive air quality land uses and receptors.

The potentially sensitive air quality receptors in and near the proposed project site include:

- Single-family homes along Jefferson Avenue, Yanez Court, Revere Way, and Bayview Way, north of the project site.
- Single-family homes along Wilmington Way, south of the project site.
- Single-family homes along Fallen Leaf Way, east of the project site.
- Redwood Parent Nursery School, east of the project site, at 3997 Jefferson Street.

The Parent’s Nursery School located provides day care and educational classes for up to 75 children ranging in age from 13 months to 4 years and is open for 10 months of the year. At any one time, the maximum number of children on the site is about 35. Therefore, the project could potentially expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations.

Diesel engines emit both gaseous and solid material; the solid material is known as Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM). Almost all DPM is less than 1 micrometer, or micron (μm), in diameter, and thus is a subset of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$. DPM is typically composed of carbon particles and numerous organic compounds. Diesel exhaust also contains gaseous pollutants, including volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x). The majority of DPM is small enough to be inhaled into the lungs and what particles are not exhaled can be deposited on the lung surface and in the deepest regions of the lungs where the lung is most susceptible to injury. In 1998, the California Air Resource Board (CARB) identified DPM as a TAC based on evidence of a relationship between diesel exhaust exposure, lung cancer and other adverse health effects. DPM also contributes to the same non-cancer health effects as $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure. Project-related construction activities would emit $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ from equipment exhaust. Nearly all the project’s $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ emissions from equipment exhaust would be DPM and Toxic Air Contaminates (TACs).

A quantitative construction health risk assessment (HRA) was conducted for the proposed project to assess potential, excess cancer and non-cancer health risk increases at sensitive receptor locations associated with DPM exposure from diesel exhaust generated during project construction activities. The HRA found that the Maximum Exposed Individual Receptor (MEIR) would be at approximately 1019 Willington Way. The potential cancer health risk increase at the MEIR location would be approximately 3.2 excess cancers in one million, which is lower than the BAAQMD recommended threshold of 10 excess cancers in one million. The potential health risk increase for a child receptor at the Redwood Parent Nursery School was less than one cancer in one million. Potential non-cancer health risk increases were also below BAAQMD recommended thresholds. For more information on result of the HRA conducted for the proposed project, please see Appendix A, Section 4.3.3.

As noted on page 3 of the geotechnical report prepared by Berlogar Stevens & Associates, approximately 1 to 4 feet of stiff gray-green silty clay, underlain with serpentine, was encountered on the western portion of the site. Serpentine is known to potentially contain naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). During grading and/or excavation of areas containing serpentine rock, the project Applicant and/or the Applicant’s designated contractors would be required to comply with CARB ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (17 CCR §93105). The implementation of these measures would ensure NOA does not become airborne and result in health risks at nearby sensitive receptor locations and pose an individual or combined risk that would be in excess of BAAQMD thresholds. Furthermore, the BAAQMD requires Applicants submit

an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan application that documents the potential sources of dust emissions that may contain asbestos, and the actions that would be taken to prevent its accidental release (e.g., tire shaker, wheel wash system, etc.).

The proposed project would not exposure sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact would be less than significant.

Source: BAAQMD, Berlogar Stevens & Associates 2018, MIG 2019; Appendix A, Section 4.3.3

3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Discussion: Construction of the project would generate typical odors associated with construction activities, such as vehicle exhaust odors. The odors generated by the project would be intermittent and localized in nature and would disperse quickly. There are no other anticipated odor emissions. Therefore, the project would not create emissions or odors that adversely affect a substantial number of people. This impact would be less than significant.

Sources: MIG 2019; Appendix A, Section 4.3.4

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
4.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		

Discussion: No federally or state listed endangered species were found to be present on or near the project site. A California fully protected species, the white-tailed kite, has the potential to forage on the project site, but is not expected to nest there. Other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code are potentially present within the abandoned structures, shrubs and trees, and the removal of any nesting areas could impact nesting birds with clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, grading construction noise and other possible disturbance leading to nest elimination or abandonment. The project also provides roosting and foraging habitat for the rare pallid bat as well as other common bat species that are protected under California Fish and Game Code. The proposed project would remove trees and structures that could be occupied by bats.

Mitigation Measure 2: All construction-related activities (including but not limited to mobilization and staging, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading) shall occur outside the avian nesting season before February 1, or after September 15. If construction activities or noise will occur within that time frame, all suitable habitats located within the project's area of disturbance, including staging and storage areas plus a 250-foot (passerines) and 1,000-foot

(raptor nests) buffer around these areas should be thoroughly surveyed for active nests by a qualified biologist no more than 5 days before commencement of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If project activities are delayed by more than five days following a survey, an additional nesting bird survey shall be performed prior to commencing the activity. The results of the surveys should be documented and submitted to the County Planning and Building Department prior to its issuance of building/grading permits.

If active nests are present, no site disturbance and mobilization of heavy equipment (including but not limited to equipment staging, fence installation, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading), shall take place within 25 feet of non-raptor nests, and 1,000 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified wildlife biologist. In consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, until the chicks have fledged. Monitoring shall be required to insure compliance with the MBTA and relevant California Fish and Game Code requirements. Monitoring dates and findings should be documented and provided to the County Planning/Building Department.

If project construction will last for more than one year, this mitigation measure shall be implemented throughout construction of the project, including home construction for any activities occurring during the nesting season (February 1 to September 15).

Mitigation Measure 3: Before the start of construction and related activities (including, but not limited to mobilization and staging, clearing, grubbing, tree removal, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading), a survey of structures and tree cavities suitable for roosting bats, as well as other roosting habitats, should be conducted within the project footprint. This shall include a 50-foot buffer, as feasible, by a qualified biologist within 14 days prior to the start of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If suitable structures, tree cavities, or other roost habitats are found, an emergence survey of the cavities shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If a rare bat species, an occupied maternity, or a colony roost is detected, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) shall be consulted to determine appropriate measures if the roost cannot be avoided. The results of all surveys shall be documented. Echolocation survey may be needed to verify the presence of bats, or an exclusion zone around the occupied tree or structure until the bats leave the roost. Due to restrictions of the California Health Department, direct contact by workers with any bat is not allowed. The qualified bat biologist should be contact immediately if a bat roost is discovered during project construction.

Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018

4.b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Discussion: Arroyo Ojo de Agua, a tributary of Redwood Creek, flows through the southeastern edge of the project site. Water in the creek originates from properties adjacent to the creek, both upslope and downslope of Jefferson Boulevard, including drainage water from the Woodside Fire Protection District fire station via an outfall structure located in the creek channel. Within and adjacent to this creek is a sizable (0.54-acre) stand of Arroyo Willow (*Salix lasiolepis*) and red willow (*Salix laevigata*) on the project site. Stormwater and irrigation runoff from the neighborhood upslope of Jefferson Boulevard flows into the creek and supports this willow stand via two culverts on the project site and the historic creek channel. One culvert is fed by a channelized drainage that extends about 200 feet from Jefferson Boulevard to a culvert east of an existing house. There is no

aquatic vegetation, rocky substrate, or other habitat features for aquatic life in this drainage channel, as the culvert dries up in the summer and does not support riparian vegetation. The other culvert is fed by a concrete lined channel parallel to Jefferson Boulevard. The two culverts combine into one culvert that drains into the stand of willows near the southern end of the property, and then flows into the creek.

Historic maps of the area depict the headwaters of Arroyo Ojo de Agua as originating upstream of the creek that traverses the edge of the project site. Historic modifications from roadbuilding, grading and stormwater piping have substantially altered historic drainage patterns. These alterations eliminated much of the riparian habitat characteristics once likely present on the project site, but some runoff from the upper watershed still passes through the site in the historic stream channel during most of the year. The majority of stream channel on the project site lacks vegetation common in riparian corridors, except for predominantly non-native species. The drainage system created by historic alterations led to the emergence of an approximately 0.54-acre willow grove that is located on portions of proposed Lots 8, 9 and an adjoining property that is not the subject of this application. Soil testing throughout the corridor confirmed that the stream channel soils lacks wetland properties that are codified in state and federal regulations.

There is also an existing trampoline and non-engineered concrete riprap off to the side of the main stream channel but below top of bank, as well as invasive Himalayan Blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), Italian thistle (*Carduus piccnocephalus*), and eucalyptus below top of bank. A consistent water supply is important for the willow habitat to be maintained. The proposed project would increase runoff through the creation of new impervious surfaces, and will need to be mitigated.

