

County of San Mateo  
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Bewley Single-Family Residence
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2010-00079
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Current Planning Section, 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Angela Chavez (650) 599-7217
5. **Project Location:** 1455 Audubon Avenue, Montara
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 036-310-180, 8.199 Acres
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Henri Mannik, 5429 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland, CA 94609
8. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture/ Rural
9. **Zoning:** Planned Agriculture District/ Coastal Development District (PAD/CD)
10. **Description of the Project:** Coastal Development Permit, Planned Agricultural Development Permit, Design Review Permit, and a Grading Permit to allow for the construction of a 4,500 sq. ft. single-family residence, a 554 sq. ft. detached garage, and an 1,146 sq. ft. detached accessory building. The project also includes the construction of approximately 645 linear feet of new driveway with three turnarounds and a small bridge to cross an existing culvert. In order to prepare the building sites and construct the driveway, the project involves 3,483 cubic yards of grading.
11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is located just outside the Urban/Rural boundary amongst large parcels which are mainly developed with residential development. The subject property is bordered by Montara Creek on its southern boundary with riparian vegetation reaching into the western and eastern sides of the parcel. The parcel is undeveloped and has been identified as having environmentally sensitive habitat areas, special status plants, and the potential to support special status species.
12. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** State Water Quality Control Board.
13. **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, has consultation begun?:** *(NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review*

process (see Public Resources Code Section 21083.3.2.). Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality). The County of San Mateo has not received any requested consultations pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.1.1.

**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	X	Climate Change		Population/Housing
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Public Services
X	Air Quality	X	Hydrology/Water Quality		Recreation
X	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning		Transportation/Traffic
X	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
X	Geology/Soils	X	Noise		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 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 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. <b>AESTHETICS.</b> 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 significant adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The subject parcel is not located within or adjacent to any County or State Scenic Corridor. The proposed development of the parcel will not impact views from any public lands, water bodies, or roads given the distance and topography of the site in relationship to any of these features. The project site does have natural scenic qualities given that it is located in close proximity to the edge of the rural/urban boundary. However, there is existing residential development located throughout the project vicinity. This development varies in both the size of parcel and scope of development depending on which side of the boundary it is located on. The proposed project has been designed to complement the site and has incorporated measures such as burying the water cisterns and concealing fire suppression water tanks. The proposed development is consistent with the design and scale of development present in the surrounding community.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				
1.b. Significantly damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X

**Discussion:** Three less than significant size pine trees are proposed for removal as part of the project. Two of the trees are located adjacent to the proposed residence where other larger trees are to be maintained. The other tree proposed for removal is located adjacent to the driveway and would likely be damaged by driveway construction. Given the large number of remaining trees on the project site, the removal of these trees will not have a significant impact on the visual character of the area. The subject parcel is not located within a state scenic highway, there are no historic buildings, and there are no rock outcroppings present on the site.

**Source:** Project Plans, Project Location.

1.c. Significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The parcel is located at the end of Audubon Street where it slopes from high to low ending at Montara Creek. The surrounding parcels are developed mainly with residential development but horse paddocks and other types of accessory structures are also present in the immediate project vicinity. The project proposes to disturb approximately 1.24 acres of the 8.199 acres that make up the project site. The project also proposes 3,483 cubic yards of earthwork in order to construct the road and construct pads for the proposed structures. While the amount of earthwork proposed is significant, it will be utilized to construct a driveway to provide ingress/egress capable of accommodating emergency vehicles and to minimize the appearance of rain cisterns and fire suppression water tanks. While the proposed structures will be visible from the surrounding area, this is consistent with the existing development in the area. The proposed site is not located on a ridgeline and the proposed grading attempts to mimic the surrounding topography thereby avoiding impacts to the visual quality of the site.

**Source:** Project Location, Project Plans.

1.d. Create a new source of significant light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The proposed residence and accessory buildings will not utilize materials which will result in glare during the daytime. However, exterior lighting will be a feature of the proposed buildings. The new lighting fixtures will result in a new source of nighttime light. However, the proposed lighting fixtures are designed so that the light emitted is focused, downward facing, and confined to the boundaries of the parcel.

**Source:** Project Plans.

1.e. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The subject property is not located within a State or County Scenic Corridor. However, at its nearest point the Cabrillo Highway County Scenic Corridor's boundary ends approximately 707 linear feet to the southwest of the project parcel. The project parcel is not visible from the corridor due to the long distances, topography of the area, mature vegetation, and existing development located between the parcel and the corridor.

**Source:** Project Location.

1.f. If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project parcel is located within a Design Review District. The Coastside Design Review Committee reviewed the project and found it to be consistent with the applicable Design Review requirements. The proposed project does not include any requests for exceptions from any General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions.

**Source:** San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County General Plan; Project Location.

1.g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The proposed project site has natural scenic qualities. The general project vicinity consists of parcels ranging from just under two acres to approximately nine acres in size. Most are developed with single-family residential development surrounded by pasture, mature trees, and undisturbed natural vegetation. The parcels to the south of the project site, across Montara Creek, are located within the urbanized Moss Beach area and are developed with higher density residential development. The project site is visible from both within the project area and the community of Moss Beach. However, as discussed previously, the project has been designed to complement the project site and has utilized measures such as burying the proposed water cisterns within the footprint of the main house and incorporating the required fire suppression water tanks into the design of the accessory building by screening them below its deck, aiding in minimizing the impact to the scenic qualities of the site.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location.

**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 forestland, 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:

	<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><b>Discussion:</b> The subject parcel is located within the Coastal Zone.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The subject property is zoned Planned Agricultural District (PAD). While the purpose of the PAD Zoning District is to support agricultural activities it does allow for the construction of a single family residence and accessory buildings with the issuance of a PAD permit. The project was reviewed by the County's Agricultural Advisory Committee which determined that the project would not be detrimental to agriculture. The parcel is not covered by an existing Open Space Easement or by a Williamson Act contract. However, at the time of this parcel's creation in 2002, a Master Land Division Plan designated this parcel as an agricultural parcel which was to be covered by an agricultural easement. The agricultural easement was intended to cover the parcel in its entirety with the exception of a proposed house site, driveway, and areas within 50 feet of these areas shown on plans submitted in January 2000. Post approval and at the time of the subdivision recordation, the easement was emitted. Further biological studies of this parcel have identified the presence of both special status plants and sensitive habitats which were not considered in the plans of January 2000. The project as currently proposed includes consideration of these areas. Therefore, as a condition of approval of the required permits, the required easement will be recorded. The proposed development will therefore be consistent with the known current conditions of the parcel and intent of the original easement requirement.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County Local Coastal Program; San Mateo County Williamson Act Contract Program.</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><b>Discussion:</b> While the project parcel is zoned for agriculture there are no agricultural activities currently occurring on the parcel. The areas available to agricultural activities are limited due to natural features and conditions present on the parcel. Montara Creek runs along the south western parcel boundary. The parcel slopes downward in this area toward the creek and is dominated by riparian vegetation. A small portion of seasonal wetland exists toward the eastern boundary of the</p>				

<p>parcel. There are also patches coastal terrace prairie, coastal strawberry, and beach strawberry present on the parcel. The parcel does not meet the definition of forestland.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; Project Plans; U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service Forest Inventory Analysis 2005.</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><b>Discussion:</b> The subject parcel is located within the Coastal Zone but is not identified as having soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts. The area is instead mapped as Grazing lands.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; San Mateo County General Plan- Productive Soil Resources Map.</p>					
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is located within the Planned Agricultural District (PAD) Zoning District. The parcel does not contain prime soils but has been identified as appropriate for grazing operations. However, given the size of the parcel, presence of special status plants, and sensitive habitats on the parcel, the remaining portions of the parcel are not contiguous and are insufficient in size to support grazing operations. While the proposed project will convert lands zoned for agriculture, the physical constraints present on the parcel make its ability to support agricultural activities improbable.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.</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))?  <i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project does not include rezoning nor does it conflict with the underlying zoning district as residential development is permissible with the issuance of a PAD permit. Further, the subject property does not qualify as forestland or timberland nor is it zoned as such.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.</p>					

