

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Atkins-Concra Single-Family Residence (Amendment)
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2016-00150
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Summer Burlison, Project Planner; 650/363-1815 or sburlison@smcgov.org
5. **Project Location:** Kebet Ridge Road, unincorporated Woodside
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 075-321-220; 18.4 acres
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Ryan Atkins, Meghan Concra, 3044 Hacienda Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
8. **General Plan Designation:** Open Space
9. **Zoning:** Resource Management (RM)
10. **Description of the Project:**

Background:

An Initial Study (IS) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) were previously prepared for the project and certified by the County of San Mateo in 2017. A copy of these previous documents are included as Attachment C for reference. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162(b) states that if changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent negative declaration if required under subdivision (a); otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation. This subsequent IS and attached MND have been prepared to address project scope changes since certification of the previous 2017 IS/MND.

Project Scope Changes:

Project scope changes since the previous 2017 IS/MND are included in the amended plans, see Attachment B. Building changes include creating more interior usable space on the 2nd floor of the proposed two-story residence (no exterior footprint changes) and increasing the decking around the residence by 374 sq. ft. for a new total of 988 sq. ft. of deck. Additionally, the amended project involves modifying the previously approved grading amount of 910 cubic

yards (c.y), including 625 c.y. of cut and 285 c.y. of fill, to a new total of 4,140 c.y. of grading, including 3,705 c.y. of cut and 435 c.y. of fill. The additional grading will occur east of the proposed residence and is necessary to achieve less than 35% slope gradient for the proposed leachfield area to allow for a gravity septic system design. The increased grading will increase the number of trees necessary for removal from 37 trees to 50 trees including Douglas fir, canyon live oak, coast redwood, tan oak, Pacific madrone, and coast live oak trees ranging in size from 11 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) to 46 inches dbh, of which 28 require a permit to remove due to their size (being over 55 inches in circumference pursuant to the Development Review Criteria of the RM District Regulations).

Based on the proposed changes, an amendment to the previously approved Resource Management (RM) Permit and Grading Permit are required.

11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** See 2017 Initial Study, Attachment C.
12. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None
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?:** No, there are no California Native American Tribes affiliated with the project area that have requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to

projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. AESTHETICS. 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>Discussion: The project parcel is located on a southeast-facing ridge of the central Santa Cruz Mountains, west of Skyline Boulevard. The parcel is configured in a flag shape with the eastern “pole” portion fronting La Honda Road (State Route 84) and the western “flag” portion fronting Kebet Ridge Road. A majority of the parcel consists of slope gradients over 35% and contains dense vegetation and tree coverage. The project proposes a new two-story residence in the western portion of the parcel. The residence will have a maximum height of 28’-6”. A new driveway from Kebet Ridge Road down to the project site will be constructed along with a retaining wall of up to 8 ft. in height in some portions that abut 30% or greater downslopes. Development is proposed in the only relatively flat, open area of the parcel that sits approximately 20 ft. below Kebet Ridge Road. The parcel continues in a downward slope east of the project site area all the way to La Honda Road, approximately 0.25 miles east. Although the project site is relatively higher in elevation than most of the surrounding parcels in the area, the project site will not be visible from surrounding residential properties, or Kebet Ridge Road, due to the area’s topography and dense tree coverage. The nearest water body is La Honda Creek which runs through the eastern portion of the parcel abutting La Honda Road, approximately 0.24 miles east of the project site. Therefore, the project will not have a significant adverse effect on any scenic vista, views from residential areas, public lands (none), water bodies, or roads.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; Amended Project Plans.</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	
<p>Discussion: The project proposes to remove 50 trees in and around the immediate project area in order to accommodate the proposed development. Tree removal consists of Douglas fir, canyon live oak, coast redwood, tan oak, Pacific madrone, and coast live oak trees ranging in size from 12 inches dbh to 46 inches dbh. As mentioned, proposed tree removal will be limited to the immediate project area and to that necessary to construct the project (including the driveway, drainage, and utilities). Given the extent of mature trees on the 18.4-acre parcel and surrounding area, the proposed removals will not cause significant damage to scenic resources, as tree removal will be spread out over the approximate 1-acre area of proposed disturbance to accommodate the building pad and downhill septic system. See staff’s discussion in Section 4.e. below.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				

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 project site is not visible from surrounding residential properties due to existing topography and dense tree coverage in the area. Although a number of trees are proposed for removal along the Kebet Ridge Road roadway frontage, the frontage has a significant change in grade elevation from the roadway such that the house ridge will not significantly protrude above the roadway elevation. The east side of the relatively flat building site area (which is relatively absent of trees) provides a private overlook to the lower immediate and distant region toward La Honda Road. However, due to the significant drop in elevation and dense tree coverage in the area, the project site is not visible from La Honda Road or any public viewpoints. The project proposes to use cement board siding in subtle blue-gray and brown-gray colors with a standing seam metal roof in dark brown to help minimize any visual impacts to the rural character and quality of the area. The house and carport will be of modern design with extended roof lines. The buildings are situated so as to fit into the existing terraced topography of the project area, to the extent feasible.

While the project site is relatively flat, a total of 4,140 cubic yards (c.y.) of grading is proposed, including 3,705 c.y. of cut and 435 c.y. of fill to construct the building pad, hardscape/driveway, in-ground pool, and septic system. The amended project includes an additional 3,080 c.y. of excavation and 150 c.y. of fill that will be focused in the sloped area east of the residence where the septic system is proposed. Additional grading (from that already approved) is necessary in this area to accommodate a gravity septic system below natural grade that is in compliance with the County's standards. The proposed grading is the minimum necessary to implement the project and would not significantly alter the topography or ground surface relief features.

