County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST

1. **Project Title:** Zmay Minor Subdivision, Grading Permit and Resource Management (RM) Permits of a 60.3 acre parcel to create four parcels approximately, 0.73-acre each, for future residential development and, a 57.48± acre remainder parcel (with approximately 48.21 acres of land to be protected by a conservation easement, and 9.27 acres, including an existing single family dwelling, of developable area, and a Grading Permit for 11,200 cubic yards of earthwork (5,600 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 5,600 cy of fill) for landslide repair. No residential development is proposed with this application.

2. **County File Number:** PLN 2014-00410

3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** San Mateo County Planning and Building Department 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063

4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Erica D. Adams, Project Planner 650/363-1828

5. **Project Location:** 1551 Crystal Springs Road, San Mateo Highlands Area of Unincorporated San Mateo County

6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 038-131-110; 60.3 acres

7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Nicholas Zmay, 751 Laurel Street, Suite 409, San Carlos, CA 94070

8. **General Plan Designation:** Open Space; Urban

9. **Zoning:** Resource Management (RM)

10. **Description of the Project:** The applicant proposes a Minor Subdivision of a 60.3-acre parcel. The subdivision will create four parcels for future residential development (four single-family residences on Proposed Parcels 1-4) and a designated remainder parcel which will contain an existing single-family residence. The subject parcel is adjacent to existing residential development in the City of Hillsborough and in the sphere of influence of the City of San Mateo. The four parcels created by the subdivision will be 0.67- 0.73 acres in size, with house locations along Parrott Drive.

    A 57.48 acre remainder parcel will be comprised of approximately 48.21 acres of land to be protected by a proposed conservation easement and a developable area of 9.27 acres including an existing single family dwelling. The subject parcel contains landslide areas which the applicant proposes to mitigate through repair work to be completed prior to the recording of the final map. A Grading Permit for 11,200 cubic yards of earthwork is required for the landslide repair work on the proposed parcels.

    The project would be implemented in two phases. In Phase 1, which is the current project (PLN 2014-00410), the applicant intends to gain County approval of a tentative map for the

Minor Subdivision and the associated RM Permit and Grading Permit. The County's Geotechnical consultant has recommended that prior to recordation of the Parcel Map for the Minor Subdivision, the applicant perform grading activities limited to the completion of landslide repair work within the boundaries of Proposed Parcels 2 and 3. In Phase 2, the applicant proposes to apply for additional land use permits necessary to construct houses on the 4 new lots. Residential development is not included in this project and will require Resource Management (RM) Permits and potentially Grading Permits through a separate permitting process.

All necessary public utilities exist and services are available for future residential development. No new roads are required for future residential development.

11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

The subject parcel is approximately 60.3-acres. The majority of the parcel is undeveloped. There is an existing single-family residence on a portion of the subject parcel which takes access from Crystal Spring Road.

The site is bounded to the west by Crystal Springs Road, to the southwest by Polhemus Road, to the northeast by Parrott Drive. The City of Hillsborough borders/surrounds the parcel to the north and west. Single-family residential neighborhoods are located to the east and west, with areas of open space to the north and south. The property is within the sphere of influence of the City of San Mateo.

The property is generally steep with slopes varying from 2:1 to 3:1 (horizontal to vertical). San Mateo Creek and Polhemus Creek run along the base of the ridgeline and converge near the southern corner of the property. The portion of the parcel along Parrot Drive where 4 new parcels and future residences are proposed, has an approximate slope of 37%.

Hillside areas of the property have experienced landslide activity in the past. One active landslide is mapped over a large portion of Proposed Parcel 2 and to a limited extent on Proposed Parcel 3. As proposed, landslide repair work, which includes 11,200 cy of grading, will precede recordation of the final map and any residential development.

12. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None

13. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?:** *(NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code Section 21083.3.2.). Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality).*

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1.	**AESTHETICS**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
1.a.	Have a significant adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?		X		

Discussion: The subject parcel is 60± acres with approximately 2,300 feet of road frontage along Crystal Springs Road and Polhemus Road, with the exception of about 600 feet where The Odyssey School (a private school) is located between Polhemus Road and the property. Approximately 1,500 lineal feet of the parcel abuts Crystal Springs Road, which is also a designated County Scenic Route by the San Mateo County General Plan. The southwestern corner of the parcel, 800 lineal feet, abuts a portion of Polhemus Road which is also designated as a County Scenic Route. Neither road is designated a state scenic highway.

The four proposed parcels will take access from Parrot Drive which is along the northwestern edge of the parcel. The four proposed parcels will not be visible from Crystal Springs Road nor Polhemus Road due to distance, intervening vegetation, and topography. Crystal Springs Road is a lineal distance of approximately 1,000 feet from the parcel locations on Parrot Drive. Polhemus Road curves eastward, away from the proposed parcels and is a lineal distance of approximately 2,200 feet from the proposed parcels. In addition, the proposed parcels would be located approximately 300 feet in elevation above the scenic routes, with dense tree coverage in between the scenic route and parcel locations on Parrot Drive. The view from both roads will remain

unchanged due to these factors. These factors also minimize the visibility of future residential structures from either road.

The proposed development primarily consists of the creation of four new parcels (Parcels 1 to 4) along Parrott Drive. These parcels will be located in an area adjacent to and across from existing residences located on Parrott Drive in the City of Hillsborough. The new parcels are proposed to be smaller than the typical parcel size found in Resource Management (RM) Zoning District, in order to be more compatible in size to residential parcels on Parrott Drive which are zoned R-1/S-8, and have a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet.