<p><b>3. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
3.a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> A temporary increase in the number of vehicles and dust is expected during project construction. However, with implementation of standard construction related best management practices to address dust emissions, along with the requirement that construction vehicles meet California Air Resources Board regulations to reduce air pollution (e.g., limits on idling), there are no expected conflicts with the applicable air quality plan. Operational emissions, which are those emissions occurring after construction and for the life of the development, are not significant enough to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.</p>				
3.b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> There are no known air quality violations in this area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.</p>				
3.c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As of December 2012, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. A temporary increase in the project area is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations reduce the potential effects to a less than significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Bay Area Air Quality Management District.</p>				
3.d. Expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by BAAQMD?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> There are no identified sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the project site (e.g., schools, day care centers, nursing homes, etc.).</p>				



<b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location.				
3.e. Create objectionable odors affecting a significant number of people?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not involve any aspects which would result in objectionable odors. Further, the project area is rural in nature and the adjacent properties are large in size thereby limiting the number of people generally present in the area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
3.f. Generate pollutants (hydrocarbon, thermal odor, dust or smoke particulates, radiation, etc.) that will violate existing standards of air quality on-site or in the surrounding area?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is expected to have temporary impacts associated with the grading activities necessary to cut back the banks and install the temporary roadway to access the project staging area. This work is expected to generate a temporary increase in dust, motor vehicle and diesel particulate matter in the area. This temporary increase is not expected to violate existing standards of on-site air quality given required vehicle emission standards required by the State of California for vehicle operations. To mitigate for the temporary increase in dust, Mitigation Measure 1, below, is recommended. Mitigation Measure 13 under Question 7.a (below), is further recommended to minimize particulate matter and greenhouse gasses.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 1:</b> The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water all active construction and grading areas at least twice daily.</li> <li>Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets/roads.</li> <li>Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).</li> </ol> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management, California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board.</p>				

**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 significant 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:** Biological assessments were submitted as part of the project application. The most comprehensive report was completed by Geoff Smick, biologist, of WRA Environmental Consultants (WRA, 2017). The original report was completed in July 2013 with updates in October 2015 and December 2017. The second assessment, dated November 30, 2015, was completed by Karen Swaim, wildlife biologist, of Swaim Biological, Inc. (Swaim, 2015). The Swaim assessment focuses specifically on the potential for occurrences of the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake. While the assessment completed by WRA provides a detailed assessment of the potential for overall resource occurrences on the subject property.

The WRA assessment identified ten potential biological impacts associated with the project. Mitigation Measures were provided for each of the potential impacts reducing them to less than significant. In addition, the assessment provides general avoidance and minimization measures to reduce potential impacts to sensitive communities and special-status species.

The assessment identified five Sensitive Biological Communities which are protected either through local, State, and/or Federal statutes. These areas have been specifically identified as the 0.04-acre portion of the parcel that supports Coastal Terrace Prairie, the 0.01-acre portion of the parcel that supports a season wetland seep, the 0.6-acre portion of the parcel that supports Central Coast Riparian Scrub, Montara Creek which is a Perennial Stream that runs along the southern boundary of the parcel, and that the entire parcel is within the James V. Fitzgerald watershed which is a defined Area of Special Biological Significance.

The WRA assessment notes that 63 special status plant species have the potential to occur within the study area based on its database and literature research. However, site visits determined that the project parcel only has a high potential to support one special status plant species (California wild strawberry- *Fragaria vesca*) and a moderate potential to support nine other special status plant species (Bent-flowered fiddleneck- *Amsinckia lunaris*; Coast rock cress- *Arabis blepharophylla*; Pappose tarplant- *centromadia parryi* ssp. *parryll*; California bottle-brush grass- *Elymus californicus*; Coast iris- *Iris longipetala*; Perennial goldfields- *Lasthenia californica* ssp. *Macrantha*; Marsh microseris- *Microseris paludosa*; Oregon polemonium- *Polemonium carneum*; and San Francisco champion- *Silene verecunda* ssp. *verecunda*). Of these ten special status plants only the California wild strawberry was observed on the project site. The biologist assessment includes a recommendation for a 50-foot avoidance buffer for the strawberry plants located in the western portions of the parcel. Mitigation Measure 3, below, has been added to address this recommendation. Further, the assessment notes that California wild strawberry plants are also present in the eastern portions of the property. The biologist recommends that these plants be relocated.

The other 52 special status plant species which were identified as having the potential to occur were deemed unlikely to occur by the biologist due to hydrologic conditions, soil conditions, lack of

topographic positions necessary to support specific species, lack of associated vegetation communities necessary to support the special status plant(s), that the study area is located outside of the known elevations and/or distribution of the special status plant(s), and/or that the study area contains disturbed abiotic and or biotic conditions which preclude the special status plant.

In regard to special status wildlife species the assessment notes that resource databases identify 67 special status wildlife species have been documented in the general project area. Site visits and further research determined that the project site has a high potential to support two special status wildlife species (White-tailed kite- *Elanus leucurus* and Allen's hummingbird- *Selasphorus sasin*) and a moderate potential for five other special status wildlife species (Hoary bat- *Lasiurus cinereus*; Northern harrier- *Circus cyaneus*; Olive-sided flycatcher- *Contopus cooperi*; Loggerhead shrike- *Lanius ludovicianus*; and the Monarch butterfly- *Danaus plexippus*) to occur. Mitigation Measures 2 and 4 as detailed below were recommended in order to mitigate potential impacts to these species. The remaining documented species were deemed unlikely to occur on the project site or have no potential to occur due to a lack of suitable habitat.

The California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*) and San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*) are two Federally listed protected species documented to occur in the project vicinity. The Swaim assessment found that no California red-legged frog (CRLF) were observed during site visits but that the project site provides potential upland habitat. The assessment notes that the proposed development is adequately distanced from the aquatic habitats located on the project parcel and general project vicinity to avoid any significant impacts. Further, the assessment includes avoidance and minimization measures which have been included as Mitigation Measure 6 in the event that CRLF are encountered. While generally the San Francisco garter snake (SFGS) are found in conjunction with CRLF, the assessment determined that it was unlikely that SFGS is present on the site. However, the assessment notes that there was an unconfirmed sighting of SFGS on the project site and therefore has included avoidance and minimization measures to avoid any significant impacts should SFGS be encountered. These measures have been included below under Mitigation Measures 2 and 6.

**Mitigation Measure 2:** To reduce the potential for impacts to sensitive communities and special-status species, the following general best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented. Implementation of these general BMPs, in combination with the species- and habitat-specific measures provided in Mitigation Measures 3 – 10 and 13, will minimize adverse impacts:

- a. Appropriate perimeter erosion and sediment control measures (i.e., silt fencing, straw wattles) shall be installed around any stockpiles of soil or other materials which could be transported by rainfall or other flows in order to reduce the possibility of soil erosion and sediments flowing into natural habitats.
- b. All access, staging, and work areas shall be delineated with orange construction fencing, or with a similar material and all work activities shall be limited to these areas.
- c. All access, staging, and work areas shall be the minimum size necessary to conduct the work.
- d. All staging, maintenance, and storage of construction equipment shall be performed in a manner to preclude any direct or indirect discharge of fuel, oil, or other petroleum products into the Study Area. No other debris, rubbish, soil, silt, sand, or other construction-related materials or wastes shall be allowed to enter into or be placed where they may be washed by rainfall or runoff into wetland areas. All such debris and waste shall be picked-up daily and shall be properly disposed of at an appropriate facility. If a spill of fluid materials occurs, the area shall be cleaned and contaminated materials disposed of properly. The affected spill area shall be restored to its natural condition.
- e. Disturbance or removal of vegetation shall not exceed the minimum necessary to conduct the work.

