

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** New Single-Family Residence and Second Unit
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2018-00038
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:** Laura Richstone, Project Planner; 650/363-1829, LRichstone@smcgov.org
5. **Project Location:** 340 Coggins Road, Woodside
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 083-310-150; 4.4 acres (191,664 sq. ft.)
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Ray Schmitt, 7850 Messick Road, Salinas, CA 96907
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** N/A
9. **General Plan Designation:** Open Space Rural
10. **Zoning:** Resource Management District (RM)
11. **Description of the Project:** Resource Management Permit for the construction of a new single-story 1,597 sq. ft. single-family residence, detached 440 sq. ft. two-car garage, detached 746 sq. ft. single-story second unit with attached 288 sq. ft. single-stall carport, and the installation of a new septic system, 5,000 gallon water tank, and gravel driveway and fire truck turnaround on a vacant 4.4-acre parcel.
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The 4.4-acre undeveloped parcel is located east of the unincorporated community of La Honda and west of the Russian Ridge Preserve. The project parcel is surrounded by low density single-family rural development and receives access via a shared road/driveway off of Coggins Road. The project parcel and the parcels to the east and west are gently sloped and dominated by native and invasive grasses. Steinberg Gulch is located approximately 750 feet to the south of the project site. The rear boundary of the parcel sits approximately 350 feet away from the edge of the corresponding Steinberg Gulch vegetation.
13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** N/A
14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code**

Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?: (NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.2.). Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality).

This project is not subject to Assembly Bill 52, as the County of San Mateo has no records of requests for formal notification of proposed projects within the County from any traditionally or culturally affiliated California Native American Tribes. However, the County seeks to satisfy the Native American Heritage Commission’s best practices and has referred this project to all tribes within San Mateo County. As of the date of this report, no tribes have contacted the County requesting formal consultation on this project.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

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

1. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?				X
<p>Discussion: The subject parcel is not located within or adjacent to any County or State Scenic Corridors. Though undeveloped, the project parcel is surrounded by low density rural residential development. The parcel has a southwest downward slope with the proposed development clustered in flatter northeastern portion of the parcel near a shared private driveway to reduce the development footprint, preserve the majority of the existing landscape (native and invasive grasses) and reduce the grading/need for additional road infrastructure. Though located in the upper portion of the parcel, the proposed development will be located approximately 120 feet from Coggins Road (the closest road) and will be screened from view by dense vegetation and trees along the south side of the road. The proposed development is located between two developed parcels, approximately 750 feet from the nearest body of water (Steinburg Gulch), and 0.60 miles away from the nearest public lands (the Russian Ridge Preserve). Given the project's distance from public lands, the dense screening vegetation along Coggins Road and Steinburg Gulch, and proposed maximum height of 16'-10", the project will not impact the view from any public lands, residential areas, water bodies or roads.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within or in close proximity to a State Scenic Highway. Furthermore, no trees are proposed for removal nor are any rock outcroppings located near the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; San Mateo County General Plan; Scenic Resources Map.</p>				
1.c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, such as significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X

<p>Discussion: The project is located in a non-urbanized area and is surrounded by rural single-family residences. With a proposed maximum height of 16'-10" the development is compatible with the surrounding rural development and is not visible from Coggins Road. The project will require 242 cubic yards (c.y.) of grading (230 c.y. of cut and 12 c.y. of fill) with most of the grading (193 c.y. of cut) associated with the new driveway and fire truck turnaround. The proposed grading will not represent a significant change in topography as the proposed development is located in the flattest portion of the parcel and will blend with the surrounding topography. In addition, the project will re-landscape disturbed areas with native grasses to blend with the surrounding grasslands. As the project is not located on a ridgeline and due to the minimal proposed grading quantities the proposed project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; San Mateo County General Plan; Scenic Resources Map.</p>				
1.d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X	
<p>Discussion: Exterior lights are proposed for the two-car garage and main residence. Though it is not expected that these lights would adversely affect daytime views of the area the following mitigation measure is proposed to ensure evening operation of the exterior lights will not impact nighttime views.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 1: All exterior lights shall be dark sky compliant and designed and located as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area. The applicant shall submit cut sheets of the proposed lighting at the building permit stage.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
1.e.	Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?			X
<p>Discussion: The subject property is not located within a designated State or County Scenic Corridor. At its nearest point the State Highway 84 and La Honda Road County Scenic Corridor is located approximately 0.5 miles from the western boundary of the project parcel.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
1.f.	If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?			X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located within a Design Review District.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; San Mateo County Zoning Map.</p>				
1.g.	Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?		X	
<p>Discussion: Situated between the La Honda Creek Preserve and the Russian Ridge Preserve and north of Sam McDonald County Park the project parcel has natural scenic qualities consisting of gently sloping rural grasslands. At its closest point the project is located approximately 0.6 miles from the edge of the Russian Ridge preserve and is not visible from these public lands due to the</p>				

surrounding hilly topography. The proposed project will be clustered together on the flattest portion of the parcel close to the existing shared road/driveway to reduce necessary grading and ground disturbance and will be screened from the nearest road by mature vegetation. In addition, upon completion, all disturbed areas will be seeded with native grasses to blend with the remainder of the undisturbed parcel. Given the topography of the area the natural colors and materials of the construction which will blend with the surrounding vegetation, the proposed project will have minimal visual impacts to the area.

Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County GIS.

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

	<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

Discussion: The project parcel is zoned Resource Management (RM). Though agricultural uses are allowed in the RM Zoning District, there are no agricultural lands on or adjacent to the proposed parcel that are mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the San Mateo County Important Farmland Map of 2018. Though not mapped, the parcel and surrounding area do contain soils which support vegetation suitable for grazing. Due to its small size (4.4 acres), the potential for this parcel to support grazing operations is limited. While the majority of the parcel would remain undeveloped, the project would convert lands suitable for grazing into residential use. However, such a conversion would be minimal in comparison to the overall size of the parcel and would not convert mapped Farmlands.

Source: San Mateo County Important Farmland Map, 2018.