The four proposed parcels along Parrott Drive will retain the existing RM zoning, which requires development to conform to development review criteria. Residential uses are allowed in the RM Zoning Districts, are consistent with the property's General Plan designation of Open Space, and require a RM Permit. The development review criteria of the RM Zoning District prohibits the removal of trees ≥ 55 inches in circumference except with an RM Permit. The removal of trees less than 55 inches in circumference is permitted. Development on these parcels would conform to the front and side setbacks of the S-8 Zoning District, per Section 6319.c of the RM Zoning District, with the intent of blending in with existing residences along Parrott Drive. New houses would be restricted to a 36-foot height limit.

There is no new development proposed at this time on the remainder parcel, which contains an existing single-family residence. The existing residence, while accessed from Crystal Springs Road, is minimally visible from the public right-of-way due to intervening vegetation. New development on the remainder parcel would require an RM Permit and compliance with applicable development review criteria.

Prior to recording of the final map, the applicant proposes to perform grading necessary for landslide repair an existing landslide. The landslide area is located primarily on proposed parcels numbers two and three. Phase one of this application will require grading activity to repair the landslide areas. The landslide repair area is mostly free of trees; however, 10 trees which are greater than 55" in circumference have been identified on the four proposed parcels, and may need to be removed so equipment can access the site. The required grading would not alter the scenic nature of the hillside as viewed from public roads, since, as previously mentioned, the area is not visible from Polhemus or Crystal Springs Roads.

In the intervening timeframe between when the repair work is complete and when construction of the residences occurs, the hillside will be seeded for stabilized using erosion control measures as recommended by the project geologist and approved by the County, as required by Mitigation Measure 1. These measures will be temporary and not visible from Polhemus Road and Crystal Springs Road.

Future residential development will further modify the hillside but the impacts from scenic roads will remain insignificant as the proposed building locations would infill an undeveloped area between existing houses on Parrot Drive. Replanting of trees is required by Mitigation Measure 2 to achieve compliance with the County's RM Zoning Regulations and to improve hillside stabilization and minimize the potential visual impact of the new development.

Adherence to the Mitigation Measures 1 and 2 would reduce potential aesthetic impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 1: Immediately upon completion of the landslide repair work, the disturbed areas of the hillside shall be stabilized using erosion control measures as recommended by project geologist and approved by the County. If seeds are to be applied, the applicant shall use a local, non-invasive seed mixture consistent with the surrounding vegetation. Measures shall remain in place and replaced/repaired as necessary to provide adequate erosion control, as determined by the County, until grading/construction of future houses has commenced.

Mitigation Measure 2: A comprehensive tree replacement plan shall be developed for all protected trees (55-inches or greater in circumference), which are removed during landslide repair, grading, and future construction activities associated with residential development. Replacement shall occur at completion of future residential development. The replanting ratio shall achieve either a 1:1 replacement with 5-gallon sized trees, or a 3:1 replacement ratio with trees 15 gallons or greater in size proposed, of native species. A master planting and monitoring plan, including any necessary irrigation, for all four lots shall be prepared by a landscape designer or architect and submitted to the Planning and Building Department for review. The tree replanting for lots shall be made a condition of the final approval of the certificate of occupancy for each new residence. **Source:** San Mateo County Zoning Regulations - Resource Management (RM) Zoning District					
1.b.	Significantly damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
Discussion: The proposed area of grading work and the site of future residences is not visible from the scenic roads due to distance, topography and vegetation. **Source:** Site Visit, San Mateo County Maps					
1.c.	Significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline?		X		
Discussion: The proposed grading will be mitigated with replacement vegetation and occurs in an area which is minimally visible from Parrott Drive, as it is located below street level, on a steep slope. (See discussion for Question 1.a.) The project does not involve development on a ridgeline. **Source:** Site Visit, San Mateo County Maps					
1.d.	Create a new source of significant light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
Discussion: No development is proposed with this application. Future residential development will be subject to a Resource Management Permit and must comply with RM development review criteria pertaining to lighting such as minimization of exterior lighting. **Source:** Project Scope, RM Zoning District					
1.e.	Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?		X		
Discussion: See discussion for Question 1.a. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo County Maps					

1.f.	If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
Discussion: The project is not located within a Design Review District. **Source:** San Mateo County General Plan and Zoning Regulations					
1.g.	Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?		X		
Discussion: See discussion for Question 1.a. **Source:** Site Visit, Project Scope					

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

		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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 subject property is within the RM Zoning District, which allows for agricultural uses. The area to be subdivided consists of soil comprised of Fagan Loam and with slopes ranging from 15% to 50%. The project site does not contain land shown to be Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.

The site contains a single-family residence, and has not been used in the recent past for agriculture. The parcel is surrounded by residential uses in the City of Hillsborough and is located within the sphere of influence of the City of San Mateo. With the exception of the existing dwelling, on a proposed 9-acre remainder parcel the proposed 48.21-acre remainder parcel will retain its current open space use through the recordation of a conservation easement. The proposed Draft Conservation Easement is included as Attachment N.

Source: University of California Natural Resources Conservation Service: http://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/gmap/					
2.b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
Discussion: Both agriculture and residential uses are allowed uses within the RM Zoning District. An RM-zoned parcel's development density is determined by density analysis. The proposed density, is consistent with the RM zoning regulations and the approved density analysis completed by the County on May 21, 2013 (DEN2013-00001). With the recordation of a Conservation Easement (which will allow agricultural uses) a density bonus can be allowed by the RM zoning regulations and the determined density for the subject parcel will allow for a total of five single-family residences (four new and one existing) along with a conservation easement for 57 acres. The property currently does not contain any existing open space easements and is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. No conversion of farmland will occur with this proposal. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps and Zoning Regulations					
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	
Discussion: See discussion of potential impacts to farmland for Question 2.a. There are no forestlands on the subject property. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
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
Discussion: The subject parcel is not within the Coastal Zone. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			X	
Discussion: See discussion of potential impacts to agricultural land for Question 2.a. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
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				X

	Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? *Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.*				

Discussion: The subject parcel does not contain timberland or forestland, nor does the parcel adjoin such areas or uses.