- f. Stockpiles of soil or other materials that can be blown by wind shall be covered when not in active use.
- g. All trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered.

**Mitigation Measure 3 (BIO-6):** The California wild strawberry located in the western portion of the project parcel shall be protected by a 50-foot avoidance buffer. Prior to the commencement of any construction related activity the applicant shall install exclusion fencing reflecting this buffer.

- a. A 50-foot avoidance buffer should be maintained around the higher quality western subpopulations.
- b. A physical barrier, such as orange construction fencing, shall be established on the edge of the 50-foot buffer to ensure protection of this habitat during ground disturbance activities and all exterior construction (e.g., grading, concrete work, irrigation/drainage work, landscaping, etc.).
- c. A qualified biologist shall develop a mitigation and monitoring plan to be implemented during the start of ground disturbance activities to ensure successful translocation of these plants on site if they are impacted. At a minimum, the mitigation and monitoring plan shall include:
  - (1) Documentation of proposed impacts to the species;
  - (2) Proposed mitigation including some combination of transplantation or re-establishment of impacted populations and/or preservation and management of existing populations;
  - (3) Proposed methods for transplantation, re-establishment, or restoration;
  - (4) A 3-year monitoring program with annual reporting;
  - (5) Performance criteria for transplants or plantings, including (a) survivorship, (b) density, and (c) cover, and performance criteria for invasive plants and other potential threats to the success of the mitigation efforts including, but not limited to, erosion and human disturbance; and
  - (6) An adaptive management plan for addressing any failure to meet performance criteria or to address other unforeseen problems.

**Mitigation Measure 4 (BIO-7):** Impacts to all nesting birds shall be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following measures:

- a. Impacts to nesting birds can be avoided if potential activities are initiated outside of the nesting season (September 1 – February 14).
- b. If work is to be conducted during the nesting season (February 15 – August 31), preconstruction breeding bird surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to initial ground disturbance to avoid impacting active nests, eggs, and/or young.
- c. If any nests are found, they shall have a suitable buffer established for protection of the nest and young. Buffer distance will vary based on species and conditions at the site, but are typically at least 25 feet for common passerines, and may be up to 500 feet for California fully-protected species. Buffers shall be maintained until a qualified biologist determines that the nest is no longer active.

**Mitigation Measure 5 (BIO-8):** Impacts to roosting bats can be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following measures:

- a. Any mature trees within the Study Area that are proposed for removal shall be removed outside of the maternity roosting season. For this area of California, the maternity roosting season is typically defined as April 1 – August 31.

- b. It is recommended that one week prior to the initiation of activities, a qualified biologist conduct a survey for bat roosts within the Study Area. If a roost is detected during the non-maternity roosting season (September 1 – March 31) then the biologist shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) before any further activities are initiated. If Project activities are initiated during the maternity roosting season (April 1 – August 31) and a roost is detected, then a 50-foot buffer shall be implemented where no construction activities shall occur, until the biologist has determined that the young have left the roost.
- c. At any time of year, if a large tree (dbh >12 inch) will be removed, it shall be left on the ground for 24 hours before being taken off-site or chipped. This period will allow any day roosting bats the opportunity to leave before the tree is either removed from the area or chipped.

**Mitigation Measure 6 (BIO-10):** Any potential impacts to California red-legged frog (CRLF) can be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following measures:

- a. Within 24 hours prior to initial ground disturbance, a pre-construction survey for CRLF shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If the species is found, the qualified biologist shall record the location, number, and any other relevant information. The biologist shall then contact the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine the next steps including whether or not relocation of the animal is possible.
- b. If the preconstruction survey is completed and no CRLF are observed, then the work area shall be surrounded by a wildlife exclusion fence at least 2 feet tall. Escape funnels shall be installed along all sides of the fence to allow any undetected wildlife within the project footprint to escape. Escape funnels shall be placed no further than 100-feet apart.
- c. Once the wildlife exclusion fence is installed, a qualified biologist shall inspect the fence on a weekly basis to identify any breaches, rips, or access points that might allow wildlife to enter the project footprint. Weekly fence inspections shall continue until the project is complete and the fence is scheduled to be removed.
- d. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting, or wrapping around wattles), or similar material in any form shall not be used on the Project in order to avoid entangling, strangling, or trapping CRLF inside or outside of the wildlife fence.
- e. Construction shall be limited to the dry season (April 15 to October 31) to avoid impacting CRLF when they are most likely to use the Study Area as a migration corridor.
- f. Any pipes or culverts that could provide shelter for CRLF shall be elevated off the ground or have their ends covered to prevent animals from climbing into the open-ended materials.

**Source:** SWAIM, 2015; WRA, 2017; Project Location; Project Plans.

4.b. Have a significant 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:** The western portion of the property supports a 0.04-acre area of coastal terrace prairie. While not acknowledged by the County’s Local Coastal Program, coastal terrace prairie is made up of native grasses and forbs that are recognized as environmentally sensitive habitat areas by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and by the California Coastal Commission. While the proposed structures have been proposed to avoid the habitat, construction related activities could result in negative impacts. Therefore, the biologist recommended implementation

of Mitigation Measure 2 along with Mitigation Measure 7 (BIO-1), as detailed below, to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The project site also supports an areas of dense riparian and coastal scrub habitat which run along the southern parcel boundary adjacent to Montara Creek. The biologist notes that there is approximately a 0.6-acre band of Central Coast riparian scrub composed of arroyo willow vegetation which runs adjacent to the Montara Creek. The San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP) requires that a 50-foot buffer, which extends outward from the edge of the riparian habitat, be established to create a buffer between development and the creek/habitat. The biologist mapped the edge of the habitat and the project has been designed to adhere to the delineated buffer. The biologist assessment notes that while the proposed work area is not adjacent to the stream, indirect impacts due to erosion and impairment of water quality during ground disturbance would be a significant impact. The following mitigation measures have been recommended to ensure compliance with the required buffer.

**Mitigation Measure 7 (BIO-1):** Impacts to coastal terrace prairie shall be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measure:

- a. A 100-foot buffer shall be placed around this ESHA to protect this community from disturbance incurred from the residential development proposed within the Study Area. This buffer will also give the native grasses the opportunity to reproduce, expanding the overall area of native grassland in the western portion of the site.
- b. A physical barrier, such as orange construction fencing, shall be established on the edge of the 100-foot buffer to ensure protection of this habitat during ground disturbance activities and all exterior construction (e.g., grading, concrete work, irrigation/drainage work, landscaping, etc.).

**Mitigation Measure 8 (BIO-3):** Impacts to Central Coast riparian scrub (California coffeeberry scrub) shall be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

- a. Maintain a 50-foot no disturbance buffer in order to protect this scrub from adverse or indirect impacts during ground-disturbing activities.
- b. Riparian areas are potentially within the jurisdiction of the CDFW under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. A Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement would be required if project activities impacted this habitat. The current project plans do not indicate any encroachment into this habitat, but if plans change then a 1602 Agreement will be required.

**Mitigation Measure 9 (BIO-4):** Impacts to Montara Creek can be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

- a. A minimum 50-foot buffer shall be maintained in order to protect this stream from adverse or indirect impacts during ground-disturbing activities.
- b. BMPs (as described in Mitigation Measure 2) are required to be implemented to ensure protection of the stream during ground disturbing activities.