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 not located within an Open Space Easement or under a Williamson Act Contract. The project parcel is zoned Resource Management (RM). While agriculture is an allowed use in the RM District, residential uses are also allowed with the issuance of a Resource Management Permit. The applicant has submitted for a Resource Management Permit with the County of San Mateo. Decision on Resource Management Permit will be rendered after the posting period for this subject Initial Study/Mitigation Negative Declaration has ended.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Zoning Regulations; San Mateo County Agricultural Preserves Map; 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 undeveloped and is largely surrounded with single-family residential development. The parcel is not designated as Farmland and will not result in the conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use.</p> <p>Defined as “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.” (PRC Section 1220(g)), the project parcel is dominated by native and invasive grasses and does not contain trees or forestland. As such, the proposed development will not convert Farmland or forest land to a non-agricultural or non-forest use.</p> <p>Source: Department of Conservation San Mateo County Important Farmland Map 2014; Project Plans.</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: This project is not located within the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County GIS.</p>					
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?				X

Discussion: The project parcel is located adjacent to an existing road and is not considered to be protected agricultural land under the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations. Soils within the project area are mapped by the United States Department of Agricultural Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as having Land Capability Classifications of Class 6 and Class 7, which consist of soils that have severe or very severe limitations to agriculture and are generally unsuitable for cultivation. The proposed development would result in the conversion of approximately five percent of the parcel to residential use with the remainder of the parcel remaining undisturbed and as discussed in Section 2.b., residential and agricultural uses are allowed within the RM District. With no current agricultural use of the project site or adjacent properties the proposed development would not result in the significant loss of agricultural land or soil capability.

Source: Zoning Maps; Natural Resources Conservation Service; San Mateo County General Plan Productive Soil Resources Soils with Agricultural Capability 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 project parcel is zoned Resource Management (RM) and, as such, is not located in a Timberland Preserve Zoning District. In addition, the project parcel is dominated by grasslands and has not been identified as containing forestland. Single-family residential development is an allowed use in the RM District, does not conflict with the existing zoning, and would not require a rezoning of the area.

Source: San Mateo County Zoning Maps; San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.

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

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

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

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2017 CAP. The project and its operation involve minimal hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide: CO₂) air emissions, whose source would be exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and

personal cars of construction workers), whose primary fuel source is gasoline, during its construction. Due to the site's rural location and assuming construction vehicles and workers are based in urban areas, potential project air emission levels from construction would be increased from general levels. However, any such construction-related emissions would be temporary and localized and would not conflict with or obstruct the Bay Area Air Quality Plan. Similarly, once constructed ongoing use of the single-family residence and second unit would have minimal impacts to air quality standards.

The BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As defined in the BAAQMD's 2017 CEQA Guidelines, the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all feasible construction measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures that they have determined, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. These control measures have been included in Mitigation Measure 2 below:

Mitigation Measure 2: The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b. Apply water two times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking, and staging areas at construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- c. Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them.
- d. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 miles per hour.
- e. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- f. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

Also, see the discussion to Question 7.1 (Climate Change: Greenhouse Gas Emissions), relative to the project's compliance with the County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.

Source: BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017; Project Plans.

3.b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?		X		

Discussion: The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is a State designated non-attainment area for Ozone, Particulate Matter (PM10), and Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5). A temporary increase in the project area of particulate matter is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. Therefore, any increase in these criteria pollutants would be significant.

<p>The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations (to reduce air pollution e.g., limits on idling) will reduce the potential effects to a less than significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 2 will minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Source: BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017; Project Plans.</p>					
3.c.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?		X		
<p>Discussion: Sensitive receptors are facilities or land uses such as schools, hospitals, or residential areas where people live, play, convalesce, or a place where insensitive individuals spend significant amounts of time. Sensitive individuals, such as children and the elderly, are those most susceptible to poor air quality.</p> <p>The project site is located in a very low density rural residential area with few sensitive receptors (i.e., single-family residences) located to the east, west and south of the project parcel. However, any pollutant emissions generated from the proposed project will primarily be temporary in nature and associated with project construction. Mitigation Measure 2 will minimize potentially significant exposure of pollutants to nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>					
3.d.	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X		
<p>Discussion: Once operational, the proposed project, which includes the construction of a single-family house, two-car garage, second unit, single-stall carport, driveway/fire truck turnaround, and installation of associated septic and utility infrastructure in a rural area, will not result in adverse emissions. The project has the potential to generate emissions during construction such as noise and odor. However, any such odors will be temporary and are expected to be minimal. Mitigation Measure 3 below is recommended to reduce noise emissions related to the construction of the proposed development to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 3: Noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Saturdays. Said activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving, and Christmas (San Mateo Ordinance Code Section 4.88.360).</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</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 substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate,			X	

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?				
--	--	--	--	--

Discussion: The project parcel is situated south of Coggins Road between two developed parcels. The parcel is gently sloped toward the southwest and is dominated by grasses. The northeastern corner of the parcel between Coggins Road and a shared driveway is sparsely vegetated; however, none of the trees along this area are proposed for removal. Further, Steinberg Gulch and its associated vegetation are located on the adjacent property just south of the subject parcel. The project site will be located approximately 700 feet from Steinberg Gulch itself and 500 feet the edge of the Gulch’s vegetation. A search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) identified no State or Federal Special Status plant or animal species within or adjacent to the project parcel. Due to the lack of trees on-site, distance from nearest riparian area, and lack of identified special status species the project is not expected to have an adverse effect on any candidate or special status species.

Source: California Natural Diversity Database, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, County GIS, Project Plans.

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

Discussion: The project includes 230 c.y. of cut and 12 c.y. of fill with the closest water course (Stenberg Gulch) and associated vegetation located approximately 500 feet downhill from the project site. Though the applicant has proposed to reseed disturbed areas with native grasses, the following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce runoff potential during project construction:

Mitigation Measure 4: Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the property, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program “General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines,” including:

- a. Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b. Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c. Clear only areas essential for construction.
- d. Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either

non-vegetative best management practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.

- e. Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and to control dust.
- f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 feet from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j. Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acres or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.
- k. Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.
- l. No erosion or sediment control measures will be placed in vegetated areas.
- m. Environmentally sensitive areas shall be delineated and protected to prevent construction impacts.
- n. Control of fuels and other hazardous materials, spills, and litter during construction.
- o. Preserve existing vegetation whenever feasible.

Source: Project Site; San Mateo County GIS.

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

Discussion: There are no identified wetlands on the project parcel, nor is there any physical evidence (such as wetland vegetation) to suggest that wetlands are present on-site.

Source: Project Plans; Site Visit; San Mateo County GIS.

4.d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
<p>Discussion: Few trees are located in the northeast corner of the project parcel between an existing shared driveway and Coggins Road. These trees are not proposed for removal and are separated from the proposed development by the aforementioned shared driveway. The proposed development is clustered near the existing shared driveway to reduce disturbance and increase distance from the riparian vegetation located south of the parcel. With a maximum building height of 16'-10", no trees proposed for removal, and distance from the nearest riparian habitat, the construction and use of the single-family residence and second unit is not expected to interfere with the movement of wildlife species.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
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
<p>Discussion: No tree removal is proposed and all disturbed areas will be reseeded with native grasses to reduce erosion.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
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?				
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within the boundaries of a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or any other approved regional or State habitat conservation plan area.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; California Department of Fish and Wildlife; San Mateo County GIS.</p>				
4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel nor the project site is inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; California Department of Fish and Wildlife Services; National Wildlife Refuge System Locator.</p>				
4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X

Discussion: The project parcel includes no oak woodlands or other timber woodlands. Thus, the project poses no impact.