There is also a serpentine bunchgrass grassland on the site that was inspected for rare plant species. This community would be protected under the General Plan if rare species were found, however, as the site is very small, is fragmented from other serpentine grasslands and supports no unique plant species, the removal of this patch through the proposed project is considered to have a less than significant impact.

To assure the maintenance, partial replacement, and protection of habitat for fish, plants, or wildlife, the following mitigation measures are necessary:

Mitigation Measure 4: Removal of the trampoline and concrete riprap from the riparian zone is required to improve the habitat value of the creek corridor. If bank stabilization becomes necessary, bioengineering methods, such as logs, native plant material or natural rocks, shall be used. Remove non-native invasive plants from the riparian zone, primarily the Himalayan blackberry and Italian thistle, and also non-native trees upstream and downstream of the 0.54-acre willow grove including acacia, fig, mayten, eucalyptus, and cedar. Replace the non-native trees with native riparian trees under the direction of a restoration ecologist. A 1:1 ratio is suitable but can be adjusted as necessary by the restoration ecologist.

Mitigation Measure 5: Prepare a Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan and follow Best Management Practices to protect water quality both during construction and post-construction.

Mitigation Measure 6: To compensate for the pruning and removal of 2,500 square feet of willows on proposed lots 9 and 10, plant red willow cuttings taken from the red willow stand or other nearby source under the direction of a restoration ecologist. Willow plantings shall be both upstream (approximately 2,500 sq. ft.) and downstream of the 0.54-acre willow grove. The downstream planting shall be outside of the sanitary sewer easements, but as close to the creek channel as possible. The plantings shall include *Aeschulus californica*, *Baccharis pilularis*, *Heteromeles arbutifolia*, *Quercus agrifolia*, *salix laevigata*, and *salix lasiolepis*, and shall be planted consistent with Willow Restoration and Enhancement Plan prepared by MIG, and dated August 2019.

Mitigation Measure 7: Record a conservation easement on the Parcel Map and adjoin lot on Fallen Leaf Way covering the existing willow grove and the mitigation areas planted to offset partial removal of the existing willow grove. The conservation easement shall preclude development of any kind within the easement area, and shall be subject to management by the homeowners association established to manage the common resources of the subdivision, including the conservation area. The applicant shall have a qualified biologist prepare a management plan for the conservation area for review and approval of Planning and Building Department. The Conservation Area Management Plan (Plan) shall describe the monitoring and maintenance activities needed to ensure the ongoing success of the proposed mitigation willow plantings. The conservation easement area shall be fenced with a perimeter fence that allows for wildlife movement, but clearly delineates the area. The plan shall include measures that ensure:

- a. There would be no significant adverse impact on endangered, rare or threatened species or their habitat;
- b. There are no hazardous materials at or around the project site that may be disturbed or removed;
- c. Stream or river bank stabilization with native vegetation or other bioengineering techniques, the primary purpose of which is to reduce or eliminate erosion and sedimentation; and
- d. Any culvert replacement conducted in accordance with published guidelines of the Department of Fish and Game or NOAA Fisheries, the primary purpose of which is to improve habitat or reduce sedimentation.

Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018

4.c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X		
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Discussion: The project site does not contain state or federally protected wetlands as defined by the state of California’s Wetlands Definition, or the three USACE parameters of hydrology, hydrophytic vegetation, and hydric soils. The creek channel on the project site is considered waters of the state, which include “any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state.” Two mapped data points met both the hydrophytic vegetation and hydrology criteria, but not the soil parameter under the federal rules. Therefore, the site does not have wetlands. However, historic maps of the area depict the headwaters of Arroyo Ojo de Agua as originating upstream of the project site, and the creek traverses the edge of the project site. Historic modifications from roadbuilding, grading and stormwater piping have substantially altered historic drainage patterns. These alterations eliminated much of the riparian habitat characteristics once likely present on the project site, but some runoff from the upper watershed still passes through the site in the historic stream channel during most of the year. The drainage system created by historic alterations led to the emergence of an approximately 0.54-acre willow grove that is located on portions of proposed Lots 8, 9 and 10. Impacts to these areas from the project are adequately addressed by Mitigation Measures 6, 7 and 8.

Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018

4.d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The proposed project is surrounded by developed roads, a fire station and single-family residences, and is not contiguous with other open space areas. The creek provides limited movement opportunities for aquatic species due to downstream modifications such as engineered channels and underground culverts. Thus, the project would not interfere with the movement of any native or migratory wildlife species.

Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018

4.e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?		X		
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Discussion: The project proposal involves the removal of 63 trees, 61 of which are protected trees, Pursuant to Section 6565.21, which provides that in Emerald Lake Hills, trees larger than 6 inches in diameter or 19-inches circumference are protected. One coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) may meet the definition of a heritage tree, as it has two trunks measuring together greater than 48 inches diameter at breast height. Mitigation for the removal of the trees is required. For each of each indigenous tree removed, there shall be a replacement with three (3) or more trees of the same species using at least fifteen (15) gallon size stock. For each loss of a significant exotic tree, there shall be a replacement with one tree from a list maintained by the Community Development Director. Substitutes for trees listed by the Community Development Director may be considered but only when good reason and data are provided which show that the substitute tree can survive and flourish in the regional climatic conditions. Replacement trees shall be maintained for a 5-year period to ensure establishment. Loss of any particular replacement prior to the termination of the maintenance period shall require the landowner at his/her expense to replace the lost tree or trees. Under such circumstances, the maintenance period will be automatically extended for a period of two (2) additional years.

Protect all existing significant and heritage trees (as defined in Parts Two and Three of Division VIII of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code) to be retained from damage during construction activities including grading. Additional protective measures shall be required for landscaping around significant or heritage trees. The following criteria are to be followed unless topography, proximity of proposed structures, or other valid reason determined by the Design Review Committee or Design Review Administrator, as is applicable, are found to restrict construction so much that protecting any particular significant or heritage tree is not practicable and would mandate less restrictive measures. Any exception to the below listed criteria shall be determined in advance by a licensed landscape architect and best management practices in lieu shall be presented to the decision maker for review and approval: 28.1.65 (1.) Compaction of soils within the dripline of the tree is to be avoided. Only very limited use of heavy equipment within the dripline shall be allowed and should be brought to the attention of the Design Review Administrator prior to such incursion. (2.) Grading in the vicinity of any indigenous significant or heritage oak, bay or madrone tree shall be done with detailed plans provided in advance by a licensed landscape architect. Under no circumstances will fill or excavation at the base of any significant or heritage oak, bay or madrone tree exceed 4 inches from

existing grade. (3.) Additional protective measures such as fencing shall be required to prevent damage to the trunks and root systems of trees during grading and construction. (4.) Trimming of low lying limbs of indigenous trees should be avoided by rerouting construction equipment or by bracing or guying such limbs out of the way of construction equipment. Any such work to shift limbs shall be done under the strict supervision of a licensed landscape architect or arborist.

Mitigation Measure 8: Minimization of the tree removal is required and should be consistent with Section 6565.15(A) of the County’s Zoning Ordinance. Coast live oaks should be retained where possible and protected. Authorization from the County is required for the removal of the significant trees (any tree with a single stem of 6-inch diameter or 19-inch circumference) or the trimming or removal of a heritage tree. Replacement trees will be required as a condition of the grading and tree removal permit.

Mitigation Measure 9: The proposed project must comply with the arborist report recommendations for the protection of trees during construction, including installation and maintenance of protective fencing around retained trees, the presence of the project arborist for all work within the dripline of protected trees, measure to protect trees during trenching, irrigation for protected trees, tree trimming that adheres to ANSI 300 standards and Best Management Practices, and inspection of the site by the project arborist to ensure proper installation of tree protection measures.

Mitigation Measure 10: Removal of plant species listed as “High” or “Moderate” in the California Invasive Plant Council Inventory should be removed prior to the start of project construction. Removal methods that prevent the spread of the invasive plants should be used, such as removing the plants before they go to seed, placing the removed plants in sealed plastic bags or covered dumpsters, and disposing of them as refuse rather than as compost. If removal is not possible, the spread of invasive plant species should be avoided during construction by washing boots and equipment that have contact invasive plants before working in another area. Landscape vegetation must not include any plant species listed as “High,” “Moderate” or “Limited” in the California Invasive Plant Council.

Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018

4.f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project site is not within an area covered by an adopted Habitat Conservation plan or Natural Conservation Community Plan.

Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018

4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project is not located inside or within 200 feet if a marine or wildlife reserve.

Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018

4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
---------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project site is mostly invasive grassland, and does not contain oak woodlands, therefore the project will have no impact on this type of ecosystem.

Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
<p>Discussion: The project was referred to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State for review of historical resources (including both archaeological sites and historical buildings). CHRIS acknowledged a previous study conducted within the project area, however, an additional field study was recommended due to the previous study having been conducted in 1977. CHRIS also recommended referral of the project to the Native American Heritage Commission, which was completed in May 2019. Tribal consultation was not requested by any of the identified Native American tribes. The following mitigation measures are recommended to ensure a less than significant impact upon cultural resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 11: Prior to building permit issuance, the project sponsor shall incorporate, via a note on the first page of the construction plans, that should cultural, paleontological or archaeological resources be encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archaeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e). The note on the plans shall be subject to review and approval of the Current Planning Section.</p> <p>Source: California Register of Historical Resources</p>				
5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		
<p>Discussion: Refer to Question 5.a., above for discussion and mitigation.</p> <p>Source: Site Survey</p>				
5.c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

Discussion: In the unlikely event human remains are encountered during demolition or grading activities, the following mitigation measure is recommended.

Mitigation Measure 12: The treatment of human remains and any associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity within the project site shall comply with applicable State laws. This shall include immediate notification of the County of San Mateo Medical Examiner (ME) and the project proponent.

In the event of the ME’s determination that the human remains are Native American, notification of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), is required who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (PRC Section 5097.98).

The project sponsor, archaeological consultant, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment, with appropriate dignity, of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. The California PRC allows 48 hours to reach agreement on these matters. If the MLD and the other parties do not agree on the reburial method, the project will follow PRC Section 5097.98(b) which states that “. . . the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.”

Source: Site Plan, County Maps

6. ENERGY. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	

Discussion: Long-term energy use, construction of the homes, will be subject to the California Green Building Standards (CalGreen) and must comply with Title 24 (energy standards) regarding construction waste, water conservation, non-toxic sealants, and renewable materials, among others. CalGreen incorporates energy efficient standards within the building as well as considering construction activities in its standards in order to promote energy efficient residential buildings and construction. Short-term energy use is anticipated to be less than significant given the scope of construction activities (construction of the road, relocation of utilities, etc.) in order to prepare the site for residential construction. Demolition of any structures needed to prepare the property for subdivision improvements will be subject to Waste Management Plan requirements regarding salvage, reuse or recycle of inert construction solids as part of the required building demolition permit.

Source: Project Scope, California Green Building Standards, EECAP

6.b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.		X		
<p>Discussion: The San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan Development Checklist identifies activities and measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure compliance with this Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 13: The applicant shall implement the following basic construction measures at all times:</p> <p>a. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxic Control Measure, Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</p> <p>b. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.</p> <p>c. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person, or his/her designee, shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</p> <p>Source: Project Scope, EECAP</p>				

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
<p>i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</p> <p><i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i></p>				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in a designated State of California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. According to the California Geologic Survey, there are no fault traces on the site. The nearest fault, the San Andreas is approximately 1-mile west of the site. Given the</p>				

<p>absence of know active faults on or in close proximity to the site, the potential for fault-ground-rupture to occur on the site is very low to nil, therefore there will be no impacts related to earthquake faults.</p> <p>Sources: Berlogar Stevens Associates Design Level Geotechnical Investigation, Department of Conservation Alquist Priolo Maps, and San Mateo County GIS</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project area could experience strong ground shaking during the lifespan of the project due to several active faults in the Bay Area. The principal concern related to human exposure to ground shaking is that it can result in structural damage, potentially jeopardizing the safety of persons occupying the structures. However, all new facilities would be designed and constructed to meet or exceed relevant standards and codes. The project application includes a site-specific geotechnical report, and the applicant will be required to implement all recommendations identified (or would implement comparable measures) for this project. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: ABAG Earthquake Shaking Potential Map</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in a liquefaction zone, or an area known to have ground failure in the past. Bedrock was predominantly found to be shallow. Therefore, there is no significant impact from potential seismic-related ground failure.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County GIS, Berlogar Stevens & Associates Design Level Geotechnical Investigation</p>				
iv. Landslides?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in an area not identified as being susceptible to landslides; therefore, there is no significant impact from potential landslides.</p> <p>Sources: San Mateo County Landslide Risk Map, Landslide Inventory, and Deep-Seated Landslide Susceptibility Maps, California Department of Conservation, Berlogar Stevens & Associates Design Level Geotechnical Investigation</p>				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?				X
<p><i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i></p> <p>Discussion: The project is not located on or near the coast, and therefore will not have a significant impact on coastal cliffs.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County GIS</p>				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		

Discussion: The project will subdivide and prepare nine lots for future single-family home construction and will involve approximately 9,887 cy of grading. This construction has the potential to generate a loss of topsoil and lead to potential soil erosion through grading, and movement of construction vehicles. Relative to the total grading and potential erosion during the future construction activity at the project site, the following mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that the impact is less than significant:

Mitigation Measure 14: Any unstable areas shall be stabilized through the planting of native plants. These plants must have strong, stabilizing roots.

Mitigation Measure 15: The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities:

- a. Water all active construction and grading areas at least twice daily.
- b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- c. Apply water two times daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at the project site.
- d. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
- e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

Mitigation Measure 16: Prior to the issuance of any permit for development on the site, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

- a. Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b. Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c. Clear only areas essential for construction.
- d. Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative best management practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e. Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and control dust.
- f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of

200 feet from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.

- h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j. Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acre or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.
- k. Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.

Source: Site Plans, Project Geotechnical Report

7.c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?				X
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The site is not located in an identified landslide or liquefaction risk area nor on an unstable geologic unit or on unstable soil. All future construction will be reviewed by the County Geologist, and all site grading will be consistent with the recommendations in the Berlogar Stevens & Associates Design Level Geotechnical Investigation. Therefore, there will be no impact from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse.

Source: San Mateo County Landslide Risk Map, Landslide Inventory, and Deep-Seated Landslide Susceptibility Maps, California Department of Conservation, Berlogar Stevens & Associates ABAG Maps

7.d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The principal concern related to expansive soil is that it can result in structural damage, potentially jeopardizing the safety of persons inhabiting the structures. However, all new facilities would be designed and constructed to meet or exceed relevant standards and codes. In the event that any future development is required by the County to prepare a site-specific geotechnical report, the applicant would implement any recommendations identified (or would implement comparable measures). Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

Source: California Building Code.

7.e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
<p>Discussion: Sewer service will be available from the Emerald Lake Hills Sewer District. Therefore, there would be no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				
7.f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
<p>Discussion: While there are patches of serpentine soils present on-site, and this soil type provides a unique habitat for rare species of plants, no rare species were found on the site. This community would be protected under the General Plan if rare species were found; however, as the site is very small, is fragmented from other serpentine grasslands and supports no unique plant species, the removal of this patch through the proposed project is considered to have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: MIG General Biological Resources Assessment, October 2018</p>				

8. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		
<p>Discussion: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) includes CO2 emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline or diesel. Approval of the subdivision would generate short-term GHG emissions during earthwork activities for site improvements, which involve the operation of several construction-related vehicles during earthwork activities as well as personal vehicles of construction workers to the worksite. This project may result in a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. It will allow this region to accommodate more of the people who work here. This would reduce commute distances, reducing vehicle miles traveled and increasing the likelihood of the use of alternative means of transportation.</p> <p>In addition to Mitigation Measure 13, the following mitigation is recommended to reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 17: The applicant shall utilize the following, where feasible:</p> <p>a. Perform on-site material hauling with trucks equipped with on-road engines (if determined to be</p>				

<p>less emissive than off-road engines).</p> <p>b. Use alternate e fuels for generators at construction sites such as propane or solar, or electrical power.</p> <p>c. Use a California Air Resources Board approved low carbon fuel for construction equipment.</p> <p>d. Encourage and provide carpools, shuttle vans, transit passes and/or secure bicycle parking for construction worker commutes.</p> <p>e. Reduce electricity use in the construction office by using compact fluorescent or LED bulbs, powering off computers every day, and replacing heating and cooling units with more efficient ones.</p> <p>Source: Project Scope</p>				
8.b. Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
<p>Discussion: With implantation of the above recommended mitigation measures, this project will not conflict with the County of San Mateo Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.</p> <p>Source: EECAP</p>				
8.c. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?			X	
<p>Discussion: As discussed in Question 2.c., above, the project parcel is not considered forestland. Sixty-three trees will be removed during earthwork activities but will be replaced prior grading completion.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 18: Prior to recordation, applicant is required to submit a replanting and vegetation plan that sufficiently sequesters the amount of CO2 provided by the existing 63 mature trees proposed to be removed.</p> <p>Source: Planning Maps, Site Survey</p>				
8.d. Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not near a coastal cliff/bluff, thus the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Planning Maps, Site Survey</p>				
8.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X