**Source:** WRA, 2017; San Mateo County Local Coastal Program; Project Location.

4.c. Have a significant adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

**Discussion:** The eastern portion of the parcel contains an approximately 0.01-acre seasonal wetland. Per the biologic assessment the proposed project has the potential to damage the resource which meets both the Army Corps of Engineers and Local Coastal Program definition for wetland. In order to avoid potential significant impacts to the wetland area Mitigation Measure 10 has been provided.

**Mitigation Measure 10 (BIO-2):** Impacts to seasonal wetland seeps shall be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measure:

- a. Due to the relatively small size of this wetland, possible man-altered hydrologic contributions, substantial cover of non-native species, and the presence of other on-site ESHA limiting development potential, WRA recommends that the buffer be reduced from 100 feet to 50 feet. The reduced buffer is unlikely to have adverse impacts to this wetland and should sufficiently protect it from indirect impacts.
- b. A physical barrier, such as orange construction fencing, shall be established on the edge of the 50-foot buffer to ensure protection of this habitat during ground disturbance activities and all exterior construction (e.g., grading, concrete work, irrigation/drainage work, landscaping, etc.).

**Source:** Project Location; San Mateo County Local Coastal Program; WRA, 2017.

4.d. Interfere significantly 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:** As discussed previously the biological assessment notes that the project site has the potential to support several special-status bird species. In addition, other common native birds such as: house finch, yellow-rumped warbler, American crow, etc., are known to occupy the project area and have the potential to nest within the project area. The biologist identified potential impacts to include activities which would result in the removal of active nest structures and/or causing disruption sufficient to cause abandonment of an active nest. These types of activities are violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as well as California Fish and Game Code. However, compliance with Mitigation Measures 2 and 4 as discussed in 4.a., above will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**Source:** WRA, 2017, Project Location, Project Plans.

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:** Three less than significant size pine trees are proposed for removal as part of the project. A 6" pine tree and a 7" pine tree are located adjacent to the proposed residence where other larger trees are to be maintained. The 9" pine tree proposed for removal is located adjacent to the driveway and would likely be damaged by driveway construction. Trees less than 12" in diameter are not considered significant trees by either the Design Review District Chapter of the County Zoning Regulations or the County's Significant Tree Regulations. Further, compliance with Mitigation Measures 2 and 4 will ensure that impacts to birds that might occupy the tree will be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, the removal of the three less than significant size pine trees (while preserving the remainder of the significant trees located on the project parcel) will not result in any significant impacts.

**Source:** Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, San Mateo County Ordinance Code Section 12000.

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 area is not covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

**Source:** Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan.

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

**Discussion:** The project site is not located within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.

**Source:** Project Location.

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

**Discussion:** The proposed project will not result in the loss of oak woodlands or non-timber woodlands as the area is not located in an area designated as woodlands nor are any trees classified as woodland or other non-timber woodland trees impacted by the project.

**Source:** Project Plans, Project Location.

<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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 significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?				X



<p><b>Discussion:</b> A referral was sent to California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) in 2014. Their response noted that previous studies had been conducted which covered the entirety of the project site. These previous studies determined that the parcel contained no cultural resources. However, the CHRIS response notes that additional studies should be conducted if there were any building or structure present on the property which was 45 years or older. Given that there are no structures present on the property, additional evaluation is not necessary or required.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, California Historical Resources Information System.</p>					
5.b.	Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The CHRIS response also noted that based on previous studies, the project site has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological sites. No further study for archaeological resources was recommended.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, California Historical Resources Information System.</p>					
5.c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> There are no mapped unique paleontological resources or geological features on the project parcel. The project location consists of Qt (Marine Terrace deposits of the Pleistocene periods) and Kgr (Salinian Complex plutonic (granite) rocks of the Cretaceous period) which is commonly found throughout San Mateo County.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, U.S. Geological Survey Geologic Map of the San Francisco Bay Region, 2006.</p>					
5.d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> There are no known human remains located on the site and none were identified in previous evaluations of the project area. However, given that the project site is largely undisturbed the following mitigation measure has been included in the event human remains were encountered.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 11:</b> In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The applicant shall then immediately notify the County Coroner's Office and possibly the State Native American Heritage Commission to seek recommendations from a Most Likely Descendant (Tribal Contact) before any further action at the location of the find can proceed. All contractors and sub-contractors shall be made aware of these requirements and shall adhere to all applicable laws including State Cultural Preservation laws.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>					

6. <b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> 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. Expose people or structures to potential significant adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
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 significant evidence of a known fault?  <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As is the case for most of San Mateo County the subject parcel is located in an area that is subject to earthquakes. The property is located approximately .73 of a mile east of the Seal Cove fault complex and 6.74 miles west of the San Andreas fault. While the project area is included in the Montara Mountain Quadrangle Map the parcel itself is not located within an area delineated as a special studies zone.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> State of California Department of Conservation, Montara Mountain Quadrangle.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is subject to moderate shaking from the Hayward fault, strong to very strong shaking from the San Andreas fault, and violent shaking from the San Gregorio fault. A soils report and a geotechnical investigation were submitted as part of the project's review and received conditional approval by the County's Geotechnical Section. The project will be subject to the issuance of a building permit and all work shall be completed in accordance with the California Building Code and subject to recommendations made by the applicant's engineer to ensure the health and safety of occupants.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County Earthquake Shaking Fault Maps (San Gregorio Fault, San Andreas Fault, Hayward Fault); Earth Investigations Consultants , October 30, 2009.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is located in an area identified as having very low to low probability for earthquake liquefaction.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> United States Geological Survey (USGS)- San Francisco Bay Region Geology and Geologic Hazards, Susceptibility Map of the San Francisco Bay Area;</p>				

iv. Landslides?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is located in an unmapped area for landslides. The parcel has moderate slopes and does not exhibit visible scars of past failures in the project area. The geotechnical report notes that evidence of historic slides are localized and confined to the southern side of Montara Creek, opposite the project site. As mentioned previously, the submitted soils report and geotechnical investigation were evaluated and received conditional approval by the County's Geotechnical Section. The project will be subject to the issuance of a building permit and all work shall be completed in accordance with the California Building Code and subject to recommendations made by the applicant's engineer.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; California Department of Conservation, CGS Information Warehouse: Landslides; Earth Investigations Consultants, October 30, 2009.</p>				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?  <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>				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is located approximately .35 of a mile inland from the nearest coastal bluff/cliff. While there are bluff failures occurring throughout the mid-coastal area of San Mateo County the project area is not currently at risk due to rate of failure and distance to the bluff.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>				
6.b. Result in significant soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project includes approximately 1,966 cubic yards of cut and 1,517 cubic yards of fill for a total of 3,483 cubic yards of earthwork. The proposed earthwork involves the creation of the driveway, installation of on-site drainage measures, and preparing the development sites for the proposed structures. The proposed site alterations are clustered along the proposed driveway which leaves the majority of the parcel undisturbed. However, in order to ensure that the proposed modifications do not result in soil erosion during project construction the following mitigation measure is necessary.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 12:</b> Prior to commencement of the project, 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 County Wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:</p> <p>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.</p>				

- b. Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c. Clear only areas essential for project activities.
- d. Within five days of clearing or inactivity, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative BMPs, such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two weeks of seeding/planting.
- e. Project site 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. Install storm drain inlet protection that traps sediment before it enters any adjacent storm sewer systems. This barrier shall consist of filter fabric, straw bales, gravel, or sand bags.
- k. Install sediment traps/basins at outlets of diversions, channels, slope drains, or other runoff conveyances that discharge sediment-laden water. Sediment traps/ basins shall be cleaned out when 50% full (by volume).
- l. 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 one-third the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.
- m. Utilize coir fabric/netting on sloped graded areas to provide a reduction in water velocity, erosive areas, habitat protection, and topsoil stabilization.
- n. 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:** Project Plans; Project Location.