Source: 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 substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		

Discussion: The project was referred to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine the site’s potential for cultural resources. In our response letter dated July 17, 2019, the NAHC noted that the requested Sacred Lands File search results were negative. Though the NAHC has no records of cultural resources at the project site, a list of Native American Tribes who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the area was provided with the recommendation that the Lead Agency contact these tribes. Per the recommendation of the NAHC, San Mateo County contacted these tribes in July 2019 notifying them of the proposed project to determine if there would be a significant impact to tribal or cultural resources. As of October 2019, San Mateo County has received no response to indicate that the proposed project would impact any cultural or historical resources.

This project was also referred to the California Historical Resources Northwest Information Center of Sonoma State University to determine the potential for cultural or historical resources on the site. In a response letter dated July 1, 2019, the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) noted that no cultural resources studies have been conducted within the project area and that no previously identified cultural resources have been located within 0.25 miles of the project area. However, CHRIS noted that based on the environmental setting, Native American resources in this part of San Mateo County have been found in areas populated by oak, buckeye, laurel, and hazelnut trees as well as sites near watercourse and bodies of water in the past. As the project site is located on a gentle slope near wooded areas and less than 1-mile from multiple creeks, CHRIS determined that there is a moderate potential for unrecorded Native American resources to be present at the proposed project area. In response to these concerns, an archaeological survey and report prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants was conducted. A site visit consisting of an intensive pedestrian survey of the whole parcel was performed by an SWCA archaeologist on August 27, 2019. With limited ground cover, the archaeologist was able to examine all exposed ground surface areas for prehistoric artifacts, historic artifacts, soil discoloration that may indicate the presence of cultural midden, linear features, soil depressions, and other features indicative of the former presence of historic structures or buildings. No archaeological resources were identified on the project parcel during the field survey. As the NAHC Sacred Lands File Search, CHRIS records, and the field survey did not identify the presence of previously undocumented cultural or historical resources on or near the project area, the project archaeologist concluded that the project area has low potential for the presence of cultural and/or historical resources and recommended no further studies at this time.

Though the potential to discover cultural, paleontological or archaeological resources during construction is low the following mitigation measures are proposed:

Mitigation Measure 5: In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interiors' Professional Qualification Standards for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. In addition, an archaeological report meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards detailing the findings of the monitoring will be submitted to the Northwest Information Center after monitoring has ceased. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred.

Mitigation Measure 6: If a newly discovered resource is, or is suspected to be, Native American in origin, the resource shall be treated as a significant Tribal Cultural Resource, pursuant to Public Resources Code 21074, until the County has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative.

Source: Project Location; California Register of Historical Resources, California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated July 1, 2019; SWCA Archaeological Report, dated October 2, 2019.

5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion: See discussion 5.a above.

Source: Project Location; California Register of Historical Resources, California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated July 1, 2019; SWCA Archaeological Report, dated October 2, 2019.

5.c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Discussion: Minimal grading (230 c.y. of cut and 12 c.y. of fill) is proposed for the northern portion of the parcel adjacent to an existing shared driveway. There are no known human remains located within the project area or surrounding vicinity. The following mitigation measure has been included in the event human remains are encountered.

Mitigation Measure 7: In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains and State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed. The applicant shall then immediately notify the County Coroner's Office, the County Planning and Building Department, and possibly the State Native American Heritage Commission to seek recommendations from a Most Likely Descendant (Tribal Contact) before any further action at the location of the find can proceed. All contractors and sub-contractors shall be made aware of these requirements and shall adhere to all applicable laws including State Cultural Preservation laws. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

Source: California Public Resources Code; Project Location; SWCA Archaeological Report, dated October 2, 2019.

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

Discussion: Energy conservation standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission) in June 1977 and are updated every 3 years (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations). Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. On June 10, 2015, the California Energy Commission (CEC) adopted the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which went into effect on January 1, 2017. On May 9, 2018, the CEC adopted the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which will take effect on January 1, 2020. Under the 2016 Standards, residential buildings are 28 percent more energy efficient and nonresidential buildings are 5 percent more energy efficient than under the 2013 Standards. The proposed project would comply with the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards which would be verified by the San Mateo County Building Department prior to the issuance of the building permit. The project would also be required adhere to the provisions of CALGreen and GreenPoints, which establishes planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants.

Construction

The construction of the project would require the consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (e.g., fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles (transportation) and construction equipment. Transportation energy use during construction would come from the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would fluctuate according to the phase of construction and would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure. Most construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas-powered or diesel-powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered equipment.

Operation

During operations, energy consumption would be associated with resident and visitor vehicle trips and delivery and supply trucks. The project is a residential development project near Highway 84 served by existing road infrastructure. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) provides electricity to the project area. Currently, the existing site does not use any electricity because it is a vacant parcel. Therefore, project implementation would result in a permanent increase in electricity over existing conditions. However, such an increase to serve a single-family residence and second unit would

represent an insignificant percent increase compared to overall demand in PG&E's service area. The nominal increased demand is expected to be adequately served by the existing PG&E electrical facilities and the projected electrical demand would not significantly impact PG&E's level of service. No natural gas distribution lines exist within the project vicinity. As is typical in this area of San Mateo County, natural gas is stored on-site in tanks and provided by private third-party entities on an as needed basis. The natural gas demands for a single-family residence and second unit are nominal and are not expected to result in a significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during operation and construction of the project given the financial implication of the inefficient use of such resources. As such, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Source: California Building Code; California Energy Commission; Project Plans.

6.b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project design and operation would comply with State Building Energy Efficiency Standards, appliance efficiency regulations, and green building standards. Therefore, the project does not conflict with or obstruct state or local renewable energy plans and will not have a significant impact. Furthermore, the development would not cause inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption.

Source: Project Plans.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>				X

Discussion: Faults in the closest proximity to the project site include the La Honda Fault, 1.25 miles to the southwest, the San Andreas Fault, 4 miles to the northeast, and the San Gregorio

Fault, 6.25 miles to the southwest. While the site is in relatively close proximity to the faults listed above, the project site is not located in a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or special study area where a fault rupture is likely to occur.