<p>Discussion: The project site is approximately 600 feet above sea level. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) estimates that mean sea level will rise by no more than 6.6 feet by 2100.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, FEMA Flood Maps, NOAA Sea Level Rise Viewer (https://coast.noaa.gov/slr/)</p>					
8.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not within a special flood hazard area on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM). The site is located in a FEMA Flood Zone X, which is considered a minimal flood hazard. These areas have a 0.2% annual chance of flooding, with areas of 1% annual chance of flooding with average depths of less than 1-foot.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0285E, effective October 16, 2012</p>					
8.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The site is not within a floodway. See discussion in Section 8.f. above.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0285E, effective October 16, 2012</p>					

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
<p>Discussion: Neither the subdivision, earthwork, or future development of the site would entail the routine transport, use, or disposal of toxic or other hazardous materials.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>					
9.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

<p>Discussion: Subdivision and earthwork activities will not involve hazardous materials that could be released of significant amounts.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>					
9.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
<p>Discussion: The project site is across the street from the Redwood Parents Nursery School. However, the project does not involve the use of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Maps</p>					
9.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
<p>Discussion: The Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Database and Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List shows that it is not on such a site. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: EnviroStor Database, Department of Toxic Substances Control</p>					
9.e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The closest airport is San Carlos airport which is located over 3.9 miles northeast of the project site. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Maps, Google Earth</p>					
9.f.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the County's Emergency Operations Plan. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services</p>					

9.g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is located within the wildlands urban interface (WUI) and is designated as a Community at Risk. The project site is located within an area mapped and designated by Cal-Fire as a “very high” fire hazard severity zone. Any building and infrastructure associated with the proposed project would be required to meet all applicable fire standards relating to construction quality, equipment access, and fire water flow requirements. The County, Uniform Building Code, and current Cal-Fire regulations adequately address issues related to wildland fires. This impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 19: The building plans of the Proposed Project shall be reviewed by a representative from Woodside Fire Protection District (WFPD) to ensure that regulations in the County’s Fire Ordinance are met and the project complies with the County Fire/Cal-Fire requirements. Prior to recordation, the applicant shall submit landscaping plans to be reviewed by County staff and by WFPD to ensure that the trees, shrubs and groundcovers are specified to include only fire-adapted plants and located to provide defensible space around the homes.</p> <p>Source: ABAG, Cal-Fire</p>				
9.h. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not in a flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0285E, effective October 16, 2012</p>				
9.i. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not in a floodway. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0285E, effective October 16, 2012</p>				
9.j. 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
<p>Discussion: No dam or levee is located on or near the subject parcel.</p> <p>Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0285E, Project Scope, Division of Safety of Dams</p>				
9.k. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p>Discussion: The site is not in a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow hazard zone. It is not on the coast, in a landslide area, or near a lake or the Bay.</p>				

Source: FEMA Community FIRM Panel 06081C0285E, Landslide Map

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?		X		
<p>Discussion: As discussed in Section 7.b (above), construction has the potential to generate a loss of topsoil and lead to potential soil erosion through grading, and movement of construction vehicles that would degrade surface or ground water quality. With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 14-16, potential project impacts related to sedimentation would be reduced to a less than significant level. The project is also subject to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) C3/C6 requirements.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, Site Plans, Drainage Plans, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board Municipal Regional Permit for Stormwater Management</p>				
10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
<p>Discussion: Redwood City Municipal Water District has stated that they have adequate water to serve the project. Impermeable surfaces resulting from this project will be adequately treated through the incorporation of bioretention areas in compliance with County Stormwater requirements such that groundwater recharge will not be substantially impacted. Further discussion on impermeable surfaces is found in Question 10.g., below.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, Project Plans</p>				
10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				

i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;		X		
<p>Discussion: The project is adjacent but not within a watercourse. New development on the site will include drainage features approved by the Planning and Building Department, and subject to NPDES C3/C6 requirements. Relative to the potential impacts during construction activities, Mitigation Measure 20 and 21 included under the discussion to Question 10.c.ii will ensure that the project will represent a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: County Maps, Project Description</p>				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;		X		
<p>Discussion: As discussed in Question 10.b, above, the project is required to meet stormwater requirements. Biotreatment areas and stormwater drains are included in the proposal and subject to compliance with the County's stormwater program.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 20: At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan to the Department of Public Works in compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 21: Projects subject to Provision C.3.i (individual single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2,500 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, and other projects that create and/or replace at least 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface but are not C.3 Regulated Projects) shall implement at least one (1) of the six (6) site design measures listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use. b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas. c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas. d. Direct runoff from driveways and/or uncovered parking lots onto vegetated areas. e. Construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces. f. Construct bike lanes, driveways, and/or uncovered parking lots with permeable surfaces. <p>A site drainage plan will be required for construction of the new residences that will demonstrate how roof drainage and site runoff will be directed to an approved location. In compliance with the County's Drainage Policy, this plan must demonstrate that post-development flows and velocities to adjoining private property and the public right-of-way shall not exceed those that existed in the pre-developed state.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, San Mateo County's Drainage Policy and Provisions</p>				
iii. 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; or			X	

<p>Discussion: The County requires that all development not increase the volume, velocity, or pollutant load of surface runoff from the site in order to comply with State and Federal runoff permits. The Planning and Building Department has reviewed and conditionally approved the conceptual drainage plans and will review the site's drainage plan for any future development at the site.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
<p>Discussion: The County requires that all development not increase the volume, velocity, or pollutant load of surface runoff from the site in order to comply with State and Federal runoff permits. The Department of Public Works has reviewed and conditionally approved the conceptual drainage plans and will review the site's drainage plan for any future development at the site and it's not anticipated to impede or redirect flood flows.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, Project Plans</p>				
10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
<p>Discussion: The site is not in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, and is not anticipated to risk any release of pollutants as a result of project inundation.</p> <p>Source: FIRM Maps</p>				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X
<p>Discussion: See the discussion provided to Question 10.c.iii.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, Project Plans</p>				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or groundwater quality?				X
<p>Discussion: See the discussion provided to Question 10.c.iii.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?				X
<p>Discussion: See the discussion provided to Question 10.c.iii.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a. Physically divide an established community?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is located within an established community. It will not sever any roads, walkways, paths, or other connections. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Location Maps</p>				
11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
<p>Discussion: As mitigated, the project conforms with the County's General Plan, RH/DR Zoning Regulations, Subdivision Ordinance, and Streets and Highways Code. Thus, the project poses no significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans</p>				
11.c. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?				X
<p>Discussion: Development to the proposed density is accommodated in the current General Plan. The project has been granted conditional approved from the applicable utility agencies, which have capacity to serve the development. The majority of the surrounding lands are currently developed and zoned residential. It is not anticipated that this project will necessitate new commercial facilities, expanded utility or recreational facilities. Thus, the project poses no such impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
<p>Discussion: According to the San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resources Map, there are no known mineral resources on the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, County General Plan Mineral Resources Map</p>				
12.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 11.b.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, County General Plan Mineral Resources Map</p>				

13. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
<p>Discussion: The subdivision would not expose persons to any new noise levels. However, earthwork activities may increase ambient noise levels, however on a temporary basis. For the future development of the parcels, aside from some minor noise generation during construction, the single-family homes, upon completion and operation, would not produce any audible noise. The County Noise Ordinance does not apply to construction noise. The impact of noise at night is much greater than noise generated during the day, as reflected in the Noise Ordinance's more stringent overnight limits. Limiting future construction to the workday will allow nearby residents to enjoy their properties. The following mitigation measure is recommended to ameliorate this impact to a less than significant level:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 22: Noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Saturdays. Said activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving, and</p>				

Christmas (San Mateo Ordinance Code Section 4.88.360).				
Source: Project Plans, County Noise Ordinance				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	
<p>Discussion: The subdivision would not expose people to ground-born vibration or noise. However, earthwork activities are expected to produce minor vibration, though on a temporary basis. Some ground-borne vibration is expected during the construction of the future single-family units and associated infrastructure; however, the vibration will be minimal. Thus, the impact will be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, County Noise Ordinance.</p>				
13.c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located within the proximity of a private airstrip. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Aerial Photography, County GIS</p>				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
<p>Discussion: The population growth will not be significant as a result of the subdivision and future construction of nine single-family dwelling units. The General Plan land use designation for this property is Low Density Residential (0.3-2.3 du/acre); this is the planned density for this community. Subdivision of this property is consistent with that designation (proposed density is 2.29 du/acre). Thus, future development to this density level was anticipated.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				