6.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
--	--	--	--	---

<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not identified as containing a geological unit or soil that is presently unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project. The project site does not show evidence of previous landslides and is mapped as having a low to very low susceptibility for liquefaction. Therefore, compliance with the recommendations of the Engineering Geologist, Civil Engineer, adherence to the California Building Code, and compliance with the Mitigation Measures will ensure that the proposed site disturbance does not result in soil instability.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, California Department of Conservation Hazard Maps.</p>					
6.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as noted in the 2010 California Building Code, creating significant risks to life or property?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The submitted geotechnical report notes that there are highly expansive soils present on the project parcel but states that the proposed project is feasible from a geotechnical perspective. In order to address the presence of expansive soils the report includes specific recommendations for the design of the structures which include the type of foundation and depth of piers to be utilized. These recommendations have been incorporated into the project plans. Therefore, there are no significant impacts associated with the presence of expansive soils.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; Earth Investigations Consultants, October 30, 2009.</p>					
6.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><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project includes the installation of a septic system. The San Mateo County Environmental Health Division, which is the agency that regulates septic systems, completed a preliminary review of the project and provided a conditional approval. Further, the geotechnical study determined that the standard operation of a leach field would not create ground instability if installed and maintained correctly.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; Earth Investigations Consultants, October 30, 2009.</p>					

<b>7. CLIMATE CHANGE.</b> 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.	Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		

**Discussion:** A minor temporary increase in greenhouse gasses during the construction phase may occur. Vehicles are subject to California Air Resources Board emission standards. Although the project scope is not likely to significantly generate greenhouse gases, the following mitigation measure is recommended.

**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 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.

**Source:** California Air Resources Board, San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.

7.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
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project does not conflict with the San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan provided that the mitigation measure outlined in 7.a, above is implemented.

**Source:** San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.

7.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
---	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** Discussion: See discussion under 2.c above.

**Source:** Project Location.

7.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
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project parcel is located on the east side of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway) approximately .35 of a mile (as the crow flies) from the nearest coastal bluff. Given the distance from the ocean and terrain between the project site ocean sea level rise is not expected to impact the project site.

<b>Source:</b> Project Location.					
7.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> See 7.d above. <b>Source:</b> Project Location.					
7.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
<b>Discussion:</b> The project is not located in such an area. The project site is located within a Flood Zone X (Areas with minimal risk outside the 1-percent and .2-percent-annual-chance floodplains. No base flood elevations or base flood depths are shown within these zones.); Community Panel No. 06081C0117F, effective August 2, 2017. <b>Source:</b> Project Location; Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map 06081C0117F.					
7.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The project is not in an area defined as such. <b>Source:</b> Project Location; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Hazard Maps.					

<b>8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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.	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
<b>Discussion:</b> No transport of hazardous materials is associated with this project. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans.					

8.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><b>Discussion:</b> The use of hazardous materials is not proposed as part of the project.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
8.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><b>Discussion:</b> The emissions of hazardous materials, substances, or waste are not proposed as part of the project. In addition, the project site is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
8.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><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located in an area identified as a hazardous materials site.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> California Department of Toxic Substances Control.</p>				
8.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 for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located within two miles of the Half Moon Bay Airport and is included in the Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The project site is included in the "airport influence area" of the Half Moon Bay Airport. The airport influence area (Zone 7) includes all other portions of regular aircraft traffic patterns not covered by the other six zones described in the plan. Based on the plan the airport influence area has been determined to be at low risk for aircraft accidents. Further, the proposed structures do not exceed 39 feet in absolute height, as measured from natural grade, which is approximately 35.82 feet below the Part 77 protrusion threshold for this area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, Half Moon Bay Airspace Management GIS; Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, 2014.</p>				
8.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard				X



for people residing or working in the project area?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> There are no private airstrips located in the project area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>				
8.g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The development of this parcel does not involve aspects which would block or re-route any part of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; Project Plans.</p>				
8.h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The subject parcel is not located within a mapped area for wildland fires. However, there is a mapped area within a half mile of the project site which is defined as a State Responsibility area with a high fire risk. A review of the project was completed by Coastside Fire Protection District (Cal-Fire) and was conditionally approved. This conditional approval includes requirements that the applicant provide a driveway with turnarounds capable of accommodating emergency vehicles, the installation of water tanks for fire suppression, a fire hydrant, and that the single-family residence and ancillary structures install fire sprinklers.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; Cal-Fire, California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map.</p>				
8.i. 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><b>Discussion:</b> The project is not located in such an area. The project site is located within a Flood Zone X (Areas with minimal risk outside the 1-percent and .2-percent-annual-chance floodplains. No base flood elevations or base flood depths are shown within these zones.); Community Panel No. 06081C0117F, effective August 2, 2017.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map 06081C0117F.</p>				
8.j. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See 8.i., above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map 06081C0117F.</p>				

8.k. 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><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located within a mapped flood area or within the vicinity of a levee or dam inundation area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>				
8.l. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is not located in a mapped tsunami inundation area. Nor is the project parcel located in an area subject to seiches or mudflows.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>				

<b>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> 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. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (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><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project does have the potential to result in stormwater discharge. The project site is located in the James V. Fitzgerald Marine Preserve Watershed which is an Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS). Due to the project location and proposed earthwork the project will be considered a stormwater regulated site and will be subject to compliance with the County's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program. However, given that there is a moratorium on grading activities in the wet season (October 1 – April 30), the required installation of sediment and erosion control measures, and the installation of the required stormwater/drainage system there are no expected significant impacts. However, the biologist assessment included the following mitigation measure to ensure compliance.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14 (BIO-5):</b></p> <p>a. Discharges to receiving waters may occur only during the wet weather season (October 1 – April 30) and must (1) be composed of only stormwater, (2) be free of pollutants, and (3) must not alter natural ocean water quality in the ASBS.</p>				

- b. All new point source discharges into the ASBS shall either be retained on-site or shall be treated on-site prior to entering a County storm drain.
- c. Water that comes into contact with architectural copper during installation, cleaning, treating, and washing can be a source of water pollution to the County storm drains and eventually to the ASBS. Therefore, architectural copper BMPs are required to be identified on project plans and implemented during construction and future maintenance.
- d. Discharge to the Montara Water and Sanitary District's sewer system is required, in compliance with Section 3-8.800 of the Montara Water and Sanitary District Code. For properties served by private septic, pool and/or spa discharge shall be dechlorinated and slowly discharged to landscaped areas (determined adequate to support the volume).
- e. Erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted for review and approval for projects within the ASBS watershed that involve soil disturbance and are subject to a building or grading permit.
- f. Pursuant to the Water Board's General Exception to the California Ocean Plan with Special Protections (Attachment B, Section A.2.c.1), weekly construction site inspections are required for all construction sites within the ASBS watershed that involve soil disturbance and are subject to a building or grading permit (considered Stormwater Regulated Construction Sites "SWRS").
- g. On-site areas (new or replaced) used for car washing shall drain to adequately-sized vegetative areas or other on-site treatment facilities or occur on permeable surfaces (e.g., gravel, grass) and shall use as little detergents as necessary. Phosphate free or biodegradable soap is highly encouraged. Discharge to the sanitary sewer is prohibited (Montara Water and Sanitary Code).
- h. Landscape irrigation must comply with the County's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO), when applicable. The County's adopted WELO applies to new and rehabilitated landscapes with a total landscape area equal to or greater than 2,500 sq. ft. for public agency and private development projects or which are developer-installed in single-family and multi-family projects.

**Source:** Project Plans, San Mateo County Excavation, Grading, Filling, and Clearing Ordinance, San Mateo County Water Pollution Prevention Program.