Source: State of California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Alquist-Priolo Regulatory Map. UPP Geotechnology Inc. Geotechnical Study, dated November 28, 2016.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The project site is expected to experience moderate ground shaking for a high intensity of 7.5 (Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI)) earthquake scenario on the San Gregorio Fault and very strong shaking for a 7.2 MMI earthquake scenario on the San Andreas Fault. The principal concern related to human exposure to ground shaking is that strong ground shaking can result in structural damage to buildings, potentially jeopardizing the safety of its occupants. The single-family residence and second unit will be manufactured homes and as such must meet minimum Federal and State building standards for earthquakes. Adherence to applicable building codes will reduce the likelihood of potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death resulting from strong seismic ground shaking. No further mitigation is necessary.

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, Shaking Hazard Map; Project Plans.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Discussion: Based on the San Mateo County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map, this area is not identified as being at risk for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling. Therefore, the proposed project proposes little risk to health or safety. No mitigation is necessary.

Source: San Mateo County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map, 1973.

iv. Landslides?				X
-----------------	--	--	--	---

Discussion: Based on the U.S. Geological Survey's Landslide Susceptibility Map of 1972, the project site is located in Landslide Susceptibility III (areas of moderate susceptibility to landslides). A site specific geotechnical study prepared by UPP Geotechnology Inc., (Attachment E), was conducted to evaluate the potential geotechnical hazards on the site. Per the geotechnical study, while the community of La Honda is prone to landslides, the project parcel is located on the crest of a gentle ridge outside of identified prehistoric and historic landslides. Although a small shallow landside was previously identified north of Coggins Road, the geotechnical consultants observed no evidence of slope instability within the project site or its vicinity. The geotechnical study also noted that the sandstone bedrock that underlies the subject site has not been found to be susceptible to deep-seated landsliding. Furthermore, the geotechnical consultants noted that the slope areas within and immediately around the building area are uniform and that there was no evidence of springs or seeps that could affect the stability of the building site. Based on the foregoing the geotechnical report concluded that the project will not increase the potential for landsliding nor is the project site located in a high landslide susceptibility area.

Though the project includes 230 c.y. of cut and 12 c.y. of fill with most of the grading (193 c.y. of cut) associated with the construction of the driveway and fire truck turnaround, the project area has been located in the flatter upper portion of the parcel near the existing shared driveway to reduce the development footprint, driveway length, and grading quantities. Grading plans for this project were prepared by a licensed civil engineer in consultation with the geotechnical consultants; no grading

activities that would impact ground stability are proposed. The project will be subject to the issuance of a building permit and all work shall be completed in accordance with the California Building Code. As such, the likelihood of a landslide at the project site is low and no mitigation is required.

Source: U.S. Geological Survey's Landslide Susceptibility Map, 1972; Project Location; UPP Geotechnology Inc. Geotechnical Study, dated November 28, 2016.

v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?

Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).

X

Discussion: The project parcel is not located near any coastal cliffs or bluffs.

Source: Project Location.

7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

X

Discussion: The construction of the project involves 230 c.y. of cut and 12 c.y. of fill with a total land disturbance of 8,085 square feet. These grading activities are minor in nature, confined to a flat area near the existing shared driveway (to minimize necessary grading), and do not require a Grading Permit. While the occupation and use of the single-family residence and second unit is not expected to result in significant erosion or loss of topsoil, project construction may result in erosion. To reduce erosion, the applicant has proposed to reseed disturbed areas with native grasses at the end of construction. These grasses will cover the exposed dirt areas and reduce erosion and loss of topsoil during rain events. Reseeding disturb areas, in conjunction with Mitigation Measure 4 and Mitigation Measure 8, prevent the loss of topsoil and reduce erosion on-site.

Mitigation Measure 8: The applicant shall implement dust control measures, as listed below. Measures shall be included on plans submitted for the building permit and encroachment permit applications. The measures shall be implemented for the duration of any grading, demolition, and construction activities that generate dust and other airborne particles. The measures shall include the following:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b. Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind.
- c. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- d. Apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking, and staging areas at the construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- e. Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking, and staging areas at the construction sites.
- f. Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them.
- g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

<p>h. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 miles per hour (mph).</p> <p>i. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.</p> <p>j. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
7.c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?		X		
<p>Discussion: The California Geological Survey Geologic Data Map identifies the generalized rock types within the project site as “P”, which is described as Pliocene marine sandstone, siltstone, shale, and conglomerate; mostly moderately consolidated.” These geologic units are typical of the area. See 7.a. and 7.b. above for mitigation measures relating to erosion, liquefaction, and seismic ground failure.</p> <p>Source: U.S. Geological Survey’s Landslide Susceptibility Map, 1972; California Department of Conservation Geological Survey; Project Plans.</p>				
7.d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?		X		
<p>Discussion: Expansive soils can undergo volume changes with changes in moisture content. Specifically, when wetted during the rainy season, expansive soils tend to swell and when dried (as during the summer months) these soils shrink. Structures located on expansive soils tend to experience cyclic seasonal heave and settlement which can affect the structural stability of structures.</p> <p>Based on the laboratory testing of the project site’s soils, portions of the near-surface soils were identified as moderately expansive. Due to the presence of relatively shallow bedrock, the geotechnical report concluded that the shrink and swell of the soils should not have a significant impact on the proposed project provided that the project adheres to the design and structural recommendations for the foundation and proposed flatwork contained within the geotechnical report. Mitigation Measure 9 will reduce the potential risk to life or property related building on expansive soils to a less than substantial level.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 9: The project shall be designed and constructed to follow the recommendations outlined in the UPP Geotechnology Inc. geotechnical report dated November 28, 2016.</p> <p>Source: UPP Geotechnology Inc. Geotechnical Study, dated November 28, 2016.</p>				
7.e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Discussion: The proposed project includes the installation of a septic system. San Mateo County Environmental Health Services (EHS) is the agency that regulates septic systems within the County of San Mateo. EHS completed a preliminary review of the proposal which included a percolation test to determine if the underlying soils can support the proposed septic system. After a preliminary review and percolation test EHS determined that the site could support the proposed septic system and conditionally approved the project.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

7.f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
------	--	--	---	--	--

Discussion: Based on the project parcel's existing surrounding land uses, it is not likely that the project parcel would host any paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. As discussed in Question 7.c, geology within the project site is typical of the surrounding area. Mitigation Measures 5 – 7 shall ensure that if significant if any resources are encountered potential impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels.

Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County GIS.

8. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		

Discussion: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO2) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. Project-related vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal vehicles of construction workers) and machinery associated with the proposed grading and construction of the single-family residence, second unit, and driveway/firetruck turnaround will result in the temporary generation of GHG emissions along travel routes and at the project site. Even assuming construction vehicles and workers are based in and traveling from urban areas, the potential project GHG emission levels from construction would be considered minimal. Although the project scope is not likely to generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases, Mitigation Measure 2 will ensure that any impacts are less than significant.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

8.b.	Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
------	---	--	--	--	---

<p>Discussion: The San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP) identifies implementation measures for the reduction of GHG emissions resulting from development consistent with state legislation, including construction idling. The majority of GHG emissions from the project are expected to occur during the construction phase, primarily from vehicle exhaust. GHG emission from the habitation of the single-family residence and second unit will be associated with vehicle trips will not conflict with the EECAP and are expected to be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, 2013 San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.</p>					
8.c.	Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel and surrounding parcels are not considered forest land, nor do they host any such forest canopy. Therefore, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County GIS.</p>					
8.d.	Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located on or near a coastal cliff/bluff. As such, the project will not expose people or structures to significant risk involving coastal cliff/bluff erosion resulting from sea level rise.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.</p>					
8.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is located over 7 miles from the Pacific Ocean and sits well above sea level. As such, the project will not expose people or structures to significant risk involving sea level rise.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.</p>					
8.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project site is located in FEMA Flood Zone X, which is considered a minimal flood hazard (Panel No. 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012). FEMA Flood Zone X areas have a 0.2% annual chance of flooding, with areas with one (1) percent annual chance of flooding with average depths of less than 1-foot. Therefore, the project impact would be less than significant.</p>					

Source: Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012.					
8.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: The project parcel not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by FEMA. Pursuant to the discussion in Section 8.g., the project poses no impact.					
Source: Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012.					

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: The project does not involve the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence and second unit.					
Source: Project Plans.					
9.b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
Discussion: The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence and second unit. The use of hazardous materials is not proposed for either the construction or long-term operation of this project.					
Source: Project Plans.					
9.c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X

<p>Discussion: The project parcel is located approximately 1-mile from the nearest existing or proposed school and the emission of hazardous materials, substances, or waste is not proposed for this project.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County GIS.</p>					
9.d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and therefore would not result in the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List.</p>					
9.e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within a known area regulated by an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>					
9.f.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed single-family residence and second unit will be located on a privately-owned parcel. This parcel receives access from Coggins Road via an existing shared driveway. The proposed project would not impede, change, or close any roadways that could be used for emergency purposes and all existing roads would remain unchanged. There is no evidence to suggest that the project will interfere with any emergency response plan. Therefore, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps.</p>					
9.g.	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located within the high Fire Hazard Severity Zone (State Responsibility Area). However, the project was reviewed by Cal-Fire and received conditional</p>					

<p>approval subject to compliance with the California Building Code for a fuel break, water storage (fire suppression), hardwired smoke detectors, an automatic fire sprinkler system, and ignition resistant construction and materials, among other fire prevention requirements. No further mitigation, beyond compliance with the standards and requirements of Cal-Fire, is necessary.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, California State Fire Severity Zones Maps, Cal-Fire.</p>					
9.h.	Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in 100-year flood hazard area. The project site is located within a Flood Zone X (areas with minimal food risk). No base flood elevations or base flood depths are shown within these zones. Community Panel No. 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
9.i.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
9.j.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
<p>Discussion: As discussed in Section 9.h., the project site is not located within a mapped flood area or within the vicinity of a levee or dam. The project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as the project site is not located within a flood hazard zone that will be inundated by a 100-year flood.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
9.k.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not in a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow hazard zone.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, San Mateo County Hazards Maps.</p>					

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?			X	
<p>Discussion: The proposed project has the potential to generate polluted stormwater runoff during site grading and construction-related activities. The 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. Drainage analysis for the project was prepared by MFG Engineers Inc., dated October 2017, detailing the proposed drainage system. The drainage report states that the proposed detention system is designed such that post-development runoff will be less than pre-development runoff, that there will be no appreciable downstream impacts, and no runoff is diverted onto the adjacent parcels. The proposed project, including the discussed drainage report and plans, were reviewed and conditionally approved by the Building Inspection Section's Civil Section for compliance with County drainage standards. Based on the drainage report and review by the County's Civil Section the project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, MFG Engineers Inc., Drainage Analysis, October 2017.</p>				
10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is served by an existing domestic well and has met the County's Environmental Health Services standards regarding quality and flow. The well will serve the subject parcel and will not provide water to the surrounding parcels. The water demands required for a single-family residence and second unit are minimal and are not expected to substantially decrease groundwater supplies as opposed to other high water intensity uses (i.e., agriculture). A majority of the project site will remain undeveloped and will continue to allow water to percolate into the ground. For the water displaced from the project's increased impervious surfaces, an on-site drainage system has been proposed that would capture and retain rainwater on-site which would allow it to percolate back into the ground and recharge the groundwater supply. As the project site is not located in an identified groundwater basin, and as the County does not have a comprehensive groundwater management plan, the nominal water demands of the proposed project will not impede sustainable groundwater management.</p>				

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Office of Sustainability, Groundwater Website https://www.smcsustainability.org/energy-water/groundwater .				
10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:		X		
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not involve the alteration of the course of a stream or river. The project involves the construction of 8,093 sq. ft. of impervious surface associated with the single-family home, two-car garage, second unit, carport and driveway. The proposed development on the project parcel will include drainage features that have been conditionally approved by the Building Inspection Section's Civil Section. With Mitigation Measures 2, 4, and 8 to address potential impacts during construction activities, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the site or will result in substantial erosion or siltation. Upon mitigation, the project will have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				X
<p>Discussion: Though the project will create 8,093 sq. ft. of impervious surface area, the project has been designed to meet the County's drainage standards. These standards include requiring post-construction stormwater flows to be at or below pre construction flow rates. The storm drain system designed for this project meets this standard by proposing to detain runoff from impervious surface areas to rock filled level spreaders. The spreaders will disperse the velocity of water flow and allow water to percolate into the soils. Reviewed and conditionally approved by the Building Inspection Section's Civil Section, the proposed drainage system will capture and retain water on-site and will not substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Building Inspection Section Civil Section.</p>				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				X