14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>Discussion: The subject property is currently vacant. No units will be removed, and no residents will be displaced.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				

<p>15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the 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 public services:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?				X
15.b. Police protection?				X
15.c. Schools?				X
15.d. Parks?				X
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X
<p>Discussion: The result of the project will be the creation of nine new lots. The future development of the nine parcels with single-family homes is marginal and will not require the construction of any new facilities. The project will not disrupt acceptable service ratios, response times or performance objectives of fire, police, schools, parks or any other public facilities or energy supply systems. The payment of development fees, such as the parks in-lieu fee, user fees, and additional property taxes generated, will allow the maintenances of the existing serve levels. Thus, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				

16. RECREATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
<p>Discussion: The subdivision will create nine new single-family parcels. The impact of use would be less than significant. Multiple County and State parks, in addition to open space lands, are located within the region. The Planning Department is not aware of any parks that are at or near capacity such that this project would cause physical deterioration of such lands.</p> <p>Source: Project Description</p>				
16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.</p> <p>Source: Project Scope</p>				

17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?				X
<p>Discussion: The County's General Plan transportation policies direct the County to "plan for a transportation system that provides for the safe, efficient and convenient movement of people and goods in and through San Mateo County..." and "plan for providing...maximum freedom of movement for all transportation users and adequate access to various land uses..."</p> <p>RKH Civil and Transportation Engineering prepared a traffic study in 2011 and updated it in 2018 (Appendix B) to assess the transportation impacts of the project. The study assessed a 10-lot subdivision application which was later amended to a nine-lot subdivision. One of the lots in the 10-lot proposal was created sometime during the 1940s and was deemed by the County to be in compliance with the Subdivision Map Act. This lot is being developed separately from this project. The project evaluated streets and intersections within the vicinity of the project, the configuration of</p>				

the proposed private street (cul-de-sac) and the configuration of four driveways to be connected to Jefferson Avenue as part of the project.

The findings from the traffic study reported here are for the original 10-lot subdivision. The RKH report found that “the proposed 10-lot subdivision is estimated to generate 11 net new vehicle trips during the morning street peak hour, 10 net new vehicle trips during the afternoon street peak hour, and 116 daily vehicle trips during an average weekday. The project will not create a significant impact on the streets or intersections within the project study area.” The report also found that “no off-site improvements are needed to accommodate project generated traffic.” As discussed below, no studied intersections would have level of service (LOS) worse than B, while the County’s standard for minimum acceptable intersection LOS is D.

The afternoon traffic peaks at the same area with reverse movement. During the observation periods, there were few recordings of vehicles on the Northbound controlled road. There were also no pedestrians crossing the intersections and a few adult bicyclists on Jefferson Avenue. Based on the traffic study completed by RKH, the intersections appear to be operating at a level service in the A to B range, which is defined as very low delay of 0-10 to 10-15 seconds per vehicle, and well below the County threshold for requiring traffic mitigation.

Source: RKH Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix B), dated September 2011, and Updated May 2018

17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts</i> ?			X	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Discussion: CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts, states, in part, that:

- a. Land Use Projects. Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact....” and
- b. Qualitative Analysis. If existing models or methods are not available to estimate the vehicle miles traveled for the particular project being considered, a lead agency may analyze the project’s vehicle miles traveled qualitatively. Such a qualitative analysis would evaluate factors such as the availability of transit, proximity to other destinations, etc. For many projects, a qualitative analysis of construction traffic may be appropriate.
- c. Methodology. A lead agency has discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology to evaluate a project’s vehicle miles traveled, including whether to express the change in absolute terms, per capita, per household or in any other measure. A lead agency may use models to estimate a project’s vehicle miles traveled and may revise those estimates to reflect professional judgment based on substantial evidence. Any assumptions used to estimate vehicle miles traveled and any revisions to model outputs should be documented and explained in the environmental document prepared for the project. The standard of adequacy in Section 15151 shall apply to the analysis described in this section.”

The CEQA Guidelines no longer require the use of level of service (LOS) analyses in environmental reviews, but it does not preclude the use for traffic impact analyses at the local level. The County currently does not have vehicle miles traveled (VMT) standards to use for environmental analyses, so in this case, the analysis will focus on LOS, rather than VMT.

The RKH Traffic Impact Analysis observed traffic at five intersections near the project site, including Jefferson Avenue-Emerald Hill Road, Jefferson Avenue-Lakeview Way, Jefferson Avenue-Fallen Leaf Way, Jefferson Avenue-Revere Way and Jefferson Avenue-California Way. These intersection observations were conducted in 2011 and 2018, and found that the observed intersections were operating at LOS A, except for the Jefferson Avenue-Revere Way intersection which was observed as functioning at LOS A/B. The RKH study also evaluated the proposed intersection of the new private street with Jefferson Avenue and the analysis showed the new intersection would also function at LOS A, under both 2011 and 2018 traffic counts. Finally the study analyzed the daily flow of traffic on Jefferson Avenue in both directions, again in 2011 and 2015 and found in both observations that the daily traffic counts represented as vehicle volumes were well within the capacity of the current roadway and that the addition of 116 daily trips was insufficient to materially affect the performance of Jefferson Avenue, both during the AM and PM peak periods as well as cumulatively in relation to other projects. The study found that the majority (>90%) of traffic on Jefferson Avenue was vehicular with small numbers of cyclists, trucks and buses operating there. All modes experienced acceptable LOS, no delays and operated at or above the roadway design speed, as well as the posted speed at all times.

Source: CEQA Guidelines and RKH Report 2018

17.c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The project is estimated to produce about 11 new vehicle trips during the peak morning hours, 10 vehicle trips during the afternoon peak hours, and 116 daily vehicle trips in an average weekday. A new cul-de-sac street will be created off of Jefferson to service six of the proposed lots. The RKH Traffic Impact Analysis states, in part that “traffic volumes entering and exiting the new cul-de-sac street are not sufficient to justify controls other than a stop control on the approach to Jefferson Avenue. A separate left turn lane for westbound vehicles on Jefferson Avenue turning into the new street would also not be warranted. However, as a matter of traffic safety, a warning notice to drivers on Jefferson Avenue that a new intersection has been created shall be implemented. The notice could be in the form of a changeable message sign (CMS) in advance of the intersection for seven days following completion and occupancy. Also, on a permanent basis, an intersection warning sign (W2-2) together with a supplemental warning sign (W16-2a) “150 FT” should be placed on Jefferson Avenue facing westbound traffic in advance of the new intersection and roadway lighting of the new cul-de-sac intersection with Jefferson Avenue in accordance with RP-8-00”(American National Standard Practice for Roadway Lighting for Local Roads).

In order to maintain roadway safety on Jefferson Avenue and to ensure the safe operation of the proposed subdivision and to alert motorists to the new intersection, the following mitigation measures are necessary:

Mitigation Measure 23: Prior to the issuance of a Grading Hard Card, the applicant shall provide to the Current Planning Section and Department of Public works for approval a traffic control plan that (1) provides advance warning to motorists on Jefferson Avenue of the activation of a new street intersection, (2) place W2-2L and W16-2a (150 FT) intersection warning signs facing westbound traffic in advance of the intersection and roadway lighting of the new cul-de-sac intersection with Jefferson Avenue in accordance with RP-8-00 (Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, ANSI/IESNA RP-8-00, American National Standard Practice for Roadway Lighting, New York, 2000, reaffirmed 2005), (3) within driveway and street corner sight triangles, there shall be no fencing,

signage, or trees planted that would create a wall effect and any trees planted should be limbed up so that the lowest branch is at least 7 feet above the road grade. Provide roadway lighting in accordance with RP-8-00, and (4) prohibits parking within the right of way on Jefferson Avenue. These measures shall be implemented prior to any equipment is staged at the site.

Source: RKH Traffic Impact Analysis Updated May 2018

17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
----------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Discussion: Three of the nine lots proposed will have direct access to and from Jefferson Avenue. Six of the proposed lots will take access from the new private street. The three driveways and the entrance to the private street are proposed to be designed consistent with Woodside Fire Protection District (WFPD) Standards. Also, the driveways and the new cul-de-sac (private street) are proposed in configurations that will allow WFPD fire engines to have clear access from Jefferson Avenue without having to cross into oncoming traffic. The Department of Public Works has also reviewed and conditionally approved the road design, in compliance with their design and standards. Further, the proposed street name assignment will be reviewed by applicable agencies (e.g., Sheriff's Office, California Highway Patrol, etc.) shall not conflict with street names in the vicinity.