<p>9.b. Significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere significantly with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</p>			X	
--	--	--	---	--

<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel is served by an existing agricultural well which will be converted to domestic service. The existing well has met the County of Environmental Health Division's standards regarding quality and flow. Given that the project seeks to introduce only one single-family residence and is located in an area of very low density of development there is no indication that the introduction of this new use will result in significant groundwater depletion or will interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>					
9.c.	Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in significant erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> While the proposed project does include a significant amount of grading it also includes measures to ensure that post-development run-off (peak flow) and velocity is less than or equal to pre-development levels in accordance with the San Mateo County Drainage policy. These measures include directing surface run-off to vegetated swales and the creation of rain gardens to collect both existing and potentially new surface stormwater. The project also includes a new culvert at the southern portion of the parcel just west of the proposed residence. The culvert will aid in handling overflow from the swales and velocity by directing the water to additional vegetated swales which include rock check dams and engineered riprap. These measures have preliminarily been reviewed and it has been determined that the project will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site and will not significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff on or off the site. The project does not propose any alteration to the nearby creeks and the areas of the parcel that are to be modified are of a significant distance away from these areas that no impacts are expected.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Drainage Policy.</p>					
9.d.	Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 9.c., above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Drainage Policy.</p>					
9.e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide significant additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion of 9.a. and 9.c., above.</p>					

<b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Drainage Policy.				
9.f.	Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?			X
<b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 9.c, above				
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Drainage Policy.				
9.g.	Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?		X	
<b>Discussion:</b> Given that the project site is currently undeveloped, the proposed development will result in an increase in impervious surfaces. However, the project is subject to the provisions of the San Mateo County Drainage policies which require that post-development run-off (peak flow) and velocity is less than or equal to pre-development levels. Therefore, while the project will result in increased impervious surfaces it will not result in increased runoff.				
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Drainage Policy.				

<b>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> 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.	Physically divide an established community?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project does not include any land division or development that would result in the division of an established community.					
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans.					
10.b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
<b>Discussion:</b> As mitigated and conditioned, the project is compliant with applicable land use regulations.					
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans; San Mateo County General Plan; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.					
10.c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

<p><b>Discussion:</b> There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that cover the project parcel.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>					
10.d.	Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project does not propose a use that would result in the congregation of more than 50 people on a regular basis.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>					
10.e.	Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Single family residential development is found within the community and within the immediate proximity of the project parcel.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>					
10.f.	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><b>Discussion:</b> The project proposes improvements to serve only the subject property. These improvements are completely within the parcel boundaries of the subject property and do not serve to encourage off-site development of undeveloped areas or increase the development intensity of surrounding developed areas.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>					
10.g.	Create a significant new demand for housing?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project proposes improvements to serve only the subject property. These improvements are completely within the parcel boundaries of the subject property and do not serve to encourage off-site development of undeveloped areas or increase the development intensity of surrounding developed areas.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>					

<b>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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. 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><b>Discussion:</b> There are no known mineral resources identified on the project parcel.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan.</p>				
11.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><b>Discussion:</b> There are no identified locally important mineral resource recovery site(s) delineated on the County's General Plan, any specific plan, or any other land use plan.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; San Mateo County General Plan; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.</p>				

<b>12. NOISE.</b> 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>
12.a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> During project construction, excessive noise could be generated, particularly during grading and excavation activities. The following Mitigation Measure, as described below, is proposed to reduce the construction noise impact to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Once construction is complete, the project is not expected to generate significant amounts of noise.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 15:</b> 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).</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				

12.b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> There are no aspects of the project that would include generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
12.c. A significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The addition of one single-family residence is not expected to create a significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
12.d. A significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> A temporary increase in ambient noise levels during the construction phase of the project is expected. However, adherence to the San Mateo County Noise Ordinance which is included as a Mitigation Measure 15 will ensure that any impacts are minimized. Post construction, the site should not result in any additional significant ambient noise.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				
12.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, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> While the project site is located within the Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan area, it is not included in the noise exposure contours delineated in the plan. Further, it is not included in the areas identified as being covered by the traffic pattern area or subject to extremely noise sensitive areas.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of Half Moon Bay Airport, September 2014.</p>				
12.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</p>				



**Source:** Project Location.

<b>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Induce significant 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><b>Discussion:</b> All of the proposed improvements are completely within the subject parcel's boundaries and are sufficient only to serve the parcel itself. While the proposal does involve the construction of a new single-family residence there are no municipal service extensions associated with the project which could trigger significant population growth in the area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
13.b. Displace existing housing ( <b>including low- or moderate-income housing</b> ), in an area that is substantially deficient in housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project will not displace existing housing as the project parcel is currently undeveloped.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				

<b>14. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in significant 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Fire protection?				X
14.b. Police protection?				X
14.c. Schools?				X
14.d. Parks?				X

14.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Given that there is existing residential development in the immediate vicinity of the project parcel and that the proposal includes the construction of only one single-family residence the project is not of sufficient scope to result in significant impacts to public services.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				

<b>15. RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that significant physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> All of the proposed improvements are to occur completely on the subject privately owned parcel. Given that the project results in the additional of one single-family residence any increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities would be minor. This increased use will not result in impacts of such a significant level that physical deterioration of any such facility will occur or be accelerated.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
15.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><b>Discussion:</b> No such facilities or activities are proposed as part this project.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				

<b>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> 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. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all				X

<p>modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</p>				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As discussed previously, the proposed site improvements are to occur completely on the subject privately owned parcel. These improvements will provide compliant emergency access to the proposed development on the site. Further, the project does not involve a level of development that would adversely impact any plan, ordinance or policy which establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, Project Plans.</p>				
<p>16.b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p>				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> No. See discussion under 16.a. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, Project Plans.</p>				
<p>16.c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in significant safety risks?</p>				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> No changes in air traffic patterns are proposed as part of this project.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
<p>16.d. Significantly increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project does not include any changes to design features of the public right-of-way and does not introduce uses that are incompatible with the zoning district.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
<p>16.e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project includes driveway construction to provide adequate emergency access. The proposed plans have been reviewed and conditionally approved by both Cal-Fire and the San Mateo County of Public Works for adequate ingress and egress to the parcel.</p>				

<b>Source:</b> Project Plans.					
16.f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> No impacts. See discussion under 16.a. above.					
<b>Source:</b> Project Location.					
16.g.	Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> No. Given that the proposed project does not result in changes outside of the parcel boundaries and the semi-rural nature of the project parcel there is no expectation of increase or change to pedestrian patterns in the area.					
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans.					
16.h.	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The project proposal provides the two required covered off-street parking spaces and given the overall parcel size has sufficient area to accommodate additional vehicles on-site in the case of visitors.					
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.					

<b>17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:					
		<b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
17.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:				

<p>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)</p>				<p>X</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> 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).</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location; State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation, Listed California Historical Resources; County General Plan, Background, Historical and Archaeological Resources Appendices.</p>				
<p>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.)</p>				<p>X</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> While the project parcel is currently undeveloped, it is the last undeveloped parcel in the immediate project vicinity. Previous development in the project vicinity did not encounter any resources which could be considered significant to a California Native American tribe. A Sacred Lands file search of the project vicinity, conducted by the Native American Heritage Council (NAHC), resulted in no found records. Therefore, the project is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change to any potential tribal cultural resources.</p> <p>The project is not subject to Assembly Bill 52 for California Native American tribal consultation requirements, as no traditionally or culturally affiliated tribe has requested, in writing, to the County to be informed of proposed projects in the geographic project area. However, in following the NAHC's recommended best practices, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize any potential significant impacts to unknown tribal cultural resources.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 16:</b> Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources be taken prior to implementation of the project.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 17:</b> In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall stop until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resource in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource, and those measures shall be approved by the Current Planning Section prior to implementation and continuing any work associated with the project.</p>				