Source: Amended Project Plans; Project Location.

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 majority of the project will be screened from surrounding views by topography, tree coverage, and distance of the development to neighboring properties. However, new light sources and glare from the proposed development have the potential to generate adverse impacts on daytime and nighttime views in the area along the exposed east side of the development as it is situated above the lower distant region to the east. The following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize any adverse daytime or nighttime view impacts from light or glare that the project may introduce to the area:

Mitigation Measure 1: All proposed lighting shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area. Manufacturer cut sheets for any exterior light fixtures shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All exterior fixtures shall be rated dark-sky compliant and designed to minimize light pollution beyond the confines of the subject premises.

Mitigation Measure 2: Final finishes of all exterior materials and/or colors shall be non-reflective.

Source: Project Location; Amended Project Plans.

1.e. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?		X		
<p>Discussion: The eastern portion of the 18.4-acre parcel is located in the La Honda Road County Scenic Corridor. However, the western portion of the parcel, including the proposed project site, is located approximately 300 ft. west of the county scenic corridor. See staff's discussion and recommended mitigation measures in Section 1.a. - 1.d. above. No further mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan, Scenic Corridors Map; Project Location; Amended Project Plans.</p>				
1.f. If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
<p>Discussion: The parcel is not located within a Design Review District.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Zoning Map.</p>				
1.g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?		X		
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 1.a. - 1.d. above.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; Amended Project Plans.</p>				

<p>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of 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:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a. For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X

<p>Discussion: According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project site is designated “Other Land” and therefore is not Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map (2017).</p>					
2.b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is zoned Resource Management (RM), which permits agricultural and residential uses. Furthermore, the parcel is not protected by an existing Open Space Easement or Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County Agricultural Preserves Map; Amended Project Plans.</p>					
2.c.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in an area identified as Farmland or suitable for agricultural activities. Furthermore, the project is not considered forestland pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) which defines forestland as land that can support 10% native tree cover of any species and that allows for management of one or more forest resources. The project site is an undeveloped, privately-owned 18.4-acre parcel surrounded by similarly sized residentially developed rural properties. The project area has been previously disturbed by historical access road grading and does not support forestland.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map (2017); Public Resources Code Section 12220(g); Project Location.</p>					
2.d.	For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>					
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is located in an area of productive soil resources with timber capabilities, based on the San Mateo County General Plan Productive Soil Resources Map. No timber-growing activities are being conducted on-site. However, the project area is an open area on the parcel confined to approximately 1 acre with proposed development clustered near Kebet Ridge</p>					

Road, leaving the majority of the 18.4-acre parcel undisturbed and available for timber production opportunities.

Source: San Mateo County General Plan, Productive Soil Resources Map.

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

Discussion: The property is zoned Resource Management (RM). Residential uses are allowed in the RM Zoning District subject to an RM permit, which the applicant is seeking as part of the subject project. No proposed zoning changes are included as part of this project.

Source: San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; Project Plans.

3. AIR QUALITY. 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:

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

Discussion: The Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP), developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), is the current regulating air quality plan for San Mateo County. The CAP was created to improve Bay Area air quality and to protect public health and the climate.

The project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2017 CAP. During project implementation, air emissions would be generated from site grading, equipment, and work vehicles; however, any such grading-related emissions would be temporary and localized. Once constructed, use of the development as a single-family residence would have minimal impacts to the air quality standards set forth for the region by the BAAQMD.

Source: BAAQMD 2017 Clean Air Plan; Amended Project Plans.

<p>3.b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p>		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion: During project construction, air emissions in the form of fugitive dust and exhaust will be generated from site grading, construction equipment, and construction vehicles. However, any such construction-related emissions will be temporary and localized.

The BAAQMD provides preliminary screening criteria in their 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines to indicate whether a project would result in the generation of construction-related criteria air-pollutants and/or precursors that exceed defined thresholds of significance. The proposed project, with the basic construction mitigation control measures below, meets the screening criteria indicating a less than significant impact for construction-related activities. Furthermore, Section 2-1-113 (*Exemption, Sources and Operations*) of the BAAQMD General Requirements exempts sources of air pollution associated with the construction of a single-family residence used solely for residential purposes, as well as road construction, from obtaining an Authority to Construct or Permit to Operate.

Mitigation Measure 3: The applicant shall submit a plan to the Planning and Building Department prior to the issuance of any grading “hard card” that, at a minimum, includes the “Basic Construction Mitigation Measures” as listed in Table 8-2 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (May 2017). These measures shall be implemented prior to beginning any ground disturbance and shall be maintained for the duration of the project activities:

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access road) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent paved roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.
- e. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment or vehicles off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- f. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- g. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the County regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Source: BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017; BAAQMD 2017 Clean Air Plan; Amended Project Plans.