Source: Woodside Fire Protection District Standards, and Project Comments

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				X

Discussion: The project site is not listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. Furthermore, the project is not listed in a local register of historical resources, pursuant to any local ordinance or resolution as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).

Source: Project Location; State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation, Listed California Historical Resources; County General Plan, Background, Historical and Archaeological Resources Appendices

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. (In applying the criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)

X

Discussion: A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the project site and the results were negative. Furthermore, the project was referred to all local tribes with a potential cultural connection to the site and none requested further consultation.

Source: Native American Heritage Commission

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X

Discussion: The subject site is located in an area that currently served by existing water, wastewater, electrical power, natural gas, and telecommunications and would not require relocation of these items. Each of the utilities were sent a project referral and each granted conditional approval indicating that future development can be served.

Source: Project Description, County GIS

19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will be served by Redwood City Municipal Water District and have received confirmation that sufficient water is available.</p> <p>Source: Project Description, Redwood City Municipal Water District</p>				
19.c. Result in a determination by the waste-water 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
<p>Discussion: The Emerald Lakes Sewer District has confirmed that system will have adequate capacity to serve the proposed nine lots.</p> <p>Source: Emerald Lakes Sewer District</p>				
19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will not generate solid waste in excess of State and local standards. Any future development would be served by Recology, a solid waste company subject to Federal, State, and local regulations, and would result in the project to not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction.</p> <p>Source: Project Scope</p>				
19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<p>Discussion: The project would not have any impacts on solid waste requirements, and the project would not generate any solid waste. Any future development on the site would be served by Recology, a solid waste company subject to Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations.</p> <p>Source: Project Scope</p>				

20. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X		

Discussion: The project site is located in the community of Emerald Lake Hills which is densely developed (approximately three units to the acre) with single-family residences interspersed with the neighborhood tree canopy. While the current site is not densely vegetated, the additional homes and landscaping will add to the overall fuel load in the area. Emerald Lake Hills, where the project is proposed, is designated by Cal-Fire on its Fire Resource and Assessment Maps as a very high fire hazard severity zone. Should a wildfire occur, there are only several roads for evacuation; Jefferson Avenue, Revere Way, Occidental Way, Fallen Leaf Way and Oak Knoll Drive, the latter four of which are only accessible from Jefferson Avenue. The Jefferson Avenue right-of-way is 50 feet wide, and the paved area of Jefferson ranges from approximately 23 to 32 feet along the edge of the project site. Roads that are blocked or damaged can prevent emergency access or egress anywhere in the project area. The emergency medical facility nearest the project site is Sequoia Hospital located approximately 3 miles from the project site.

Fire protection and emergency medical services are provided in the County via a public and private partnership among the County Health Services Department's Emergency Medical System (EMS) office; the private emergency response company, American Medical Response (AMR); and the fire service agencies in the County. The County EMS office provides operational and medical oversight of the system. Fire engines with paramedics on board have a typical response time of 7 minutes, (SMC Health System, 2012a). The project site is located in the Woodside Fire Protection District and is approximately 1,000 feet from the Woodside Fire Protection District fire station No. 19.

Construction of the proposed project would introduce additional potential sources of fire to the project site that could result in the need for fire-fighting services or emergency egress. Construction activities would be temporary in nature and are anticipated to occur periodically over a 24-month period. Equipment used during grading and periodic construction activities may create sparks, which could ignite dry grass on the project site. During construction, the use of power tools and acetylene torches may also increase the risk of fire hazard. In addition, medical emergencies could result from construction related-accidents, which could result in a response from fire protection services. Strict fire and personnel safety requirements and standards, typical of the industry, would be included in the construction contractor's contract.

Following construction, the new homes could add to the overall fire risk in the area either by igniting a fire, or providing fuel to a fire moving through the project site. However, the new homes will be sprinklered significantly reducing their potential to ignite or fuel a fire. As well, the prohibition of wood roofs and siding, and the use of fire-hard building materials and landscaping to provide defensible space can further reduce fire risk. The addition of 10 homes would not significantly add to the demand for emergency access or egress, and in the vicinity of the project site. The roadways in the vicinity of the project site are sufficiently wide to provide for emergency vehicles to navigate, if the roadway is not narrowed by parked cars. If parked cars narrowed the roadway, emergency access and egress would be compromised. Mitigation Measure 23 requires a traffic control plan that prohibits parking within the right-of-way on Jefferson Avenue.

Source: Cal-Fire FRAP Maps, San Mateo County Department of Public Works

20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?		X		
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Discussion: The project site is located in the community of Emerald Lake Hills which is densely developed (approximately three units to the acre) with single-family residences interspersed with the neighborhood tree canopy. While the current site is not densely vegetated, the additional homes and landscaping will add to the overall fuel load in the area. Emerald Lake Hills, where the project is proposed, is designated by Cal-Fire on its Fire Resource and Assessment Maps as a very high fire hazard severity zone. The project site is located on a downward facing slope, which could exacerbate a wildfire, if the wind was blowing from the north or the east.

Mitigation Measure 24: Enforce Cal-Fire’s defensible space policy by requiring the developer or residents to plant in a manner that creates defensible space around the homes.

Mitigation Measure 25: The applicant shall ensure through the enforcement of contractual obligations that the following measures are implemented by contractors during project construction:

- Staging areas, welding areas, or areas slated for development using spark- producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other materials that could serve as fire fuel. To the extent feasible, the contractor shall keep these areas clear of combustible materials in order to maintain a fire break.
- Any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrester in good working order. This includes, but is not limited to, vehicles, heavy equipment, and chainsaws.

Mitigation Measure 26: The building plans of the proposed project shall be reviewed by a representative from County Fire/Cal-Fire to ensure that regulations in the County’s Fire Ordinance are met and the project complies with County Fire/Cal-Fire requirements. The development of the Proposed Project shall be in compliance with Chapter 15 of the County General Plan with respect to residential uses adjacent to open space areas where wildfire is a threat.

Source: Cal-Fire FRAP Maps

20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?		X		
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Discussion: Potable water for residential uses and fire emergency services of the Proposed Project would be supplied by the City of Redwood City, the local municipal water supplier. There is a 8-inch water main in Jefferson Avenue that will serve the domestic and fire service water needs of the site.

New on-site water lines would be installed to service the proposed residential development. This includes an existing water line and easement that will be brought from the northern curve of Jefferson Avenue to serve the subdivisions that are adjacent to the cul-de-sac of Lots 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Lots 1, 2, and 3 will have their own, individual water meters that will connect water from the

western side of Jefferson Avenue. Access to the water tank would be established at the discretion of the City of Redwood City and could be obtained via a connection to the water main in the private street with a saddle "T" connection. Normal water usage is anticipated for single-family houses of the size typical for this neighborhood. There are also no specific landscaping plans proposed at this time, other than to be consistent with landscaping of surrounding properties and provide screening for adjacent residences. The intent is to utilize drought tolerant, native vegetation in the landscaping in order to restore areas within the project site to a natural habitat and minimize water needs. Fire hydrants will also be installed on the project site per the State and County requirements, as well as the approval of Woodside Fire Protection District.

Mitigation Measure 27: The project applicant shall require through contractual obligations that the construction contractor(s) marks the areas planned to be disturbed in white paint and notify Underground Service Alert (USA) one week prior to the beginning of excavation activities. This will be completed so the entire construction area is properly surveyed in order to minimize the risk of exposing or damaging underground utilities. USA provides a free "Dig Alert" service to all excavators (contractors, homeowners and others), in northern California, and will automatically notify all USA Members (utility service providers) who may have underground facilities at their work site. In response, the USA Members will mark or stake the horizontal path of their underground facilities, provide information about, or give clearance to dig. This service protects excavators from personal injury and underground facilities from being damaged. The utility companies will be responsible for the timely removal or protection of any existing utility facilities located within construction areas.

Mitigation Measure 28: The maximum distances between fire hydrants, in other than single-family zones, shall be 400 feet with **hydrants** being located as nearly as possible at street intersections.