Source: San Mateo County Maps

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

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

Discussion: The project would result in temporary air quality impacts, including dust from grading activities and exhaust from construction vehicles, to occupants of residences in the immediate project area during the landslide repair, grading and construction phases. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) exempts construction and operation of residential uses from permit requirements (Regulation 2-1-113). The project involves the eventual construction and operation of up to an additional four, single-family residences; however, the majority of the parcel will remain as open space use through a conservation easement. The project also includes grading for landslide repair. Density credits, which are necessary for additional residential parcels will be exhausted for the property.

The proposed grading would involve a small number of construction vehicles. The majority of grading will be balanced on the site, however it is estimated that 3,022 cy of soil will be relocated to and from the site for the landslide repair. This quantity of soil will require an average of five trucks a day over a 4-6 week period of time. All construction equipment will be required to comply with BAAQMD standards for idling times. The pollutants associated with the grading activity and residential development will be conducted in adherence with the Mitigation Measures below and dust control measures in Section 3.f. of this report. Adherence to these mitigation measures would reduce potential air quality impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 3: Prior to the beginning of any grading construction activities, including landslide repair work, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan for each phase (landslide repair, grading, and construction) showing conformance with applicable erosion control related mitigation measures and County Erosion Control Guidelines. 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, apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall also demonstrate adherence to the following measures

recommended by Murray Engineering Inc., (Attachments K and L):

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 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 weeks of seeding/planting.

e. Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and control dust.

f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.

g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 feet from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.

h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.

i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.

j. Install storm drain inlet protection that traps sediment before it enters any adjacent storm sewer systems. This barrier shall consist of filter fabric, straw bales, gravel, or sand bags.

k. Install sediment traps/basins at outlets of diversions, channels, slope drains, or other runoff conveyances that discharge sediment-laden water. Sediment traps/basins shall be cleaned out when 50% full (by volume).

Mitigation Measure 4: Prior to the issuance of the grading permit "hard card," the applicant shall submit a dust control plan for review and approval by the Current Planning Section. The plan, at a minimum, shall include the following measures:

a. Water all construction and grading areas at least twice daily.

b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

c. Pave, apply water two times daily, or (non-toxic) soil on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at the project site.

d. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

Source: San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan; BAAQMD

3.b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
Discussion: The project will not violate air quality standards or contribute significantly to any air quality violation. See discussion of potential air quality impacts for Question 3.a. **Source:** San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan					
3.c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
Discussion: The project will not create pollutants that will have a cumulative impact or prevent attainment of regional or federal quality standards. See discussion for Question 3.a. **Source:** San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan					
3.d.	Expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by BAAQMD?		X		
Discussion: The project would result in temporary air quality impacts, including dust from grading activities and exhaust from construction vehicles, to occupants of residences in the immediate project area during the landslide repair, grading and construction phases. Mitigation Measure Numbers 3 and 4 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. **Source:** San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan					
3.e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a significant number of people?			X	
Discussion: The project may result in temporary generation of odors associated with project grading and construction of four new single-family dwellings. However, this impact is temporary and would be minimized by Mitigation Measures 3 and 4. **Source:** San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan					
3.f.	Generate pollutants (hydrocarbon, thermal odor, dust or smoke particulates, radiation, etc.) that will violate existing standards of air quality on-site or in the surrounding area?			X	
Discussion: See discussion for Question 3.a. **Source:** San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan					

4.	**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
4.a.	Have a significant adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		

Discussion: The evaluation of the subject parcel revealed the presence of special-status natural communities. The primary biological concerns related to this project involve wetlands and plant and wildlife special status species, as the site has habitat and potential habitat for the California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, Central California Coast Steelhead, and mission blue butterfly.

These special communities are defined differently by each jurisdictional agency. Definitions/ descriptions include: (1) being considered rare in the region, (2) support special-status plant or wildlife species, or (3) receive regulatory protection under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and/or the California Fish and Wildlife Code (CFWC) Section 1600.

The identified communities qualify as California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) rare communities and these communities are given the highest inventory priority (CNDDB 2014, CDFG 2010). The San Mateo County General Plan defines sensitive habitats as those supporting rare or unique species, riparian corridors, wetlands, and important nesting, feeding, breeding or spawning areas, and oak woodlands.

The project must comply with the Clean Water Act (§§401 and 404), California Fish and Game Code (§1600), State water quality certification from the RWQCB, and endangered species consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

The subject property was surveyed in 2006 and the observations summarized in the 2007 Floristic Analysis (Attachment A). The survey was conducted on foot and the entire parcel was covered. The location of all populations of special-status plants were mapped and the approximate size of each population was enumerated. This report was updated in 2014 to address the new proposal of a smaller subdivision proposals; then later revised in 2015 after a second reconnaissance-level survey was performed (June 26, 2014) over an area of eight acres, encompassing the proposed new parcels. (Attachment F) The survey results are also documented in the Biological Site Assessment for the Proposed Zmay Property Subdivision. The results are discussed in the March 11, 2015 Revised Botanical Evaluation (Attachment G).