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>Discussion: The San Francisco Bay Area is in non-attainment for ozone and particulate matter (PM), including PM 10 (state status) and PM 2.5 (state status), including the 24-hour PM 2.5 national standard. Therefore, any increase in these criteria pollutants is significant. Implementation of the project will generate temporary increases in these criteria pollutants due to construction vehicle emissions and dust generated from earthwork activities. Mitigation Measure 3 will minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level. Furthermore, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) provides regulation over vehicles of residents in the State of California, including the operation of any vehicles that would be associated with the proposed single-family residence, to ensure vehicle operating emissions are minimized in the effort towards reaching attainment for Ozone, among other goals. The current project amendment is not expected to generate a significant change to this conclusion.</p> <p>Source: BAAQMD Air Quality Standards and Attainment Status, URL (2019); Amended Project Plans.</p>					
3.d.	Expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by BAAQMD?		X		
<p>Discussion: Any pollutant emissions generated from the project will primarily be temporary in nature. The project site is in a rural area with few sensitive receptors (i.e., single-family residences) located within the nearby project vicinity. Additionally, the surrounding tree canopy and vegetation will help to insulate the project area from nearby sensitive receptors. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure 3 will minimize any potential significant exposure to nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; Project Location.</p>					
3.e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a significant number of people?				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposes development of a single-family residence on an 18.4-acre parcel in a rural area of the unincorporated County and therefore, will not generate objectionable odors that could affect a significant number of people.</p> <p>Source: Amended 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>Discussion: See staff's discussions, and recommended Mitigation Measure 3, in Sections 3.b. and 3.c. above.</p> <p>Source: See sources in Section 3.b. and 3.c. above.</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
<p>Discussion: According to review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), there are no special-status plant or animal species identified on the project site or within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Furthermore, the project site is located in an area of the parcel that is believed to have undergone past disturbance given its observed topography relative to the area. The nearest mapped sensitive habitat identified on the County's General Plan Sensitive Habitats Map is riparian habitat along La Honda Creek which runs through the eastern portion of the parcel abutting La Honda Road, approximately 0.24 miles east of the project site. Therefore, the project will not impact any special-status species.</p> <p>Source: California Natural Diversity Database; San Mateo County General Plan, Sensitive Habitats Map.</p>				
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
<p>Discussion: There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities located on the project site. See staff's discussion in Section 4.a. above.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan, Sensitive Habitats Map; Amended Project Plans; Site Visit, 2017.</p>				
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
<p>Discussion: There are no wetlands located within the project area.</p> <p>Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Wetland Mapper V2 (2017).</p>				

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: See staff’s discussion in Section 4.a. above.
Source: See Sources referenced in Section 4.a. above.

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

Discussion: The project proposes to remove 50 trees consisting of 20 Douglas fir (ranging in size from 12 inches to 26 inches dbh), 7 canyon live oaks (ranging in size from 11 inches to 46 inches dbh), 2 coast redwoods (16 inches and 36 inches dbh), 7 tan oaks (ranging in size from 14 inches to 34 inches dbh), 12 Pacific madrone (ranging in size from 12 inches to 34 inches dbh), and 2 coast live oaks (18 inches and 25 inches dbh). The trees proposed for removal are the minimum necessary to accommodate the proposed development as these trees are within the footprint of the proposed development (including building, driveway, and utilities). The Development Review Criteria of the Resource Management (RM) District Regulations prohibits the removal of trees with a trunk circumference of more than 55 inches measured at 4.5 feet above the average surface of the ground (or more than 17.5 inches dbh), except as may be required for development permitted under the Zoning Regulations, among other reasons. The RM District allows single-family residences subject to the issuance of an RM Permit. Of the 50 trees proposed for removal, 28 are of a size falling under regulation by the RM District Development Review Criteria and, therefore, require an RM Permit for which the applicant is seeking. As mentioned, removal of these trees are necessary to accommodate the proposed single-family residential development.

One of the trees proposed for removal, a canyon live oak (46 inches dbh) is considered a heritage tree by definition (Section 11,050(g)) under the County’s Heritage Tree Ordinance. The tree is assessed as being in good condition with a slight lean and basal wound on the east side of the trunk. The tree is proposed for removal due to its proximity to the proposed pool, retaining walls, and utilities associated with the project. The County’s Heritage Tree Ordinance considers the proximity to existing or proposed structures and interference with utility services; the necessity of removal to construct improvements or otherwise allow economic or other enjoyment of property; and the number, species, size and location of existing trees in the area as factors for removal of a heritage tree.

In order to mitigate the proposed tree removal, replacement tree plantings are recommended at a 1:1 ratio of 15-gallon (minimum) sized trees of native species for the regulated trees proposed for removal. Furthermore, any regulated oak tree species removed shall be replaced with the same species.

Mitigation Measure 4: All regulated trees proposed for removal shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio, minimum 15-gallon size stock. All proposed replacement trees shall be shown on a Tree Replanting Plan or Landscape Plan and shall include species, size, and location. Any regulated oak tree species removed shall be replaced with the same species. The Plan shall be submitted to the

County Planning and Building Department for review and approval as part of the building permit plan sets. Source: Amended Project Plans; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County Significant Tree Ordinance; San Mateo County Heritage Tree Ordinance.					
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: There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Conservation Community Plans, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans for the project site. Source: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Habitat Conservation Planning, California Regional Conservation Plans Map.					
4.g.	Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve. Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, National Wildlife Refuge System Locator.					
4.h.	Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?		X		
Discussion: State Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17 requires state agencies to preserve and protect native oak woodlands to the maximum extent feasible or provide replacement plantings when oak woodlands are removed. For the purposes of the measure, "oak woodlands" means a five-acre circular area containing five or more oak trees per acre. The project site is smaller than the defined five-acre circular area under the State Senate Resolution. Nonetheless, the project does propose to remove non-timber woodlands consisting of a total of 50 trees of various species (i.e., Douglas fir, canyon live oak, coast redwood, tan oak, Pacific madrone, and coast live oak), of which 28 require a permit to remove due to their size (17.5 inches dbh or greater). Replacement plantings are required for the regulated trees proposed for removal. See staff's discussion in Section 4.e. above. Source: State Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17; Project Plans.					