Source: 2013 California Fire Code, Project Plans

20.d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?		X		
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Discussion: The project site is located within the San Mateo County (County) Local Responsibility Area (LRA) produced by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal-Fire). The Cal-Fire map designates the project site in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). This designation is based on data and models of potential fuels over a 30 to 50 year time horizon and their associated and expected fire behavior, and expected burn probabilities to quantify the likelihood and nature of vegetation fire exposure (including firebrands) to buildings (Cal-Fire, 2008).

Mitigation Measure 29: The project is located in a Local Responsibility Area, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and as such will be mandated to be designed and constructed to meet the requirements for *Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure* found in the California Residential Code.

Source: County GIS

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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>Discussion: The project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment and significantly impact or uncover archaeological or paleontological resources. However, as included in the analysis contained within this document, these potential significant impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of all included mitigation measures.</p> <p>Source: California Natural Diversity Database, Project Description.</p>				
21.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
<p>Discussion: The proposed project, a nine-lot subdivision in of itself, would not create any impacts. However, without mitigation, the future development could potentially generate significant impacts to air quality, primarily due to dust generation. Measures to address this temporary impact were discussed under Question 3.b. To the best of staff’s knowledge, there are no other large grading projects proposed in the immediate project area at the present time. Because of the “stand alone” nature of this future project and the relatively finite timeframe of dust generation, this future development of the property will have a less than significant cumulative impact upon the environment. No evidence has been found that the project would result in broader regional impacts, and there are no known approved projects or future projects expected for the project parcel. This project does not introduce any significant impacts that cannot be avoided through mitigation.</p> <p>Source: Project Plan</p>				

22.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The project will create nine single-family zoned parcel in a neighborhood composed of single-family houses. Any development of these two parcels will conform to the Zoning Regulations and the Building Code on lots improved to the standards required by the Subdivision Ordinance and reviewed by the Department of Public Works. Any future development on the site will be regulated by State Codes. Construction air quality impacts will be mitigated by Mitigation Measure 1. Construction traffic impacts will be mitigated by Mitigation Measure 3. Construction noise impacts will be mitigated by Mitigation Measure 22.

Source: Project Plan

RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES. Check what agency has permit authority or other approval for the project.

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
Caltrans		X	
City		X	
California Coastal Commission		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
Other: _____			
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
Sewer/Water District:	X		Will Serve Letter
State Department of Fish and Wildlife		X	
State Department of Public Health		X	
State Water Resources Control Board		X	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)		X	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		X	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		X	

<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> To reduce fugitive dust that would be generated during project construction activities, the County shall require the project Applicant and/or the Applicant's designated contractors, contractor's representatives, or other appropriate personnel to implement the following BAAQMD basic dust control measures.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Water all exposed surfaces (e.g., staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) two times per day during construction and adequately wet demolition surfaces to limit visible dust emissions. b. Cover all haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose materials off the project site. c. Use wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day to remove all visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads (dry power sweeping is prohibited) during construction of the proposed project. d. Vehicle speeds on unpaved roads/areas shall not exceed 15 miles per hour. e. Complete all areas to be paved as soon as possible and lay building pads as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. f. Minimize idling time of diesel-powered construction equipment to five minutes and post signs reminding workers of this idling restriction at access points and equipment staging areas during construction of the proposed project. g. Maintain and properly tune all construction equipment in accordance with manufacturer's specifications and have a CARB-certified visible emissions evaluator check equipment prior to use at the site. h. Post a publicly visible sign with the name and telephone number of the construction contractor and County staff person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The publicly visible sign shall also include the contact phone number for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. <p><u>Mitigation Measure 2:</u> All construction-related activities (including but not limited to mobilization and staging, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading) shall occur outside the avian nesting season before February 1, or after September 15. If construction activities or noise will occur within that time frame, all suitable habitats located within the project's area of disturbance, including staging and storage areas plus a 250-foot (passerines) and 1,000-foot (raptor nests) buffer around these areas should be thoroughly surveyed for active nests by a qualified biologist no more than 5 days before commencement of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If project activities are delayed by more than five days following a survey, an additional nesting bird survey shall be performed prior to commencing the activity. The results of the surveys should be documented and submitted to the County Planning and Building Department prior to its issuance of building/grading permits.</p>		

If active nests are present, no site disturbance and mobilization of heavy equipment (including but not limited to equipment staging, fence installation, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading), shall take place within 25 feet of non-raptor nests, and 1,000 feet of raptor nests, or as determined by a qualified wildlife biologist. In consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, until the chicks have fledged. Monitoring shall be required to insure compliance with the MBTA and relevant California Fish and Game Code requirements. Monitoring dates and findings should be documented and provided to the County Planning/Building Department.

If project construction will last for more than one year, this mitigation measure shall be implemented throughout construction of the project, including home construction for any activities occurring during the nesting season (February 1 to September 15).

Mitigation Measure 3: Before the start of construction and related activities (including, but not limited to mobilization and staging, clearing, grubbing, tree removal, vegetation removal, fence installation, demolition, and grading), a survey of structures and tree cavities suitable for roosting bats, as well as other roosting habitats, should be conducted within the project footprint. This shall include a 50-foot buffer, as feasible, by a qualified biologist within 14 days prior to the start of any site disturbance activities and equipment mobilization. If suitable structures, tree cavities, or other roost habitats are found, an emergence survey of the cavities shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If a rare bat species, an occupied maternity, or a colony roost is detected, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) shall be consulted to determine appropriate measures if the roost cannot be avoided. The results of all surveys shall be documented. Echolocation survey may be needed to verify the presence of bats, or an exclusion zone around the occupied tree or structure until the bats leave the roost. Due to restrictions of the California Health Department, direct contact by workers with any bat is not allowed. The qualified bat biologist should be contact immediately if a bat roost is discovered during project construction.

Mitigation Measure 4: Removal of the trampoline and concrete riprap from the riparian zone is required to improve the habitat value of the creek corridor. If bank stabilization becomes necessary, bioengineering methods, such as logs, native plant material or natural rocks, shall be used. Remove non-native invasive plants from the riparian zone, primarily the Himalayan blackberry and Italian thistle, and also non-native trees upstream and downstream of the 0.54-acre willow grove including acacia, fig, mayten, eucalyptus, and cedar. Replace the non-native trees with native riparian trees under the direction of a restoration ecologist. A 1:1 ratio is suitable but can be adjusted as necessary by the restoration ecologist.

Mitigation Measure 5: Prepare a Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan and follow Best Management Practices to protect water quality both during construction and post-construction.

Mitigation Measure 6: To compensate for the pruning and removal of 2,500 square feet of willows on proposed lots 9 and 10, plant red willow cuttings taken from the red willow stand or other nearby source under the direction of a restoration ecologist. Willow plantings shall be both upstream (approximately 2,500 sq. ft.) and downstream of the 0.54-acre willow grove. The downstream planting shall be outside of the sanitary sewer easements, but as close to the creek channel as possible. The plantings shall include *Aeschulus californica*, *Baccharis pilularis*, *Heteromeles arbutifolia*, *Quercus agrifolia*, *salix laevigata*, and *salix lasiolepis*, and shall be planted consistent with Willow Restoration and Enhancement Plan prepared by MIG, and dated August 2019.

Mitigation Measure 7: Record a conservation easement on the Parcel Map and adjoin lot on Fallen Leaf Way covering the existing willow grove and the mitigation areas planted to offset partial removal of the existing willow grove. The conservation easement shall preclude development of any kind within the easement area, and shall be subject to management by the homeowners association established to manage the common resources of the subdivision, including the conservation area. The applicant shall have a qualified biologist prepare a management plan for

the conservation area for review and approval of Planning and Building Department. The Conservation Area Management Plan (Plan) shall describe the monitoring and maintenance activities needed to ensure the ongoing success of the proposed mitigation willow plantings. The conservation easement area shall be fenced with a perimeter fence that allows for wildlife movement, but clearly delineates the area. The plan shall include measures that ensure:

- a. There would be no significant adverse impact on endangered, rare or threatened species or their habitat;
- b. There are no hazardous materials at or around the project site that may be disturbed or removed;
- c. Stream or river bank stabilization with native vegetation or other bioengineering techniques, the primary purpose of which is to reduce or eliminate erosion and sedimentation; and
- d. Any culvert replacement conducted in accordance with published guidelines of the Department of Fish and Game or NOAA Fisheries, the primary purpose of which is to improve habitat or reduce sedimentation.

Mitigation Measure 8: Minimization of the tree removal is required and should be consistent with Section 6565.15(A) of the County's Zoning Ordinance. Coast live oaks should be retained where possible and protected. Authorization from the County is required for the removal of the significant trees (any tree with a single stem of 6-inch diameter or 19-inch circumference) or the trimming or removal of a heritage tree. Replacement trees will be required as a condition of the grading and tree removal permit.