A visual evaluation of the site for purposes of wetland delineation was undertaken on July 16, 2017 to identify willow habitat located below to proposed parcels 2 and 3. These efforts are discussed in the August 16, 2017, Revised Wetland Evaluation. (Attachment E)

The biological discussion of potential project impacts to special status and regulated features is divided into four sections: wetlands, plants, migratory birds, and special-status animals.

Wetlands

A wetland delineation and preliminary jurisdictional determination was prepared and verified by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in 2007 for an earlier, 20-lot version of the subdivision. In 2007 the qualifying area on the parcel was identified as 0.42 acre and including 4,624 linear feet of stream channels. There are three intermittent stream channels that cross the slopes of the subject property with two originating on proposed Parcels 2 and 4 within the reduced study area. Each is a tributary to San Mateo Creek. Another 0.21-acre of non-wetland riparian habitat falls under state jurisdiction only. Due to the passage of 10 years' of time from the original wetland survey, the 2007 verification has expired.

In 2014 the original subdivision project was revised to a four-lot subdivision with parcels approximately 2 acres in size. A reconnaissance-level survey of a reduced study area, containing the area of the proposed subdivision, was performed by biologist Michael Wood on June 26, 2014. The 2014 survey supplements several previous surveys of the site. During the 2014 site reconnaissance, conditions in the reduced study area were not found to have appreciably changed since 2007.

The 2014 survey by biologist Michael Wood also identified California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) special-status natural communities (wetlands), consisting of three incised tributaries to San Mateo Creek that cross the slopes on-site, scattered willows, and coast live oak trees adjacent to these channels that might be regarded as riparian habitat, potentially falling under CDFW jurisdiction restricted to waters of the U.S./waters of the State. In addition to the presence of the wetlands, the parcel also contains habitat or potential habitat for the previously mentioned, four federal and/or state-listed endangered, threatened or fully protected species.

Michael Wood's 2015 evaluation (Revised Creek Setback Evaluation, Zmay Property Subdivision) of a modified subdivision proposal, with a further reduced study area, states the study area supports two small stands of typical riparian vegetation. Proposed parcel sizes were reduced less than an acre to avoid intersection with wetlands and the landslide area. A land survey was not conducted at this time; the document was an analysis of the reduced project area and policies impacting wetland biology. The document identified the use of buffers to minimize impacts to the wetlands. The use of buffers is incorporated in both project design and Mitigation Measures 5 and 6.

In a 2017 wetland evaluation of the property, a formal wetland delineation was performed in conformance to the guidelines of the USACE (2006, 2008) and Environmental Laboratory (1987). The primary purpose of the August 2017 delineation effort was to revisit the limits of jurisdiction of a stand of willows growing below Parcels 2 and 3. The need for this arises from the identification of an existing landslide located predominantly on Parcel 2 and because 10 years have passed since the completion of the original wetland survey.

Utilizing field data, site observations and recent and historic aerial photographs, the wetland/ upland boundary was mapped (see Attachment A, Figure 3 of letter delineation letter (Attachment E)). A total of two data points were sampled and data on vegetation, soils and hydrology were collected and recorded (field data forms are attached as Attachment D (of letter delineation letter (Attachment E). In addition to the limits of jurisdiction of the USACE, the limits of jurisdiction of CDFW were also mapped.

In all evaluations, the subject property was found to contain an area of aquatic features falling under both federal (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) and state (California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Regional Water Quality Control Board), jurisdiction. Based on the current wetland delineation, the anticipated limits of grading for the proposed slide repair would not encroach upon habitat features regulated under the CWA (i.e., waters of the U.S.) so long as site conditions remain consistent to previous biological surveys.

A new evaluation of the site is required prior to any disturbance (Mitigation Measures 5 and 6), and

should the project require a permit from a jurisdiction, said permit shall be obtained prior to the issuance of a grading hard card.

Mitigation Measures (Numbers 5-13) will protect the riparian and wetland habitat and ensure that impacts are limited to a less than significant level. As proposed and mitigated, potential impacts to wetland habitat would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure 5: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the contractor and the biologist shall meet in the field to identify the limits of riparian and wetland habitat and the extent of excavation within the environmentally sensitive area (ESA). A report/letter summarizing the meeting and with details of how construction may impact the ESA and/or reduce the efficacy of any mitigation measures or conditions, shall be submitted to the County prior to the commencement of such grading.

Mitigation Measure 6: Under the supervision of the biologist, the limits of wetland habitat shall be marked in the field with high visibility construction fencing, and the area shall be designated as an ESA. No equipment shall be permitted to operate within the ESA without prior coordination with and inspection by the project biologist.

Mitigation Measure 7: Prior to the commencement of any land disturbing activities, all mitigation measures contained in this document which are applicable to the protection of the wetlands shall be explained in detail by the biologist to the construction site manager so they can be implemented in the field.

Mitigation Measure 8: Removal of any willow trees is prohibited without a federal or state permit. Grading shall be permissible only if excavation that extends within the canopy of the willows does not involve root disturbance or removal.

Mitigation Measure 9: A federal permit is required for any excavation that requires the removal of willows within the limits of federal jurisdiction. Should removal be deemed necessary, at this point, work shall cease until all appropriate permits have been issued by the USACE and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) pursuant to the Clean Water Act, and by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the County of San Mateo shall be notified. Prior to commencement of grading activities copies of all regulatory permits and proof of the successful implementation of all permit conditions and mitigation measures shall be provided to the Planning and Building Department.

Mitigation Measure 10: If a Clean Water Act permit is required for impacts to waters of the U.S., a formal consultation with the USFWS under Section 7 of Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) shall be required, and the USFWS would issue a Biological Opinion, which would include an incidental take permit and an outline of mandatory minimization and/or mitigation measures. Compliance with Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) can also facilitate compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Conditions of all permits issued by these agencies shall be implemented in full to reduce impacts to special-status species.