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a.	Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?			X

<p>Discussion: According to a cultural resources survey report prepared by Archaeological/Historical Consultants, the project site does not contain any historical resources.</p> <p>Source: Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Archaeological/Historical Consultants, dated October 2016.</p>					
5.b.	Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		
<p>Discussion: According to a cultural resources survey report prepared by Archaeological/Historical Consultants, no archaeological resources were discovered in the project area during site reconnaissance work. While the report identifies that archaeological sensitivity in the project area is low due to the steep topography, the discovery of subsurface archaeological materials during grading or construction work is always a possibility. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is recommended:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5: In the event that archaeological resources are inadvertently discovered during construction, work in the immediate vicinity (within 25 feet) of the find must stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. Construction activities may continue in other areas beyond the 25-foot stop work area. A qualified archaeologist is defined as someone who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in archaeology. The Current Planning Section shall be notified of such findings, and no additional work shall be done in the stop work area until the archaeologist has recommended appropriate measures, and those measures have been approved by the Current Planning Section and implemented.</p> <p>Source: Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Archaeological/Historical Consultants, dated October 2016.</p>					
5.c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project site does not consist of any known or identified unique paleontological resources or geological features. Due to earthwork associated with the project, the project may have the potential to impact any unknown paleontological resources. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is recommended to minimize any potential unearthing and impact to any unknown paleontological resources within the project area.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 6: In the event that paleontological resources are inadvertently discovered during construction, work in the immediate vicinity (within 25 feet) of the find must stop until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the significant of the find. The Current Planning Section shall be notified of such findings, and no additional work shall be done in the stop work area until the paleontologist has recommended appropriate measures, and those measures have been approved by the Current Planning Section and implemented.</p> <p>Source: Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Archaeological/Historical Consultants, dated October 2016.</p>					
5.d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

Discussion: In the inadvertent event that human remains are discovered during ground disturbance and/or construction related activities, the following mitigation measure is recommended:

Mitigation Measure 7: Should any human remains be discovered during construction, all ground disturbing work shall cease and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified, pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the State of California Health and Safety Code. Work must stop until the County Coroner can make a determination of origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 for the naming of a Most Likely Descendant and the recommendations for disposition.

Source: Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Archaeological/Historical Consultants, dated October 2016.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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>Discussion: The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or special study area where fault rupture is likely to occur.</p> <p>Source: State of California, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Studies Zones Map, Woodside Quadrangle, July 1, 1974.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p>Discussion: According to a geotechnical study prepared for the project by Earth Investigations Consultants, the project site is located within a tectonic block between the Pilarcitos and Woodhaven faults (mapped within a mile of the project site). These two faults are considered inactive, but are recognized as significant tectonic features in the San Andreas fault system. The active San Andreas fault is mapped approximately 3 1/2 miles northeast of the project site. Earth Investigations Consultants concludes that the risk of fault ground rupture on the project site is considered remote given the distance to the nearest active fault. Additionally, the project is required to comply with all seismic design criteria of the current California Building Code which sets forth the minimum load</p>				

<p>requirements for the seismic design of structures. Therefore, no additional mitigation is necessary beyond current Building Code compliance.</p> <p>Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated January 19, 2016; Supplemental Geotechnical Plan Review prepared by Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated September 5, 2018.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?			X	
<p>Discussion: According to a Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project site by Earth Investigations Consultants, the occurrence of significant liquefaction from strong to violent ground shaking at the project site is low given the shallow depth to competent bedrock.</p> <p>Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated January 19, 2016; Supplemental Geotechnical Plan Review prepared by Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated September 5, 2018.</p>				
iv. Landslides?			X	
<p>Discussion: The U.S. Geological Survey's Landslide Susceptibility Map of 1972 characterizes the parcel as having moderate susceptibility to landslides. A geotechnical study of the project site prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants concludes that there are no mapped landslides affecting the project site and no evidence of active or dormant landslides in the project area based on site reconnaissance.</p> <p>Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated January 19, 2016; Supplemental Geotechnical Plan Review prepared by Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated September 5, 2018.</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>Discussion: The project site is not located on a coastal cliff or bluff.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
6.b. Result in significant soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project proposes 4,140 cubic yards (c.y.) of grading, including 3,705 c.y. of cut and 435 c.y. of fill. Given the topography of the project site, there is a potential for erosion to occur if proper erosion control measures are not implemented. The applicant has developed an erosion control plan that includes fiber rolls around the downhill perimeter of construction and a stabilized construction entrance from Kebet Ridge Road, as well as other Best Management erosion control practices. Furthermore, staff is recommending the following mitigation measures to further minimize erosion and runoff from the project area and to ensure that grading and erosion control measures are implemented appropriately:</p>				

Mitigation Measure 8: The applicant shall submit an erosion control plan in compliance with the County's General Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Guidelines Checklist for review and approval as part of the building permit plans submittal.

Mitigation Measure 9: No grading shall be allowed during the wet weather season (October 1 through April 30) to avoid increased potential soil erosion, unless the applicant applies for an Exception to the Winter Grading Moratorium and the Community Development Director grants the exception. Exceptions will only be granted if dry weather is forecasted during scheduled grading operations, and the erosion control plan includes adequate winterization measures (amongst other determining factors).

Mitigation Measure 10: An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and building permit to ensure the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

Source: Amended Project Plans; County of San Mateo Erosion Control and Tree Protection Requirements.

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	
------	---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: While Earth Investigations Consultants concludes that there is no evidence of any geological hazards that would constrain the project site, there is a potential for significant erosion from project construction. The increased grading will provide a Mitigation Measures 8 - 10 will ensure that erosion from construction activities is minimized.

Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated January 19, 2016; Supplemental Geotechnical Plan Review prepared by Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated September 5, 2018; Amended Project Plans.

6.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as noted in the 2010 California Building Code, creating significant risks to life or property?				X
------	--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project site is not identified as consisting of expansive soils per the geotechnical study completed by Earth Investigations Consultants.

Source: Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated January 19, 2016; Supplemental Geotechnical Plan Review prepared by Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated September 5, 2018; Amended Project Plans.