<p>Discussion: This project is located in a rural area of San Mateo County and is not currently served by a municipal stormwater drainage system. The proposed project includes the installation of an on-site drainage system to capture and retain runoff on site. This system has been designed, sized, and conditionally approved by the Building Inspection Section's Civil Section to meet the needs of the proposed development. No further mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Building Inspection Section Civil Section.</p>				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed development does not involve the alteration or the course of a stream or a river. Additionally, the project is not located in a floodway or flood zone as identified by FEMA. Though a stream is located south of the parcel, the proposed development is located on the high point of the parcel. The project site will be located approximately 750 feet away from the stream and 90 feet above the elevation of the stream. Due to its distance and elevation above the nearest stream the proposed project is not expected to impede or redirect flood flows. No mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0384E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) of 2015 requires local regions to create groundwater sustainability agencies (GSA's) and to adopt groundwater management plans for identified medium and high priority groundwater basins. San Mateo County has nine identified water basins. These basins have been identified as low-priority, are not subject to the SGMA, and there is no current groundwater management agency or plan that oversees these basins.</p> <p>The project includes an on-site drainage system that complies with the San Mateo County Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP) which enforces the State requirements for stormwater quality control.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County Office of Sustainability, Groundwater Website https://www.smcsustainability.org/energy-water/groundwater/.</p>				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or groundwater quality?		X		
<p>Discussion: The use of the existing well on site to provide potable water for the proposed single-family residence and second unit is not a high water demand use and is not anticipated to overdraft</p>				

the underlying groundwater and thus degrade the groundwater quality.

An on-site drainage system has been sized and designed to capture and retain the runoff created by the proposed development. The runoff will be directed into several rock level spreaders which will reduce sheet flows and retain the water on-site so that it can percolate into the ground. The on-site drainage system in conjunction with several acres of surrounding grassland will reduce the flow of water across the property and prevent erosion of the land and siltation of the adjacent creek. Though grading is involved for project construction, the construction of the proposed project would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMP's) and comply with the County's Stormwater Ordinance. These regulatory requirements in addition to adherence to Mitigation Measures 2, 4, and 8 will prevent, control and reduce erosion and siltation, integrate and LID practices control and reduce the discharge of pollutants to prevent the substantial degradation of surface water quality.

Source: Project Plans.

10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project will create 8,093 sq. ft. of impervious surface area. A proposed on-site drainage system and been designed to direct increased surface sheet flows to gravel level spreaders to reduce water velocity and retain the water so that it can percolate into the ground. Though the construction and implementation of the proposed on-site drainage system increased runoff from impervious surface areas will not create a significant impact. No mitigation is required.

Source: Project Plans.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a. Physically divide an established community?				X

Discussion: There is no land division or development proposed that would result in the division of an established community. The proposed project is located on a vacant parcel and is surrounded with rural residential development. The project, which includes the construction of a single family-residence and second unit, does not require the construction of road infrastructure and would not result in the division of an established community.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project parcel is surrounded by existing single-family residential uses to the north, south, east, and west. Single-family development and second units are an allowed use under the

General Plan, Resource Management (RM) Regulations, and Second Unit Ordinance. As part of the Resource Management Regulations, projects located in the RM District must also comply with Chapter 20A.2 (Development Review Criteria) which include environmental quality, site design and water resources review criteria to mitigate negative environmental impacts of development. The project has been reviewed and found to be in conformance with the General Plan, Second Unit Ordinance, Resource Management District, and Development Review Criteria. No mitigation is required.

Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County General Plan, Second Unit Ordinance and Zoning Regulations.

11.c. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: Development density in the RM District is controlled through the allocation of Density Credits. The amount of density credits a parcel has is determined by the parcel's size, topography and the presence of mapped hazards. Through a Density Credit Analysis, it was determined that the project parcel has one density credit. In this instance, one density credit allows for a maximum development of one single-family residential home and a second unit. As all development in this area is controlled by the density credit program, the development of the proposed project would not increase the development density of the surrounding area.

Located between two developed parcels, the construction and habitation of a single-family residence and second unit on the subject parcel is not expected to encourage off-site development. The proposed development would be served by an existing shared driveway/road and would not require the construction of additional road infrastructure. Electricity will be provided from an existing utility pole on site, new water lines will connect the well to the development, and new gas lines will be installed to connect the project to a private propane tank located on the parcel. Though new utility lines will be installed to serve the proposed development these will be private lines/connections, will not be available (or permitted) for other parcels to use, and will be contained on the project parcel (e.g. will not cross parcel boundaries).

Source: Project Plans.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X

<p>Discussion: The proposed project neither involves nor results in any extraction or loss of mineral resources. Therefore, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
12.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no known mineral resources on the project parcel; therefore, the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resources Map.</p>				

<p>13. NOISE. Would the project result in:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would not produce any long-term significant noise source. However, the project will generate short-term noise associated with grading and construction activities. The short-term noise generated during grading and construction activities will be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (<i>Exemptions</i>) of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code for Noise Control. Adherence to Mitigation Measure 3 will limit any potential impacts related to grading and construction to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?		X		
<p>Discussion: The habitation of the proposed single-family residence and second unit is not expected to generate excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels. However, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration (or noise levels) is expected during construction activities. Mitigation Measure 3 will ensure that the impact during construction are less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				

13.c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within or near airport or airstrip; nor is the proposed project located is within the vicinity of an airport land use plan.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
<p>Discussion: As discussed in Section 11.c, intensity of development in this area of San Mateo County is controlled through the allocation of density credits and is parcel specific. It was determined that the project parcel has one available density credit which allows a maximum development of one main residence and a second unit. The additional population created by those who will live in the proposed single-family residence and second unit is not significant; nor is the project expected induce any significant population growth. The project is located between two developed parcels and will not require the construction of additional road infrastructure or the expansion of public utilities. All improvements associated with the project are only sufficient to serve the proposed single-family residence and second unit, will not be available for use by other parcels, and will not extend beyond parcel boundaries.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location.</p>				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed single-family residence and second unit will be located on an undeveloped parcel; therefore, no existing housing will be displaced during the construction and operation/habitation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Location; Project Plans.</p>				

15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?				X
15.b. Police protection?				X
15.c. Schools?				X
15.d. Parks?				X
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X
<p>Discussion: All proposed project improvements are to occur completely on the privately owned subject parcel. Given that the project results in the addition of one single-family residence and second unit, any increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities would be minor. This increased use will not result in impacts of such a significant level that physical deterioration of any such facility will occur be accelerated.</p> <p>The project will result in the fire authority (Cal-Fire) expanding their service to include the subject parcel. However, as the subject parcel is located between two developed parcels already served by the fire authority, the expansion of service to include the subject parcel is minor and will not impact the fire authority's ability to respond to emergencies or service the area. There no expectation that the proposed project will disrupt acceptable service ratios, response times or performance objectives of fire, police, schools, parks, or any other public facilities or energy supply systems.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; Project Location; Cal-Fire.</p>				

16. RECREATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
<p>Discussion: The project (future occupants of and visitors to the new residences) would not significantly increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. The current</p>				

accessibility to and use of the La Honda Open Space Preserve (located approximately 1-mile to the west) and Sam McDonald County Park (located .75 miles to the south) will not be affected by the project. Potential project impact on the use of neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities would be less than significant and significant physical deterioration of any such facilities as related to the project is not expected to occur or be accelerated from the construction of a single-family residence and second unit. Therefore, the project poses no impact.