Mitigation Measure 11: At the conclusion of ground disturbance, a biological report shall be submitted to the County which discusses if the measures were executed correctly and which if any additional restoration measures need to be implemented and/or monitored.

Mitigation Measure 12: All temporarily disturbed aquatic habitat shall be restored to pre-project conditions, which may include revegetation of denuded areas with native aquatic or emergent vegetation that complement the native vegetation of adjacent habitats. A revegetation plan shall be prepared by a biologist, reviewed and subject to the approval by the County and proper execution of the plan shall be confirmed by a biologist, and written confirmation shall be submitted to the County.

Mitigation Measure 13: Regulatory permits may be expected to require mitigation for temporal or permanent impacts to riparian habitat. All required mitigation from any required regulatory permit for

temporal or permanent impacts to riparian habitat shall be implemented. Mitigation may include in situ restoration by planting, and long-term monitoring for plant survival and habitat restoration.

Mitigation Measure 14: The Project sponsor shall comply with the federal and State Endangered Species Acts for all species with potential habitat which may be impacted.

Special-Status Plant Species

In 2007, a floristic survey was conducted which identified a total of six special-status plant species that occurred on the subject property, two of which were also on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants. Special-status plant species include those listed as endangered, threatened, rare, or as candidates for listing by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS 2014), the CDFW (2014a,b), and the CNPS (2014). The CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (2014) focuses on native plants that are rare in California or that face the threat of extinction or extirpation in the state.

The six plants are (1) San Mateo woolly sunflower (*Eriophyllum latilobum*), (Malacothamnus arcuatus), (2) Arcuate bush mallow (*Allium peninsulare var. franciscanum*), (3) Franciscan onion (*Dirca occidentalis*), (4) Western leatherwood (*Elymus californicus*), (5) California bottle-brush grass (*Collinsia multicolor; formerly C. franciscana*), and (6) San Francisco (*collinsia*) a.k.a. Franciscan blue-eyed Mary. Of these, western leatherwood (Dirca occidentalis; CNPS List 1B) was mapped as occurring in the vicinity of the proposed Parcel 4.

A follow-up survey was conducted by botanist Michael Wood in August 2014 for the revised project. Mr. Wood found the presence of western leatherwood plants within the boundary of Parcel 4. None of the remaining five special-status plant species previously documented on the subject property was observed as occurring in the project area, which covers a total of approximately 5 acres. No slide repair activity occurs on Parcel 4 and residential development is not in the vicinity of known leatherwood plants.

Pre-construction identification of any plants and protection measures will prevent any significant impacts from the proposed development.

Mitigation Measure 15: Thirty days prior to development of the residence on Parcel 4, a survey identifying any western leatherwood plants shall occur. Any plants which are identified shall be protected by fencing to prevent damage from construction activities.

Migratory Birds

Mr. Wood's biological report states that "Oak woodland, scrub and grassland habitats on-site provide nesting habitat for one state-listed fully protected raptor (white-tailed kite) and ten other special-status bird species (Allen's hummingbird, Cooper's hawk, grasshopper sparrow, Lawrence's goldfinch, loggerhead shrike, merlin, Nuttall's woodpecker, oak titmouse, sharp-shinned hawk, and yellow warbler), and numerous species of migratory birds."

The report continues, with "The proposed four new parcels support suitable nesting habitat for numerous species of migratory raptors and passerines. Based on the amount of vegetative cover on site, there is a high potential for the utilization of these habitat for breeding by such birds. Site clearing activities could result in a take of migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Commission (CFGC). Disturbance during the nesting season could result in the potential nest abandonment and mortality of young, which would be a significant adverse effect pursuant to CEQA."

Construction activities, including the proposed grading would necessitate the removal of approximately, 16 trees greater than 17.5 inches in diameter (55 inches in circumference) at breast height (DBH) and result in direct or indirect impacts to nesting birds by causing destruction or abandonment of occupied nests. This number is a small fraction of the hundreds of trees located on the subject

parcel, and with planting of replacement trees, careful site planning and incorporation of mitigation measures for surveying and monitoring for the presence of nests, potential impacts from site development could be reduced to levels that are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 16: Prior to the removal or significant pruning of any trees, they shall be inspected by a qualified biologist for the presence of raptor nests. This is required regardless of season. If a suspected raptor nest is discovered, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) shall be notified. Pursuant to CFGC Section 3503.5, raptor nests, whether or not they are occupied, may not be removed until approval is granted by the CDFW.

Mitigation Measure 17: If clearing, grubbing or tree removal/pruning are to be conducted outside of the breeding season (i.e., September 1 through January 31), no preconstruction surveys for nesting migratory birds is necessary.

If clearing, grubbing or tree removal or pruning are to be conducted during the breeding season (i.e., February 1 through August 31), a preconstruction nesting bird survey shall be conducted. The survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks prior to the initiation of work. If no nesting or breeding activity is observed, work may proceed without restrictions. To the extent allowed by access, all active bird nests identified within 250 feet for raptors and 50 feet for passerines shall be mapped.

Mitigation Measure 18: For any active bird nests found near the construction limits (i.e., within 250 feet for raptors and 50 feet for passerines of the limits of work) the Project Biologist shall make a determination as to whether or not construction activities are likely to disrupt reproductive behavior. If it is determined that construction would not disrupt breeding behavior, construction may proceed. If it is determined that construction may disrupt breeding, a no-construction buffer zone shall be designated by the Project Biologist; avoidance is the only mitigation available. The ultimate size of the no-construction buffer zone may be adjusted by the Project Biologist based on the species involved, topography, lines of site between the work area and the bird nest, physical barriers, and the ambient level of human activity. Site evaluations and buffer adjustments shall be made in consultation with the CDFW and/or the USFWS Division of Migratory Bird Management.