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	
------	---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The project amendment includes additional excavation work in the area east of the residence for the proposed septic system to, in part, remove previously imported fill in order to reach native soil conditions for (septic) system. The additional grading work will also allow recontouring in portions of this sloped area to 35% to accommodate a gravity septic system. The project has been preliminarily reviewed by the County of San Mateo Environmental Health Division and has received conditional approval for the location of a septic system capable to serve the proposed residential development.

Source: Amended Project Plans; County of San Mateo Environmental Health Division.

7. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project includes the removal of 50 trees of various species (Douglas fir, canyon live oak, coast redwood, tan oak, Pacific madrone, and coast live oak) and sizes (ranging in size from 11 inches dbh to 46 inches dbh) to accommodate the proposed development. In context to the surrounding forested area, the removal of trees will not release significant amounts of GHG emissions or significantly reduce GHG sequestering in the area. Furthermore, new trees will be planted to replace the regulated trees proposed for removal.</p> <p>Grading and construction activities associated with the project will result in the temporary generation of GHG emissions primarily from construction-related vehicles and equipment. Any such potential increase in GHG emission levels will be minimal and temporary. Mitigation Measure 3 in Section 3.b. will help ensure that any such temporary emissions are minimized.</p> <p>The project introduces a new single-family residential use to the area. Any increase in GHG emissions associated with a new single-family residential use are not expected to be significant as residential use does not generate a high demand for traffic. Furthermore, the project is required to comply with all current California Codes, including the California Energy Code and all mandatory requirements under the California Green Building Standards Code.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP); Amended Project Plans.</p>				
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	
<p>Discussion: The project does not conflict with the San Mateo County Energy Efficient Climate Action Plan. See staff's discussion in Section 7.a. above.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP).</p>				

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	
<p>Discussion: As defined by Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), forestland is land that can support 10% native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. While the 18.4-acre project parcel contains more than 10% native tree cover in its current natural condition, the project site is located in an area that is relatively absent of trees. While a total of 50 trees are proposed for removal, the tree loss is relatively insignificant when compared to the dense tree coverage of the parcel and surrounding vicinity. Thus, the proposed tree removals will not release significant amounts of GHG emissions or significantly reduce GHG sequestering in the area. Furthermore, new trees will be planted to replace the regulated trees proposed for removal.</p> <p>Source: Public Resources Code, Section 12220(g); San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP); Amended Project Plans.</p>				
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
<p>Discussion: The project site is located over 7 miles from the ocean and therefore is not located within the coastal zone.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
7.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located over 7 miles from the ocean. Given the distance from the ocean and terrain between the project site and the ocean, the project will not generate any potential risk to life or structures due to sea level rise.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
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
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel 06081C0294E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				

7.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel 06081C0294E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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
<p>Discussion: The project does not involve the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>				
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>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 8.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Amended 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>Discussion: The project does not involve the emittance or handling of hazardous emissions.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</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>Discussion: The project site is not listed on a hazardous materials site list.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, URL (2019).</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>Discussion: The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
8.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located within the vicinity of any known private airstrip.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
8.g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will be located on a privately-owned parcel where all improvements will be located within the parcel boundaries. A new driveway off of Kebet Ridge Road will be constructed to serve the project; however, the driveway will be required to comply with any applicable driveway standards set forth by the County of San Mateo to ensure that it will not interfere with emergency response services in the area. Additionally, see staff's discussion in Section 16.e.</p> <p>Source: Amended 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>Discussion: The project site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, State Responsibility Area. The project was reviewed by the San Mateo County Fire Department and received conditional approval subject to compliance with Chapter 7A of the California Building Code for ignition resistant construction and materials and acceptable slope and material for the driveway, among other fire prevention requirements. No further mitigation, beyond compliance with the standards and requirements of the San Mateo County Fire Department, is necessary.</p> <p>Source: CalFire, Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps; San Mateo County Fire Department.</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>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel 06081C0294E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
8.j.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 8.i. above.</p> <p>Source: See Source Reference in Section 8.i. above.</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>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in an area that would be impacted by the failure of a dam or levee as the project site is located in the upper hills on the west side of Skyline Boulevard (State Route 35) and Woodside Road (State Route 84), at a higher elevation than any levee or dam in San Mateo County. Furthermore, the project parcel is not within a dam failure inundation area per the San Mateo County General Plan Hazards Map.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; San Mateo County General Plan, Hazards Map.</p>					
8.l.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p>Discussion: According to the San Mateo County General Plan Hazards Map, the project parcel is not located in a tsunami or seiche inundation area. Furthermore, the project parcel is not located in an area of high landslide susceptibility.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan, Hazards Map.</p>					