**Mitigation Measure 18:** Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

**Source:** Project Plans; Project Location; Native American Heritage Council, California Assembly Bill 52.

<b>18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> 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. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> While the State Water Resources Control Board does regulate wastewater discharges they do not currently have adopted statewide regulations for on-site wastewater treatment systems (i.e. septic systems). Given the rural nature of the project site, the subject parcel and surrounding community are not served by a municipal wastewater service provider. Currently, on-site wastewater treatment systems are regulated by local agencies, which for this project is the San Mateo County Environmental Health Division. The proposed onsite wastewater treatment system has been reviewed and received conditional approval by the San Mateo County's Environmental Health Division.</p> <p>The property is also served by an existing agricultural well which will be converted for domestic service. The well has been tested by the Environmental Health Division and was found to meet the standards for domestic use. There is no expectation that its use will result in any significant environmental effects.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p>				
18.b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project does require the installation of a new wastewater treatment facility (i.e., on-site septic system) to serve the proposed single-family residence. As stated previously the proposed system has been reviewed and received conditional approval by the County's Environmental Health Division. Based on this there is no indication that the proposed new system will result in any significant environmental effects.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				

18.c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> In order to comply with San Mateo County’s drainage policies onsite stormwater measures must be installed in association with the proposed project. These measures were designed by a licensed civil engineer and have been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the San Mateo County Department of Public Works. There is no indication that the installation of these measures will cause any significant environmental effects.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				
18.d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As mentioned previously, the subject parcel is served by an existing agricultural well which will be converted for domestic service. The well was tested by the Environmental Health Division and was found to be compliant with standards for domestic use. While the well conversion does require expanded entitlements it does not result in any significant impacts to water supplies.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				
18.e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> No impact. The project site is not served by a municipal wastewater treatment provider.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location</p>				
18.f. Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The property receives municipal trash pick service and there is no indication at this time that the landfill utilized has insufficient capacity to continue to serve it.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>				
18.g. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Given that the project parcel is located adjacent to existing single-family residential development, and the proposed use is consistent with these surrounding uses which are served by a municipal solid waste management company, there is no expectation that the use would result in</p>				

waste production that would trigger compliance with Federal, State, and/or local statutes and regulations. <b>Source:</b> Project Location, Project Plans.				
18.h. Be sited, oriented, and/or designed to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy; incorporate water conservation and solid waste reduction measures; and incorporate solar or other alternative energy sources?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposed residential development will be required to comply with all currently applicable efficiency standards (i.e., Title-24, CALGreen, etc.), and is located in an area that could support solar or alternative energy sources (none are proposed at this time). <b>Source:</b> Project Plans.				
18.i. Generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> No. See discussion of utility usage in 17.a.-h., above. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans.				

<b>19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, significantly reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
<b>Discussion:</b> The project parcel has been evaluated for special status habitats, plant, and animal species- a biological assessment was conducted and mitigation measures have been provided to ensure that the project does not result in any significant impacts to the identified resources. The proposed project is designed to avoid habitat of fish or other wildlife species, does not threaten to eliminate any plant or animal community, and does not reduce the range of any rare or endangered plant or animal. An archaeological referral was completed and it was determined that previous studies have been completed in the study area and found no cultural, historic, and/or prehistoric				



resources were found on the project parcel. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Project Location; WRA, 2017; CHRIS Referral.				
19.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
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project is consistent with the type and scale of development in the area. While mitigation measures have been included in the project these are to provide protections to the resources that were found to be present on the property or those that have the potential to occur. There is no expectation that the project either contributes to or creates any cumulative impacts. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, WRA, 2017.				
19.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 19.a. and 19.b., above. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location.				

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

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)		X	
State Water Resources Control Board	X		Notice of Intent- General Permit for Stormwater Discharges
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	
State Department of Public Health		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
CalTrans		X	

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		X	
Coastal Commission	X		CDP Appeals Jurisdiction
City		X	
Sewer/Water District:		X	
Other:			

<b><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></b>		
	<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><b><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u></b> The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water all active construction and grading areas at least twice daily.</li> <li>Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets/roads.</li> <li>Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Mitigation Measure 2:</u></b> To reduce the potential for impacts to sensitive communities and special-status species, the following general best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented. Implementation of these general BMPs, in combination with the species- and habitat-specific measures provided in Mitigation Measures 3 – 10 and 13, will minimize adverse impacts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate perimeter erosion and sediment control measures (i.e., silt fencing, straw wattles) shall be installed around any stockpiles of soil or other materials which could be transported by rainfall or other flows in order to reduce the possibility of soil erosion and sediments flowing into natural habitats.</li> <li>All access, staging, and work areas shall be delineated with orange construction fencing, or with a similar material and all work activities shall be limited to these areas.</li> <li>All access, staging, and work areas shall be the minimum size necessary to conduct the work.</li> </ol>		

- d. All staging, maintenance, and storage of construction equipment shall be performed in a manner to preclude any direct or indirect discharge of fuel, oil, or other petroleum products into the Study Area. No other debris, rubbish, soil, silt, sand, or other construction-related materials or wastes shall be allowed to enter into or be placed where they may be washed by rainfall or runoff into wetland areas. All such debris and waste shall be picked-up daily and shall be properly disposed of at an appropriate facility. If a spill of fluid materials occurs, the area shall be cleaned and contaminated materials disposed of properly. The affected spill area shall be restored to its natural condition.
- e. Disturbance or removal of vegetation shall not exceed the minimum necessary to conduct the work.
- f. Stockpiles of soil or other materials that can be blown by wind shall be covered when not in active use.
- g. All trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials shall be covered.

**Mitigation Measure 3 (BIO-6):** The California wild strawberry located in the western portion of the project parcel shall be protected by a 50-foot avoidance buffer. Prior to the commencement of any construction related activity the applicant shall install exclusion fencing reflecting this buffer.

- a. A 50-foot avoidance buffer should be maintained around the higher quality western subpopulations.
- b. A physical barrier, such as orange construction fencing, shall be established on the edge of the 50-foot buffer to ensure protection of this habitat during ground disturbance activities and all exterior construction (e.g., grading, concrete work, irrigation/drainage work, landscaping, etc.).
- c. A qualified biologist shall develop a mitigation and monitoring plan to be implemented during the start of ground disturbance activities to ensure successful translocation of these plants on site if they are impacted. At a minimum, the mitigation and monitoring plan shall include:
  - (1) Documentation of proposed impacts to the species;
  - (2) Proposed mitigation including some combination of transplantation or re-establishment of impacted populations and/or preservation and management of existing populations;
  - (3) Proposed methods for transplantation, re-establishment, or restoration;
  - (4) A 3-year monitoring program with annual reporting;
  - (5) Performance criteria for transplants or plantings, including (a) survivorship, (b) density, and (c) cover, and performance criteria for invasive plants and other potential threats to the success of the mitigation efforts including, but not limited to, erosion and human disturbance; and
  - (6) An adaptive management plan for addressing any failure to meet performance criteria or to address other unforeseen problems.

**Mitigation Measure 4 (BIO-7):** Impacts to all nesting birds shall be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following measures:

- a. Impacts to nesting birds can be avoided if potential activities are initiated outside of the nesting season (September 1 – February 14).
- b. If work is to be conducted during the nesting season (February 15 – August 31), preconstruction breeding bird surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to initial ground disturbance to avoid impacting active nests, eggs, and/or young.
- c. If any nests are found, they shall have a suitable buffer established for protection of the nest

and young. Buffer distance will vary based on species and conditions at the site, but are typically at least 25 feet for common passerines, and may be up to 500 feet for California fully-protected species. Buffers shall be maintained until a qualified biologist determines that the nest is no longer active.