If it is determined that construction activities are likely to disrupt raptor breeding, construction activities within the no-construction buffer zone may not proceed until the Project Biologist determines that the nest is long longer occupied.

Mitigation Measure 19: If maintenance of a no-construction buffer zone is not feasible, the Project Biologist shall monitor the bird nest(s) to document breeding and rearing behavior of the adult birds. If it is determined that construction activities are causing distress of the adult birds and are thus likely to cause nest abandonment, work shall cease immediately. Work may not resume in the area until the Project Biologist has determined that the young birds have fledged and the bird nest is no longer occupied.

Mitigation Measure 20: Preconstruction surveys for nesting migratory birds and roosting bats shall be conducted no more than two weeks prior to the start of grading and construction for work for each phase scheduled to occur during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31) or wintering period for each phase(September 1 to January 31).

Mitigation Measure 21: If active nests/roosts of migratory birds and roosting bats are identified within 300 feet of the project site, non-disturbance buffers shall be established at a distance sufficient to minimize disturbance based on the nest/roost location, topography, cover and species' tolerance to disturbance. Buffer size shall be determined in cooperation with the CDFW and the USFWS.

Mitigation Measure 22: If active nests/roosts of migratory birds are found within 300 feet of the project site and non-disturbance buffers cannot be maintained, a qualified biologist shall be on-site to monitor the nests/roosts for signs of nest disturbance. If it is determined that grading and/ or

construction activity is resulting in nest/roost disturbance, work shall cease immediately and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted.

Special-Status Animals

Mr. Wood states that based on knowledge of the geographic range and habitat affinities of special-status animals recorded from the region, and evaluation of on-site habitats, a total of 24 special-status animal species have the potential to occur on site or in the immediate project vicinity. The presence within the reduced study area of one special-status mammal, San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat, was confirmed during the 2014 follow-up reconnaissance survey. Another 14 special-status wildlife species are considered to have the potential to occur within the reduced study area, including ten birds and five bat species. Four federal and/or state-listed endangered, threatened or fully protected species are considered to have the potential to occur on the subject property. However, Mr. Wood, in a reported titled Wood Biological Consulting, Inc. – Biological Site Assessment, Zmay Property, dated August 13, 2014, and revised March 10, 2015, states that in the study area only the mission blue butterfly and white-tailed kite are considered to have a potential for occurrence; the potential for occurrence of California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake and steelhead is considered to be low. Nonetheless, development of the four new parcels could indirectly affect these species through erosion and sedimentation.

Impacts to Federal and State-listed species are regulated under the California and Federal Endangered Species Acts, and impacts to other special-status species would be considered significant under the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Development of the project site could result in direct impacts to these species (i.e., mortality of individuals, loss of host plants, nest failure, etc.) or indirect (i.e., loss of foraging habitat, noise disturbance, nest disturbance, etc.).

The 2014 survey determined that within the project site there is one special-status mammal, San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat. With this exception, there were no existing habitats or features which function as wildlife movement corridors other special status species. The potential for habitat does exist. However, the fact that (1) the proposed development will be limited to approximately 2.8 acres of the a 60-acre site (4.6%), (2) land disturbance will occur in areas that are adjacent to disturbed and/or developed land, and (3) the mitigation measures as recommended by Mr. Wood, as listed below, would be made conditions of approval for the proposal, the potential project impacts to biological resources would be reduced to a less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 23: For each phase, the applicant shall implement the following measures to avoid or minimize impacts to special status animals including performing pre-construction surveys for snakes within the daily work area, having a USFWS-approved biologist on-site during work within suitable habitat, conducting environmental awareness training, constructing exclusion fencing along the project perimeter within suitable habitat 30 days prior to disturbance, implementing erosion control BMPs, refueling vehicles/equipment off-site, and restoring the habitat to pre-project conditions.

Mitigation Measure 24: A qualified biologist should perform a ground survey to locate and mark all woodrat nests in the proposed grading and construction area. The survey shall be performed no less than 30 days prior to the initiation of ground disturbances for each phase. The contractor shall also walk the site to assist in determining which nests would be affected.

Mitigation Measure 25: The woodrat nests to be avoided shall be fenced off with orange construction fencing and their locations marked on construction plans as being off limits to all activities.

Mitigation Measure 26: Any woodrat nest that cannot be avoided shall be manually disassembled by a qualified biologist pending authorization from CDFW to give any resident woodrats the opportunity to disperse to adjoining undisturbed habitat. Nest building materials shall be immediately

removed off-site and disposed of to prevent woodrats from reassembling nests on-site.

Mitigation Measure 27: To ensure woodrats do not rebuild nests within the construction area, a qualified biologist shall inspect the construction corridor no less than once per week. If new nests appear, they shall be disassembled and the building materials disposed of off-site. If there is a high degree of woodrat activity, more frequent monitoring shall be performed, as recommended by a qualified biologist.

Mitigation Measure 28: All appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs shall be implemented. Application of erosion control BMPs shall utilize native weed-free and plastic-free fiber rolls, mats, straw mulch, hydroseed, etc., to the maximum extent possible.