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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>Discussion: The project has the potential to generate polluted stormwater runoff during site grading and construction-related activities. However, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 8 - 10.</p> <p>The permanent project will be required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy requiring post-construction stormwater flows to be at, or below, pre-construction flow rates. Additionally, the project must include Low Impact Development (LID) site design measures in compliance with Provision C.3.i. of the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit as the project is a standalone residence that would introduce 8,783 sq. ft. of new impervious surface. These guiding standards will ensure that post-construction water runoff does not violate any water quality standard as the project proposes to direct roof, driveway, and patio runoff to vegetated areas. Furthermore, the proposed septic system has been preliminarily reviewed and conditionally approved by the County Environmental Health Division.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; Amended C.3/C.6 Development Review Checklist; County of San Mateo Drainage Policy; County of San Mateo Environmental Health Division.</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)?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project is not expected to deplete any groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The project proposes to utilize an existing on-site well for domestic water use. Pump tests for the well resulted in a flow rate of 50 gallons per minute (gpm), which meets the minimum standard of 2.5 gpm for domestic use by the Environmental Health Division. There is no evidence that the use of the well would interfere with groundwater supplies of other wells in the area.</p> <p>Source: Wilkinson Well & Pump, Well Flow Test, dated December 16, 2014.</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>Discussion: The project does not involve the alteration of the course of a stream or river. Existing drainage patterns, consisting of sheet flow, will be altered by proposed grading and development of the property. An erosion and sediment control plan has been prepared by KPROX Civil Engineering to reduce stormwater-related erosion and sediment from the project site during construction. Additionally, the project has been preliminarily reviewed by the Department of Public Works for drainage compliance and conditionally approved. Furthermore, see staff's discussion in Section 9.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; County of San Mateo Department of Public Works.</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>Discussion: The project will introduce a significant amount of new impervious surfaces to the site, however, required compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i. of the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit will ensure that any increased runoff is captured and released on-site through appropriate measures (i.e., detention system). Furthermore, see staff's discussion in Section 9.a. and 9.c. above.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</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>Discussion: There are no existing or planned public stormwater drainage systems in the rural area surrounding Kebet Ridge Road. The project will result in new impervious surfaces and associated runoff. However, the project is required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy to balance pre- and-post-construction flows and Provision C.3.i. of the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit for LID site design measures. Compliance with these standards will prevent impacts to drainage systems and will minimize additional sources of polluted runoff.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>				
9.f. Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?		X		

<p>Discussion: The project is required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i. of the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit which will prevent significant degradation of surface water quality after construction. Mitigation Measures 8 - 10 will reduce construction-related stormwater impacts to a less than significant level. The project proposes to utilize an existing water well on the property, for which the Environmental Health Division has reviewed and conditionally approved. Furthermore, the well will be required to meet quality and quantity standards set forth by the Environmental Health Division.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>					
9.g.	Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project will result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 8 - 10 will reduce project-related impacts to a less than significant level. No further mitigation measures are necessary.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>					

<p>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</p>					
		<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
<p>Discussion: The project does not involve a land division or development that would result in the division of an established community. The project proposes a new single-family residence on an 18.4-acre parcel located in a rural area of the County that will be among other single-family developments on similarly sized rural parcels.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; Project Location.</p>					
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	
<p>Discussion: The project includes the construction of up to an 8-ft. tall retaining wall in the rear 20-ft. setback on the downhill side of the new downslope driveway, where 6 ft. is the maximum allowed height. However, the applicant received approval of a fence height exception, pursuant to Section 6412.2 of the County Zoning Regulations, under the original project permit approval in 2017. There are no changes under the project amendment that will conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulations. Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>					

10.c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 4.f. above. Source: See Referenced Sources in Section 4.f. above.</p>				
10.d. Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose a use that would result in the congregation of more than 50 people on a regular basis. Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>				
10.e. Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will not introduce a use that is not currently found in the area. The project proposes a single-family residential use, which is found throughout the immediate rural area. Source: Amended Project Plans; Site Visit 2017.</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>Discussion: The project consists of developing a single-family residence where improvements will be completely within the parcel boundaries of the privately-owned parcel. The adjacent parcels are already developed with single-family residences. Therefore, the project will not serve to encourage off-site development of undeveloped areas or increase the development intensity of surrounding developed areas. Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>				
10.g. Create a significant new demand for housing?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not involve a land use that will create a significant new demand for housing as the project consists of the development of a new single-family residence on a privately-owned parcel. Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>				

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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>Discussion: The project parcel does not contain any known mineral resources, according to the Mineral Resources Map of the County's General Plan.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan, Mineral Resources Map.</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>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 11.a. above.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan, Mineral Resources Map.</p>				

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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>Discussion: The project will generate short-term noise associated with grading and construction activities. However, such noises will be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the County Ordinance Code for Noise Control. Otherwise, any increased long-term project-related noise impacts will be minimal as it would be limited to noise associated with a single-family use. Furthermore, the topography of the area, existing tree coverage, and location of the proposed development on the parcel will ensure that any noise associated with the single-family residential use will not generate a significant impact to the area.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; County Ordinance Code, Section 4.88.360 for Noise Control.</p>				
12.b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	

<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 12.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; County Ordinance Code, Section 4.88.360 for Noise Control.</p>				
12.c. A significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project does not involve a significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, as the project will only result in noise associated with a single-family residential use. See staff's discussion in Section 12.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Amended 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>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 12.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; County Ordinance Code, Section 4.88.360 for Noise Control.</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>Discussion: The project is not located within an area regulated by an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</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>Discussion: The project is not located within the vicinity of any known private airstrip.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
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>Discussion: All improvements associated with the proposed project are completely within the subject parcel's boundaries and are only sufficient to serve the proposed single-family residence.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>				
13.b. Displace existing housing (including low- or moderate-income housing), in an area that is substantially deficient in housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose to displace existing housing as the project consists of a new single-family residence on an undeveloped parcel.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</p>				

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. 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

Discussion: The project is limited to a new single-family residential use and, therefore, will not involve new or physically altered government facilities or increase the need for new or physically altered government facilities. Additionally, the project will not affect service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services in the area.

Source: Amended Project Plans.

15. RECREATION. 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

Discussion: The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that significant physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated.

Source: Amended Project Plans.

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
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project does not include any recreational facilities as proposed development is limited to a single-family residential use.