Source: Project Location; San Mateo County GIS.

16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

Source: Project Plans.

17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?				X

Discussion: The proposed development would provide compliant standard and emergency access to the project parcel. The development of a single, single-family dwelling and second unit is exempted from the development and implementation of a traffic impact analysis and mitigation plan. Traffic trips (comprised of both owners/tenants and guests) generated by the new residence and second unit is not expected to introduce any significant increase in vehicles on Coggins Road, and thus will pose no significant safety impact to other vehicles, pedestrians or bicycles. The adequacy of access, along Coggins Road, to and from the site has been reviewed by both the County's Department of Public Works and Cal-Fire, who have concluded that such access complies with their respective policies and requirements. Therefore, the project poses a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

Source: Project Plan; San Mateo County Department of Public Works; Cal-Fire.

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

Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.

Discussion: Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines provides specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. A project's effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA. Per Section 15064.3, an analysis of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) attributable to a project is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. It should be noted that currently, the provisions of Section 15064.3 apply only prospectively; determination of impacts based on VMT is not required Statewide until July 1, 2020.

Per Section 15064.3(b)(3), a lead agency may analyze a project's VMT qualitatively based on the availability of transit, proximity to destinations, etc. The proposed project site is located in a rural unincorporated community halfway between Portola Valley and Pescadero. Due to its rural location the project is not located within the vicinity of any public transit stops. However, the site is located near the La Honda Elementary School and some commercial uses, including a market and post office, which are located approximately 1-mile northwest of the site along Highway 84. The site's proximity to such uses would reduce VMT associated with the proposed single-family residence and second unit. In addition, given that the project includes only one single-family residence and one second unit, traffic generated by the project would not have a substantial effect on the operation of local roadways and intersections, nor does the project include any modifications to the existing circulation system in the project vicinity that would result in a traffic safety hazard. The proposed residential use of the parcel would be compatible with the existing rural residential development in the project area. Therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County GIS.

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

Discussion: The project is served by an existing shared driveway/road off of Coggins Road. The project will not require the construction of road infrastructure nor does it propose to alter any existing roadway that would create a hazard due to sharp turns or dangerous intersections. Additionally, the construction and operation/habitation of the project does not propose the permanent utilization of equipment that would be incompatible with the existing vehicular traffic on Highway 84, Coggins Road and any other connecting roads. No mitigation is necessary.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

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

Discussion: The project proposes to construct a firetruck turnaround on the parcel to accommodate any required emergency access. Upon review of the proposed project and fire truck turnaround, Cal-Fire has conditionally approved the project has having adequate existing (e.g., Coggins Road) and proposed (e.g., turnaround) emergency access. Thus, the project poses no impact.

Source: Project Plans; Cal-Fire.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is vacant and is not listed 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; California Register of Historical Resources, California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated July 1, 2019; County General Plan; SWCA Archaeological Report, dated October 2, 2019.</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: This 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, a <i>Sacred Lands File and Native American Contacts List Request</i> was sent to the Native American Heritage Council (NAHC) in June 2019. A Sacred Lands File search was completed by the NAHC and no sacred lands were found in the subject area. In following the NAHC's recommended Best Practices, the County has also contacted local Native American tribes who may have knowledge of cultural</p>				

resources in the project area. As of the date of this report, no tribe has requested consultation.

While the project is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change to any potential tribal cultural resources, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize any potential significant impacts to unknown tribal resources:

Mitigation Measure 10: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American Tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources be taken prior to implementation.

Mitigation Measure 11: In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall cease until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resources in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource. Those measures shall be approved by the County Planning Department prior to implementation and prior to continuing any work associated with the project.

Mitigation Measure 12: 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: California Office of Historic Preservation, San Mateo County Listed Historical Resources.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would rely on a septic system because there is no municipal sewer service available in this area of unincorporated San Mateo County. Environmental Health Services viewed the proposed septic system design, found it be in compliance with the prevailing standards and regulations, and conditionally approved the project. The proposed project does not involve or require any water or wastewater treatment facilities that would exceed any requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.</p>				
19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?		X		

Discussion: The project parcel is served by an existing domestic well. The well has met the County's Environmental Health Services standards regarding quality and flow. Per the discussion in Section 10, the water needs related to a single-family residence and second unit are not high intensity uses and are not expected to overdraft the existing groundwater. Per the review of Environmental Health Services, the following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure that adequate water supply is available to serve the proposed residence and second unit. With this mitigation measure, the project's impact will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 13: At the building permit application stage, the applicant shall demonstrate adequate water supply (quantity and quality) to serve proposed, existing, and future structures. The applicant shall also delineate a minimum of 1,500 gallon dedicated domestic emergency water storage supply on the property.

Source: Project Plans; Environmental Health Services.

19.c. 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
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: This project is not served by a wastewater treatment provider. All wastewater will be treated on-site through the proposed septic system. The proposed septic system has been sized and designed to meet the needs of the proposed development and has received conditional approval from the County's Environmental Health Services.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location; County GIS.

19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: Construction of the proposed project is expected to generate solid waste on a temporary short term basis. The project will also result in the ongoing generation of solid waste after its construction as is typical for residential uses. The project site will receive solid waste service by Republic Services. Though solid waste generation is not expected to result in inadequate landfill capacity the County's local landfill facility (Ox Mountain Landfill) has as a capacity/service life until 2034.

Source: Project Plans.

19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The solid waste generated by a new single-family residence and second unit is expected to be minimal. The proposed project, as with all other development in the County would be required to adhere to County ordinances with respect to waste reduction and recycling. As a result, on impacts related to Federal, State, and local management statutes governing solid waste are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

Source: Project Plans.

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

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

Discussion: The project is located in a High Fire State Responsibility Area as identified by the County's GIS maps.