**Mitigation Measure 5 (BIO-8):** Impacts to roosting bats can be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following measures:

- a. Any mature trees within the Study Area that are proposed for removal shall be removed outside of the maternity roosting season. For this area of California, the maternity roosting season is typically defined as April 1 – August 31.
- b. It is recommended that one week prior to the initiation of activities, a qualified biologist conduct a survey for bat roosts within the Study Area. If a roost is detected during the non-maternity roosting season (September 1 – March 31) then the biologist shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) before any further activities are initiated. If Project activities are initiated during the maternity roosting season (April 1 – August 31) and a roost is detected, then a 50-foot buffer shall be implemented where no construction activities shall occur, until the biologist has determined that the young have left the roost.
- c. At any time of year, if a large tree (dbh >12 inch) will be removed, it shall be left on the ground for 24 hours before being taken off-site or chipped. This period will allow any day roosting bats the opportunity to leave before the tree is either removed from the area or chipped.

**Mitigation Measure 6 (BIO-10):** Any potential impacts to California red-legged frog (CRLF) can be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following measures:

- a. Within 24 hours prior to initial ground disturbance, a pre-construction survey for CRLF shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If the species is found, the qualified biologist shall record the location, number, and any other relevant information. The biologist shall then contact the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine the next steps including whether or not relocation of the animal is possible.
- b. If the preconstruction survey is completed and no CRLF are observed, then the work area shall be surrounded by a wildlife exclusion fence at least 2 feet tall. Escape funnels shall be installed along all sides of the fence to allow any undetected wildlife within the project footprint to escape. Escape funnels shall be placed no further than 100-feet apart.
- c. Once the wildlife exclusion fence is installed, a qualified biologist shall inspect the fence on a weekly basis to identify any breaches, rips, or access points that might allow wildlife to enter the project footprint. Weekly fence inspections shall continue until the project is complete and the fence is scheduled to be removed.
- d. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting, or wrapping around wattles), or similar material in any form shall not be used on the Project in order to avoid entangling, strangling, or trapping CRLF inside or outside of the wildlife fence.
- e. Construction shall be limited to the dry season (April 15 to October 31) to avoid impacting CRLF when they are most likely to use the Study Area as a migration corridor.
- f. Any pipes or culverts that could provide shelter for CRLF shall be elevated off the ground or have their ends covered to prevent animals from climbing into the open-ended materials.

**Mitigation Measure 7 (BIO-1):** Impacts to coastal terrace prairie shall be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measure:

- a. A 100-foot buffer shall be placed around this ESHA to protect this community from disturbance incurred from the residential development proposed within the Study Area. This buffer will also give the native grasses the opportunity to reproduce, expanding the

overall area of native grassland in the western portion of the site.

- b. A physical barrier, such as orange construction fencing, shall be established on the edge of the 100-foot buffer to ensure protection of this habitat during ground disturbance activities and all exterior construction (e.g., grading, concrete work, irrigation/drainage work, landscaping, etc.).

**Mitigation Measure 8 (BIO-3):** Impacts to Central Coast riparian scrub (California coffeeberry scrub) shall be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

- a. Maintain a 50-foot no disturbance buffer in order to protect this scrub from adverse or indirect impacts during ground-disturbing activities.
- b. Riparian areas are potentially within the jurisdiction of the CDFW under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code. A Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement would be required if project activities impacted this habitat. The current project plans do not indicate any encroachment into this habitat, but if plans change then a 1602 Agreement will be required.

**Mitigation Measure 9 (BIO-4):** Impacts to Montara Creek can be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

- a. A minimum 50-foot buffer shall be maintained in order to protect this stream from adverse or indirect impacts during ground-disturbing activities.
- b. BMPs (as described in Mitigation Measure 2) are required to be implemented to ensure protection of the stream during ground disturbing activities.

**Mitigation Measure 10 (BIO-2):** Impacts to seasonal wetland seeps shall be reduced to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measure:

- a. Due to the relatively small size of this wetland, possible man-altered hydrologic contributions, substantial cover of non-native species, and the presence of other on-site ESHA limiting development potential, WRA recommends that the buffer be reduced from 100 feet to 50 feet. The reduced buffer is unlikely to have adverse impacts to this wetland and should sufficiently protect it from indirect impacts.
- b. A physical barrier, such as orange construction fencing, shall be established on the edge of the 50-foot buffer to ensure protection of this habitat during ground disturbance activities and all exterior construction (e.g., grading, concrete work, irrigation/drainage work, landscaping, etc.).

**Mitigation Measure 11:** In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The applicant shall then immediately notify the County Coroner's Office and possibly the State Native American Heritage Commission to seek recommendations from a Most Likely Descendant (Tribal Contact) before any further action at the location of the find can proceed. All contractors and sub-contractors shall be made aware of these requirements and shall adhere to all applicable laws including State Cultural Preservation laws.

**Mitigation Measure 12:** Prior to commencement of the project, 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 County Wide 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 project activities.
- d. Within five days of clearing or inactivity, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative BMPs, such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two weeks of seeding/planting.
- e. Project site 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. Install storm drain inlet protection that traps sediment before it enters any adjacent storm sewer systems. This barrier shall consist of filter fabric, straw bales, gravel, or sand bags.
- k. Install sediment traps/basins at outlets of diversions, channels, slope drains, or other runoff conveyances that discharge sediment-laden water. Sediment traps/ basins shall be cleaned out when 50% full (by volume).
- l. 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 one-third the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.
- m. Utilize coir fabric/netting on sloped graded areas to provide a reduction in water velocity, erosive areas, habitat protection, and topsoil stabilization.
- n. 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 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 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 (BIO-5):**

- a. Discharges to receiving waters may occur only during the wet weather season (October 1 – April 30) and must (1) be composed of only stormwater, (2) be free of pollutants, and (3) must not alter natural ocean water quality in the ASBS.
- b. All new point source discharges into the ASBS shall either be retained on-site or shall be treated on-site prior to entering a County storm drain.
- c. Water that comes into contact with architectural copper during installation, cleaning, treating, and washing can be a source of water pollution to the County storm drains and eventually to the ASBS. Therefore, architectural copper BMPs are required to be identified on project plans and implemented during construction and future maintenance.
- d. Discharge to the Montara Water and Sanitary District's sewer system is required, in compliance with Section 3-8.800 of the Montara Water and Sanitary District Code. For properties served by private septic, pool and/or spa discharge shall be dechlorinated and slowly discharged to landscaped areas (determined adequate to support the volume).
- e. Erosion and sediment control plans shall be submitted for review and approval for projects within the ASBS watershed that involve soil disturbance and are subject to a building or grading permit.
- f. Pursuant to the Water Board's General Exception to the California Ocean Plan with Special Protections (Attachment B, Section A.2.c.1), weekly construction site inspections are required for all construction sites within the ASBS watershed that involve soil disturbance and are subject to a building or grading permit (considered Stormwater Regulated Construction Sites "SWRS").
- g. On-site areas (new or replaced) used for car washing shall drain to adequately-sized vegetative areas or other on-site treatment facilities or occur on permeable surfaces (e.g., gravel, grass) and shall use as little detergents as necessary. Phosphate free or biodegradable soap is highly encouraged. Discharge to the sanitary sewer is prohibited (Montara Water and Sanitary Code).
- h. Landscape irrigation must comply with the County's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELo), when applicable. The County's adopted WELo applies to new and rehabilitated landscapes with a total landscape area equal to or greater than 2,500 sq. ft. for public agency and private development projects or which are developer-installed in single-family and multi-family projects.

**Mitigation Measure 15:** 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 16:** Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources be taken prior to implementation of the project.

**Mitigation Measure 17:** In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall stop until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resource in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource, and those measures shall be approved by the Current Planning Section prior to implementation and continuing any work associated with the project.

**Mitigation Measure 18:** Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

**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.

\_\_\_\_\_

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 NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

March 1, 2018

Date



\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

Planner III

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

AC:pac - ACCCC0049\_WPH.DOCX