Source: Amended Project Plans.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. 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 modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to,				X

intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
<p>Discussion: Proposed project improvements include the construction of a new private driveway off of Kebet Ridge Road to serve the proposed single-family residence. The project has been reviewed and conditionally approved by the San Mateo County Fire Department and the County Department of Public Works for emergency access and traffic safety. Additionally, traffic generated from a single-family residence is minimal. Therefore, the project is not expected to conflict with any plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</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?				X
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 16.a. above.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</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?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose to increase air traffic levels or generate any change in air traffic patterns.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				
16.d. Significantly increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposes to construct a new driveway off of Kebet Ridge Road for single-family residential use. The project has been reviewed and conditionally approved by the County Department of Public Works for traffic safety of the proposed driveway onto Kebet Ridge Road.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; County Department of Public Works.</p>				
16.e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
<p>Discussion: The project has been reviewed and conditionally approved by the San Mateo County Fire Department for adequate emergency access in compliance with all applicable codes and regulations. Kebet Ridge Road is a narrowly improved private road that winds from Highway 84 (La Honda Road) approximately 1.2 miles to a dead end near the project area. A majority of the 3,705</p>				

c.y. of excavated soil will be off-hauled from the project site. In order to ensure that the increased construction truck and construction vehicle traffic will not impact primary emergency access or nearby properties who utilize the roadway as primary access to the Highway (84), the following mitigation measures are recommended:

Mitigation Measure 11: Off-site hauling of excavated soil shall be limited to the weekday hours of 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Trucks or vehicles associated with the project shall not be parked on the roadway.

Mitigation Measure 12: To reduce the impact of construction activities on the private roadway and neighboring properties, comply with the following:

- a. All debris shall be contained on-site; a dumpster or trash bin shall be provided on-site during construction to contain debris. The applicant shall monitor the site to ensure that trash is picked up and appropriately disposed of daily.
- b. The applicant shall remove all construction equipment from the site upon completion of the use and/or need of each piece of equipment which shall include but not be limited to tractors, back hoes, cement mixers, etc.
- c. The applicant shall ensure that no construction related vehicles impede through traffic along Kebet Ridge Road. All construction vehicles shall be parked on-site and outside of the Kebet Ridge Road easement, or in locations which do not impede safe access along Kebet Ridge Road. There shall be no overnight storage of construction vehicles or equipment on Kebet Ridge Road.

Source: Amended Project Plans; San Mateo County Fire Department.

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
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project involves the development of a single-family residence on private property and does not require any new, or impact any existing, public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

Source: Amended Project Plans.

16.g. Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The development of a private property for single-family residential use in a rural residential area is not expected to generate a noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns.

Source: Amended Project Plans.

16.h. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project involves the construction of a two-car carport, where two covered parking spaces are required pursuant to Section 6119 of the County's Zoning Regulations.

Source: Amended Project Plans; County of San Mateo Zoning Regulations.

17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. Furthermore, the project is not listed in a local register of historical resources, pursuant to any local ordinance or resolution as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).</p> <p>Source: Project Location; State Parks, Office of Historical Preservation, Listed California Historical Resources; County General Plan, Background, Historical and Archaeological Resources Appendices.</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.)		X		
<p>Discussion: 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 Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC) recommended best practices, Archaeological/Historical Consultants requested a search of the Sacred Lands Files from the NAHC, which resulted in no found records.</p>				

Additionally, Archaeological/Historical Consultants sent tribal consultation requests to five (5) Native American groups and individuals who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the Project area, as obtained from the NAHC. While a representative from the Ohlone Indian Tribe requested additional information on the results of the survey and record search conducted by Archaeological/Historical Consultants, the representative concluded that he had no further comments upon hearing that no cultural resources were found from either search. Nonetheless, the following mitigation measures are recommended based on the NAHC's best practices:

Mitigation Measure 13: 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 14: 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: Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by Archaeological/Historical Consultants, dated October 2016.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18.a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
<p>Discussion: The project includes the installation of a private, on-site septic system to serve the proposed residential development.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans.</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>Discussion: The project involves the use of an existing private water well located on the property and the installation of a new private septic system. No new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities are necessary to serve the proposed project.</p> <p>Source: Amended 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>Discussion: There are no public stormwater drainage facilities along Kebet Ridge Road. The project includes the installation of a detention system on private property to comply with the County's Drainage Policy, none of which are expected to cause a significant adverse environmental impact to the area.</p> <p>Source: Amended 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>Discussion: The project proposes to utilize an existing on-site well for domestic water use. According to pump tests preliminarily approved by the Environmental Health Division, the well flow rate was documented at 50 gallons per minute (gpm), which exceeds the County's minimum requirement of 2.5 gpm for domestic well water sources.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Environmental Health Division; Wilkinson Well & Pump, Well Flow Test, dated December 16, 2014.</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>Discussion: The project involves the installation of a private septic system to serve the proposed development. The County Environmental Health Division has reviewed and conditionally approved the preliminary septic design plans.</p> <p>Source: Amended Project Plans; San Mateo County Environmental Health Division.</p>				
18.f. Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
<p>Discussion: Similar to neighboring properties, the proposed development will receive municipal trash pick-up service by Greenwaste. The single-family residence is expected to generate a minimal increase in waste. Furthermore, there is no indication that the landfill utilized has insufficient capacity.</p> <p>Source: Confirmation from Greenwaste (2017).</p>				
18.g. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Discussion: Waste generated by single-family residential use is expected to be minimal. The project site will receive solid waste service by Greenwaste. Therefore, it is not expected that the use will result in waste production that would result in compliance issues with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulations.

Source: Amended 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
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The proposed residential development will be required to comply with all currently adopted building, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical codes.

Source: Amended Project Plans.

18.i. Generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project will not generate any demands that would exceed the capacity of any public facility or utility. See staff's discussion in Section 17.a. through 17.h. above.