Source: Wetland Evaluation by Wood Biological Consulting, Inc., dated March 11, 2015; Biological Site Assessment for the Proposed Zmay Property Subdivision, San Mateo County, California, dated August 13, 2014, revised March 10, 2015; Wood Biological Consulting, Inc. Revised Botanical Evaluation, Zmay Property Subdivision, San Mateo County Letter, dated March 11, 2015; and Revised Wetland Evaluation, Zmay Property Subdivision, dated, August 6, 2017

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

Discussion: See discussion for Question 4.a.

Source: See Question 4.a.

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

Discussion: See discussion for Question 4.a.

Source: See Question 4.a.

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

Discussion: See discussion for Questions 4.a.

Source: Biological Site Assessment for the Proposed Zmay Property Subdivision, San Mateo County, California, dated August 13, 2014, revised March 10, 2015, Prepared by: Wood Biological

Consulting, Inc.					
4.e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?		X		
Discussion: Phase one of this application will require a small number of small trees and some trees greater than 17.5 inches in diameter (55 inches in circumference) be removed as part of grading activity to repair the landslide areas. The landslide repair area is mostly free of trees, but equipment will need to access the site and some trees in close proximity to where work will occur will be impacted. There are approximately 10 trees greater than 17.5 inches in diameter, which are on the proposed parcels, and subject to potential removal in order to gain access to the site for grading. Replanting of trees shall be required for hillside stabilization, to minimize the visual impact of the grading activities, and compliance with the County's RM Zoning District Regulations. **Mitigation Measure 29:** All future development shall comply the County policies and ordinances for removal and replacement. **Mitigation Measure 30:** Whenever possible, trees shall be planted in areas of grading disturbance for hillside stabilization, to minimize the visual impact of the grading activities, and compliance with the County's RM Zoning District Regulations. **Source:** San Mateo County RM Zoning District Regulations					
4.f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?		X		
Discussion: The property is not within an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan or other local, regional habitat plan. As discussed in the response to Question 4.a. the proposal, as proposed and mitigated, reduces impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level. **Source:** Biological Site Assessment for the Proposed Zmay Property Subdivision, San Mateo County, California, dated August 13, 2014 Revised March 10, 2015, Prepared by: Wood Biological Consulting, Inc.					
4.g.				X	
Discussion: There is no marine or wildlife reserve within 200 feet of the subject parcel. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
4.h.	Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?			X	
Discussion: There are scattered trees on the subject parcel, including oaks. As discussed in Section 4.e., a small portion of the trees on the site will be removed for grading and construction activity. These trees will be replaced with native species as required by Mitigation Measure 2. The project involves the creation and development of four parcels within a 0.73-acre area for future residential development, and a 57.48± acre remainder parcel, with approximately 48.21 acres of					

land to be protected by a conservation easement. The conservation easement would retain the open space use of this area which contains many oak trees.

Source: Project Scope

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

Discussion: In July 2015, Dr. Daniel Shoup of Archaeological/Historical Consultants (A/HC) conducted a comprehensive record search for previously recorded cultural resources in the project area and within a half-mile radius. The Northwest Information Center, California Historical Resources Information System (NWIC File #14-1853) other resources were consulted. In addition, A/HC staff reviewed the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, California Historical Landmarks, and the California Inventory of Historical Resources. No recorded cultural resources and no historic resources were identified.

Dr. Shoup also carried out a pedestrian archaeological survey of the Area of Potential Effects (APE), including the four proposed parcels and the area of the landslide repair, on July 28, 2015. All open areas were inspected for cultural evidence such as historic structures, artifacts, and features; and indicators of prehistoric archaeological deposits like midden soil, flaked lithics, groundstone, and shell. No prehistoric archaeological resources were discovered in the course of the survey. No artifacts that appeared over 45 years' of age were observed. No built environmental resources were discovered in the course of the survey.

Source: California Historical Resources information System letter, dated July 8, 2015, Cultural Resource Survey Report, Prepared by Daniel Shoup, RPA, dated August 10, 2015

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

Discussion: See discussion for Question 5.a.

Source: Cultural Resources Survey Report, by Daniel Shoup, RPA, dated August 10, 2015

5.c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		

Discussion: The grading associated with the project involves land disturbance of an area approximately 126,701 sq. ft. in size on the project site. The area of disturbance does not contain any mapped or observed unique geologic features. Due to the significant level of earthwork associated with landslide repair, the project has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. The following general mitigation measures,

as provided by the Tribal Energy and Environmental Information Clearinghouse, Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development, have been included to mitigate any potential impact to paleontological resources to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure 31: A discovery of a paleontological specimen during any phase of the project could result in a work stoppage in the vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a professional paleontologist. Should loss or damage be detected, additional protective measures or further action (e.g., resource removal by a professional paleontologist) may be needed to mitigate the impact, as determined by a professional paleontologist.

Mitigation Measure 32: Contractors and workers shall use existing roads to the maximum extent feasible to avoid additional surface disturbance.

Mitigation Measure 33: During all phases of the project, the applicant shall keep equipment and vehicles within the limits of the previously disturbed construction area. The applicant shall delineate all areas to remain undisturbed on the Erosion Control and Staging Plan and the plan shall include measures, such as chain-link fencing or other kind of barrier, to demarcate the "limit of disturbance." The property owner shall demonstrate the implementation of these measures prior to issuance of the grading permit "hard card."