No revisions to the adopted Emergency Operations Plan would be required as a result of the proposed Project. The nearest public service is the La Honda Fire Brigade located approximately 2 miles west of the site at 8945 La Honda Rd, La Honda, CA 94020 and would not be impacted because primary access to all major roads would be maintained during construction. As discussed in Section 9 (*Hazards and Hazardous Materials*), the proposed project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

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

Discussion: Wildland Urban Interface fires occur where combustible vegetation meets combustible structures, combining the hazards associated with wildfires and structure fires. New residential structures constructed as part of the proposed project would include fire-resistant features that conform to modern fire and building codes, as well as fire detection or extinguishing systems. These newer residential structures would not be as vulnerable to fire as are older structures. The likelihood that a major structural fire will expand into a wildland fire before it can be brought under control is therefore significantly reduced. Similarly, wildfires will be less able to burn these buildings because of the preventative measures in place. Further, due to the proximity of the project site to the La Honda Fire Brigade station, and the very short expected response time to reported fires, the likelihood of injuries or pollutant emissions due to a wildfire is minimal. Therefore, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire, or to the uncontrolled spread of wildfire.

Source: Project Plans; Project Location.

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

Discussion: The proposed project to construct a single-family residence and a second unit on a parcel which adjoins other single-family residential development does not require the installation of new roads, fuel breaks, or power lines. The project includes the construction of a fire truck turnaround and per the review of Cal-Fire, the following mitigation measure to install an on-site water tank is recommended to ensure sufficient water is available for fire suppression purposes. The installation of such a water tank would occur on-site and not require maintenance that would exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

Mitigation Measure 14: A minimum of 5,000 gallons of water shall be stored separately on-site. This water shall be reserved for fire suppression purposes and shall not be used for potable or irrigation purposes.

Source: Project Plans.

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

Discussion: The while the project site itself is general level, the overall parcel gently slopes downward toward the southwest. The proposed on-site drainage facilities have been sized and appropriately placed to retain the stormwater on-site and allow it to percolate into the ground. As the project would not increase the risk of wildfire or the severity of wildfires the project would not expose these structures to significant risk from flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

Source: Project Plans.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number		X		

<p>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?</p>				
<p>Discussion: Without mitigation the project could potentially impact air, biological, cultural, soils, and water quality resources. Mitigation measures have been included to reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Source: All Applicable Sources Previously Cited In this Document.</p>				
<p>21.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</p>		<p>X</p>		
<p>Discussion: As defined by the CEQA Guidelines, cumulative impacts reflect “the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355[b]).</p> <p>The new utilities required to serve the project would be contained on-site, are not available to provide service to other parcels, and to staff’s best of knowledge, there are no known approved pending or future projects associated with or near the project site.</p> <p>The project will not impact agricultural or mineral resources. The project’s potential impacts with respect to air quality, water, noise, and cultural resources etc., will be limited to the construction phase of the project. All impacts will be mitigated and there is no evidence to suggest that they would substantially combine with other off-site impacts. Due to the “stand-alone” nature of this project in conjunction with the recommended mitigation measures contained throughout this document, the project will have a less than significant cumulative impact on the environment.</p> <p>Source: All Applicable Sources Previously Cited In this Document.</p>				
<p>21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>		<p>X</p>		
<p>Discussion: As discussed in the previous sections, the proposed project is to construct a new single-family residence and second unit on a vacant parcel between two developed parcels. Based on the discussions in the previous sections where project impacts were determined to be less than significant or mitigation measures were required to result in an overall less than significant impact, the proposed project would not cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.</p> <p>Source: All Applicable Sources Previously Cited In this Document.</p>				

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

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

<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> All exterior lights shall be dark sky compliant and designed and located as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area. The applicant shall submit cut sheets of the proposed lighting at the building permit stage.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 2:</u> The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below:</p> <p>a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.</p>		

- b. Apply water two times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking, and staging areas at construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- c. Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them.
- d. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 miles per hour.
- e. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- f. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

Mitigation Measure 3: Noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Saturdays. Said activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving, and Christmas (San Mateo Ordinance Code Section 4.88.360).

Mitigation Measure 4: Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the property, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

- a. Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b. Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c. Clear only areas essential for construction.
- d. Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative best management practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e. Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and to control dust.
- f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 feet from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains

by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.

- i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j. Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acres or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.
- k. Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.
- l. No erosion or sediment control measures will be placed in vegetated areas.
- m. Environmentally sensitive areas shall be delineated and protected to prevent construction impacts.
- n. Control of fuels and other hazardous materials, spills, and litter during construction.
- o. Preserve existing vegetation whenever feasible.

Mitigation Measure 5: In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interiors' Professional Qualification Standards for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. In addition, an archaeological report meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards detailing the findings of the monitoring will be submitted to the Northwest Information Center after monitoring has ceased. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred.

Mitigation Measure 6: If a newly discovered resource is, or is suspected to be, Native American in origin, the resource shall be treated as a significant Tribal Cultural Resource, pursuant to Public Resources Code 21074, until the County has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative.

Mitigation Measure 7: In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during project construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains and State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed. The applicant shall then immediately notify the County Coroner's Office, the County Planning and Building Department, and possibly the State Native American Heritage Commission to seek recommendations from a Most Likely Descendant (Tribal Contact) before any further action at the location of the find can proceed. All contractors and sub-contractors shall be made aware of these requirements and shall adhere to all applicable laws including State Cultural Preservation laws. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

Mitigation Measure 8: The applicant shall implement dust control measures, as listed below. Measures shall be included on plans submitted for the building permit and encroachment permit applications. The measures shall be implemented for the duration of any grading, demolition, and

construction activities that generate dust and other airborne particles. The measures shall include the following:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b. Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind.
- c. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- d. Apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking, and staging areas at the construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- e. Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking, and staging areas at the construction sites.
- f. Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them.
- g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- h. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- i. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- j. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

Mitigation Measure 9: The project shall be designed and constructed to follow the recommendations outlined in the UPP Geotechnology Inc. geotechnical report dated November 28, 2016.

Mitigation Measure 10: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American Tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources be taken prior to implementation.

Mitigation Measure 11: In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall cease until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resources in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource. Those measures shall be approved by the County Planning Department prior to implementation and prior to continuing any work associated with the project.

Mitigation Measure 12: 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.

Mitigation Measure 13: At the building permit application stage, the applicant shall demonstrate adequate water supply (quantity and quality) to serve proposed, existing, and future structures. The applicant shall also delineate a minimum of 1,500 gallon dedicated domestic emergency water storage supply on the property.

Mitigation Measure 14: A minimum of 5,000 gallons of water shall be stored separately on-site. This water shall be reserved for fire suppression purposes and shall not be used for potable or irrigation purposes.

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

_____ X I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because of the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

(Signature)

Project Planner

Date

(Title)

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Project Location Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. California Historical Resources Information System Letter, dated July 9, 2019
- D. Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File Search Letter, dated July 1, 2019
- E. Geotechnical Investigation Report, dated November 28, 2016

LR:pac - LARDD0345_WPH.DOCX