Source: Amended Project Plans.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

	<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

Discussion: According to the review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), there are no special-status plant or animal species identified on the project site or within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Furthermore, the project site is located in an area of the parcel that is believed to have undergone past disturbance given its observed topography relative to the area. The nearest mapped sensitive habitat identified on the County's General Plan Sensitive Habitats

Map is riparian habitat along La Honda Creek which runs through the eastern portion of the parcel abutting La Honda Road, approximately 0.24 miles east of the project site. No other water bodies are located in the near vicinity of the project site, therefore, the project would not cause any adverse impacts to a fish habitat.

Source: California Natural Diversity Database; San Mateo County General Plan, Sensitive Habitats Map; Amended Project Plans; Project Location.

<p>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.)</p>				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: All of the parcels along Kebet Ridge Road are developed with single-family residences, except for the project parcel. It is not likely that the incremental effects of this project are considerable when viewed in conjunction with the effects of past, current, and probably future private or public projects in this area. The project site is located in a rural area where the rate and intensity of development is low. While the project will potentially result in site specific impacts as discussed in this document, incorporation of the recommended mitigation measures will reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. No other new residential development is proposed in the area. Furthermore, any future development in the area will be subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Source: Subject Document; Amended Project Plans.

<p>19.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion: The project could result in environmental impacts that could both directly and indirectly cause impacts on human beings, including the introduction of new sources of light and glare, temporary air quality impacts from construction-related emissions, and temporary greenhouse gas emissions from construction-related activities, as discussed within this document. However, the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures included in this document, and mitigation measures proposed in the project plans, will adequately reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Source: Subject Document; Amended Project Plans.

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	
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	
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		X	
Coastal Commission		X	
City		X	
Sewer/Water District:		X	
Other:		X	

<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> All proposed lighting shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area. Manufacturer cut sheets for any exterior light fixtures shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. All exterior fixtures shall be rated dark-sky compliant and designed to minimize light pollution beyond the confines of the subject premises.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 2:</u> Final finishes of all exterior materials and/or colors shall be non-reflective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 3:</u> The applicant shall submit a plan to the Planning and Building Department prior to the issuance of any grading “hard card” that, at a minimum, includes the “Basic Construction Mitigation Measures” as listed in Table 8-2 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines</p>		

(May 2017). These measures shall be implemented prior to beginning any ground disturbance and shall be maintained for the duration of the project activities:

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access road) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent paved roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.
- e. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment or vehicles off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- f. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- g. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the County regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Mitigation Measure 4: All regulated trees proposed for removal shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio, minimum 15-gallon size stock. All proposed replacement trees shall be shown on a Tree Replanting Plan or Landscape Plan and shall include species, size, and location. Any regulated oak tree species removed shall be replaced with the same species. The Plan shall be submitted to the County Planning and Building Department for review and approval as part of the building permit plan sets.

Mitigation Measure 5: In the event that archaeological resources are inadvertently discovered during construction, work in the immediate vicinity (within 25 feet) of the find must stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. Construction activities may continue in other areas beyond the 25-foot stop work area. A qualified archaeologist is defined as someone who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in archaeology. The Current Planning Section shall be notified of such findings, and no additional work shall be done in the stop work area until the archaeologist has recommended appropriate measures, and those measures have been approved by the Current Planning Section and implemented.

Mitigation Measure 6: In the event that paleontological resources are inadvertently discovered during construction, work in the immediate vicinity (within 25 feet) of the find must stop until a qualified paleontologist can evaluate the significance of the find. The Current Planning Section shall be notified of such findings, and no additional work shall be done in the stop work area until the paleontologist has recommended appropriate measures, and those measures have been approved by the Current Planning Section and implemented.

Mitigation Measure 7: Should any human remains be discovered during construction, all ground disturbing work shall cease and the County Coroner shall be immediately notified, pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the State of California Health and Safety Code. Work must stop until the County Coroner can make a determination of origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to California

Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 for the naming of a Most Likely Descendant and the recommendations for disposition.

Mitigation Measure 8: The applicant shall submit an erosion control plan in compliance with the County's General Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Guidelines Checklist for review and approval as part of the building permit plans submittal.

Mitigation Measure 9: No grading shall be allowed during the wet weather season (October 1 through April 30) to avoid increased potential soil erosion, unless the applicant applies for an Exception to the Winter Grading Moratorium and the Community Development Director grants the exception. Exceptions will only be granted if dry weather is forecasted during scheduled grading operations, and the erosion control plan includes adequate winterization measures (amongst other determining factors).

Mitigation Measure 10: An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and building permit to ensure the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure 11: Off-site hauling of excavated soil shall be limited to the weekday hours of 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Trucks or vehicles associated with the project shall not be parked on the roadway.

Mitigation Measure 12: To reduce the impact of construction activities on the private roadway and neighboring properties, comply with the following:

- a. All debris shall be contained on-site; a dumpster or trash bin shall be provided on-site during construction to contain debris. The applicant shall monitor the site to ensure that trash is picked up and appropriately disposed of daily.
- b. The applicant shall remove all construction equipment from the site upon completion of the use and/or need of each piece of equipment which shall include but not be limited to tractors, back hoes, cement mixers, etc.
- c. The applicant shall ensure that no construction related vehicles impede through traffic along Kebet Ridge Road. All construction vehicles shall be parked on-site and outside of the Kebet Ridge Road easement, or in locations which do not impede safe access along Kebet Ridge Road. There shall be no overnight storage of construction vehicles or equipment on Kebet Ridge Road.

Mitigation Measure 13: 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 14: 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 MITIGATED 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.



(Signature)

Planner III

(Title)

2/22/19

Date

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Amended Project Plans, received November 21, 2018
- C. Certified Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, 2017

SSB:cmc – SSBDD0082_WCH