Mitigation Measure 9: The proposed project must comply with the arborist report recommendations for the protection of trees during construction, including installation and maintenance of protective fencing around retained trees, the presence of the project arborist for all work within the dripline of protected trees, measure to protect trees during trenching, irrigation for protected trees, tree trimming that adheres to ANSI 300 standards and Best Management Practices, and inspection of the site by the project arborist to ensure proper installation of tree protection measures.

Mitigation Measure 10: Removal of plant species listed as "High" or "Moderate" in the California Invasive Plant Council Inventory should be removed prior to the start of project construction. Removal methods that prevent the spread of the invasive plants should be used, such as removing the plants before they go to seed, placing the removed plants in sealed plastic bags or covered dumpsters, and disposing of them as refuse rather than as compost. If removal is not possible, the spread of invasive plant species should be avoided during construction by washing boots and equipment that have contact invasive plants before working in another area. Landscape vegetation must not include any plant species listed as "High," "Moderate" or "Limited" in the California Invasive Plant Council.

Mitigation Measure 11: Prior to building permit issuance, the project sponsor shall incorporate, via a note on the first page of the construction plans, that should cultural, paleontological or archaeological resources be encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archaeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e). The note on the plans shall be subject to review and approval of the Current Planning Section.

Mitigation Measure 12: The treatment of human remains and any associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity within the project site shall comply with applicable State laws. This shall include immediate notification of the County of San Mateo Medical Examiner (ME) and the project proponent.

In the event of the ME's determination that the human remains are Native American, notification of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), is required who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (PRC Section 5097.98).

The project sponsor, archaeological consultant, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment, with appropriate dignity, of human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. The California PRC allows 48 hours to reach agreement on these matters. If the MLD and the other parties do not agree on the reburial method, the project will follow PRC Section 5097.98(b) which states that ". . . the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance."

Mitigation Measure 13: The applicant shall implement the following basic construction measures at all times:

- a. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxic Control Measure, Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- b. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
- c. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person, or his/her designee, shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Mitigation Measure 14: Any unstable areas shall be stabilized through the planting of native plants. These plants must have strong, stabilizing roots.

Mitigation Measure 15: The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities:

- a. Water all active construction and grading areas at least twice daily.
- b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- c. Apply water two times daily or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at the project site.
- d. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
- e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

Mitigation Measure 16: Prior to the issuance of any permit for development on the site, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage

control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

- a. Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b. Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c. Clear only areas essential for construction.
- d. Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative best management practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e. Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and control dust.
- f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 feet from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j. Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acre or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.
- k. Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.

Mitigation Measure 17: The applicant shall utilize the following, where feasible:

- a. Perform on-site material hauling with trucks equipped with on-road engines (if determined to be less emissive than off-road engines).
- b. Use alternate fuels for generators at construction sites such as propane or solar, or electrical power.
- c. Use a California Air Resources Board approved low carbon fuel for construction equipment.

- d. Encourage and provide carpools, shuttle vans, transit passes and/or secure bicycle parking for construction worker commutes.
- e. Reduce electricity use in the construction office by using compact fluorescent or LED bulbs, powering off computers every day, and replacing heating and cooling units with more efficient ones.

Mitigation Measure 18: Prior to recordation, applicant is required to submit a replanting and vegetation plan that sufficiently sequesters the amount of CO2 provided by the existing 63 mature trees proposed to be removed.

Mitigation Measure 19: The building plans of the Proposed Project shall be reviewed by a representative from Woodside Fire Protection District (WFPD) to ensure that regulations in the County's Fire Ordinance are met and the project complies with the County Fire/Cal-Fire requirements. Prior to recordation, the applicant shall submit landscaping plans to be reviewed by County staff and by WFPD to ensure that the trees, shrubs and groundcovers are specified to include only fire-adapted plants and located to provide defensible space around the homes.

Mitigation Measure 20: At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan to the Department of Public Works in compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy.

Mitigation Measure 21: Projects subject to Provision C.3.i (individual single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2,500 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, and other projects that create and/or replace at least 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface but are not C.3 Regulated Projects) shall implement at least one (1) of the six (6) site design measures listed below:

- a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.
- b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas.
- c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas.
- d. Direct runoff from driveways and/or uncovered parking lots onto vegetated areas.
- e. Construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces.
- f. Construct bike lanes, driveways, and/or uncovered parking lots with permeable surfaces.

A site drainage plan will be required for construction of the new residences that will demonstrate how roof drainage and site runoff will be directed to an approved location. In compliance with the County's Drainage Policy, this plan must demonstrate that post-development flows and velocities to adjoining private property and the public right-of-way shall not exceed those that existed in the pre-developed state.

Mitigation Measure 22: Noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Saturdays. Said activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving, and Christmas (San Mateo Ordinance Code Section 4.88.360).

Mitigation Measure 23: Prior to the issuance of a Grading Hard Card, the applicant shall provide to the Current Planning Section and Department of Public works for approval a traffic control plan that (1) provides advance warning to motorists on Jefferson Avenue of the activation of a new street intersection, (2) place W2-2L and W16-2a (150 FT) intersection warning signs facing westbound traffic in advance of the intersection and roadway lighting of the new cul-de-sac intersection with Jefferson Avenue in accordance with RP-8-00 (Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, ANSI/IESNA RP-8-00, American National Standard Practice for Roadway Lighting, New York, 2000, reaffirmed 2005), (3) within driveway and street corner sight triangles, there shall be no

fencing, signage, or trees planted that would create a wall effect and any trees planted should be limbed up so that the lowest branch is at least 7 feet above the road grade. Provide roadway lighting in accordance with RP-8-00, and (4) prohibits parking within the right of way on Jefferson Avenue. These measures shall be implemented prior to any equipment is staged at the site.

Mitigation Measure 24: Enforce Cal-Fire's defensible space policy by requiring the developer or residents to plant in a manner that creates defensible space around the homes.

Mitigation Measure 25: The applicant shall ensure through the enforcement of contractual obligations that the following measures are implemented by contractors during project construction:

- a. Staging areas, welding areas, or areas slated for development using spark-producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other materials that could serve as fire fuel. To the extent feasible, the contractor shall keep these areas clear of combustible materials in order to maintain a fire break.
- b. Any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrester in good working order. This includes, but is not limited to, vehicles, heavy equipment, and chainsaws.

Mitigation Measure 26: The building plans of the proposed project shall be reviewed by a representative from County Fire/Cal-Fire to ensure that regulations in the County's Fire Ordinance are met and the project complies with County Fire/Cal-Fire requirements. The development of the Proposed Project shall be in compliance with Chapter 15 of the County General Plan with respect to residential uses adjacent to open space areas where wildfire is a threat.

Mitigation Measure 27: The project applicant shall require through contractual obligations that the construction contractor(s) marks the areas planned to be disturbed in white paint and notify Underground Service Alert (USA) one week prior to the beginning of excavation activities. This will be completed so the entire construction area is properly surveyed in order to minimize the risk of exposing or damaging underground utilities. USA provides a free "Dig Alert" service to all excavators (contractors, homeowners and others), in northern California, and will automatically notify all USA Members (utility service providers) who may have underground facilities at their work site. In response, the USA Members will mark or stake the horizontal path of their underground facilities, provide information about, or give clearance to dig. This service protects excavators from personal injury and underground facilities from being damaged. The utility companies will be responsible for the timely removal or protection of any existing utility facilities located within construction areas.

Mitigation Measure 28: The maximum distances between fire hydrants, in other than single-family zones, shall be 400 feet with **hydrants** being located as nearly as possible at street intersections.

Mitigation Measure 29: The project is located in a Local Responsibility Area, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and as such will be mandated to be designed and constructed to meet the requirements for *Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure* found in the California Residential Code.

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

X

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 of the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. 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.



(Signature)

10/16/2019

Planner III

Date

(Title)

Sources

MIG, 4057 Jefferson Avenue Subdivision Project Air Quality and Health Risk Assessment, August 2019 (Appendix A)*

RKH Civil and Transportation Engineering, Traffic Impact Analysis, 4057 Jefferson Avenue, Emerald Lake Hills Unincorporated Area, San Mateo County California. September 19, 2011, updated May 8, 2018 (Appendix B)*

*Due to the length of these appendix documents, these reports can be found online at:

<https://planning.smcgov.org/ceqa-docs>

JAC:pac - JACDD0443_WPH.DOCX