Source: Project Scope, Cultural Resources Survey Report, by Daniel Shoup, RPA, dated August 10, 2015

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

Discussion: The landslide repair activity involves land disturbance of an area of approximately 126,701 sq. ft. and movement of 5,600 cy, extracted and re-compacted, on the project site. Future residential development will also involve additional grading work for site access and house construction. Due to the significant level of earthwork associated with landslide repair, the project has the potential to disturb human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries. Mitigation Measure 34 below, requires the property owner, applicant, and contractors to comply with the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric. The implementation of this mitigation measure would mitigate any potential impact to interred human remains to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure 34: The property owner, applicant, and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend the subsequent measures for disposition of the remains, including but not limited to the following:

a. That all excavation crews, including landscapers, receive cultural sensitivity training for Native American cultural resources;

b. That a California-trained Archaeological Monitor with field experience be present for all earth movement including landscaping; and

c. That a qualified and trained Native American Monitor be present for all earth-moving activities, including landscaping.

Source: Tribal Energy and Environmental Information Clearinghouse website:

http://teeic.anl.gov/er/wind/mitigation/paleo/index.cfm

6. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
6.a. Expose people or structures to potential significant adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other significant evidence of a known fault? *Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.*		X		

Discussion: A report by Murray Engineers, Inc., dated February 2014, states federal and regional seismologic and geologic experts have concluded that there is a 63 percent probability for at least one "large" earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or larger in the Bay Area before the year 2038. The northern portion of the San Andreas fault is estimated to have a 21 percent probability of producing a magnitude 6.7 or larger earthquake by the year 2038.

A peer review geotechnical report, by Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc., dated June 24, 2015, concurs that the subject parcel is located in an active seismic area. The report states there are three major faults in the San Francisco Bay Area. The San Andreas and San Gregorio faults are located approximately 1.1 and 8.3 miles southwest of the site, respectively. The Hayward and Calaveras faults are located approximately 17 and 25 miles northeast of the site, respectively.

Moderate to large earthquakes are probable along several active faults in the greater Bay Area over a 30- to 50-year design life. Strong ground shaking should therefore be expected several times during the design life of any new structure, as is typical for sites throughout the Bay Area. However, the distance of the project site from the fault lines is great and the probability of damage for future development is low.

A slope stability analysis was performed by William Cotton and Associates (WCA) through the large mapped landslide and reported a factor of safety of 2.5 for static conditions and 1.1 for seismic conditions. WCA concluded that the proposed building site is likely situated on top of an ancient landslide, but based on the slope stability analysis the landslide deposit should remain stable.

Murray Engineers developed site-specific earthquake design parameters based on the current California Building Code. The February 2014 report states that "These procedures utilize State standardized spectral acceleration values for maximum considered earthquake ground motion taking into account historical seismicity, available paleoseismic data, and activity rate along known fault

traces, as well as site specified soil and bedrock response characteristics."

The following mitigation measures have been included to mitigate potential impacts related to earthquakes and ground shaking to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure 35: The improvements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with current earthquake resistance standards.

Mitigation Measure 36: All future development shall meet or exceed, the standards prescribed in the Murray Engineers, Inc., report dated February 2014.

Mitigation Measure 37: For the final approval of the grading permit, the property owner shall ensure the performance of the following activities within thirty (30) days of the completion of grading for each phase, at the project site:

a. The Engineer who prepared the approved grading plan shall be responsible for the inspection and certification of the grading as required by Section 8606.2 of the Grading Ordinance. The Engineer's responsibilities shall include those relating to noncompliance detailed in Section 8606.5 of the Grading Ordinance.

b. The engineer shall submit written certification that all grading has been completed in conformance with the approved plans, conditions of approval, mitigation measures, and the County's Grading Regulations, to the Department of Public Works and the Planning and Building Department's Geotechnical Engineer.

c. The geotechnical consultant shall observe and approve all applicable work during construction and sign Section II of the Geotechnical Consultant Approval form, for submittal to the Planning and Building Department's Geotechnical Engineer and Current Planning Section.

Mitigation Measure 38: At the building permit application stage, the applicant shall provide documentation demonstrating that the proposed residences and associated retaining walls shall be supported on drilled pier foundations extending through the fill and colluvium and gaining support in the underlying bedrock.

Source: Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc., Supplemental Geologic and Geotechnical Peer Review, dated June 24, 2015, and Murray Engineers, Inc., Geotechnical Plan Review, dated June 3, 2015.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?		X		

Discussion: See discussion for Question 6.a.

Source: See Question 6.a.

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

Discussion: The Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Murray Engineers, Inc., does not identify liquefaction and differential settling as potential geologic hazards for the project site.

Source: Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc., Supplemental Geologic and Geotechnical Peer Review, dated June 24, 2015, and Murray Engineers, Inc., Geotechnical Plan Review, dated June 3, 2015 and July 14, 2015.

iv. Landslides?		X		

Discussion: A geotechnical report prepared for the project by Murray Engineers, Inc., (MEI), dated

February 2014, states that three relatively large landslides are mapped in the central portion of the property according to the geologic map, the Geotechnical Hazard Synthesis Map for San Mateo County (Leighton and Associates, 1976), and the Preliminary Map of Landslide Deposits in San Mateo County (Brabb & Pampeyan, 1972). This document was subjected to peer review for the County by Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc. (CSA) with the results documented in a letter dated July 14, 2015. (Attachment M)

Recommendations by CSA, to facilitate stabilization work and avoid coordination complexities associated with stabilizing a landslide that crosses a property line were: "(1) slope stabilization measures must be designed and constructed prior to individual lot residential development, or (2) consideration should be given to modifying property lines so that the entire landslide is within a single parcel, or that active landslide repair be proposed as a subdivision-level improvement."

The initial review by both firms of an earlier version of the project's subdivision map included proposed parcels that were larger in size. Subsequently, the project was revised to incorporate both recommendations. The applicant's project scope was revised to include the completion landslide repair prior to the recordation of the Parcel Map for the Minor Subdivision as part of the subdivision permit. The property lines for the parcels of the proposed subdivision have been modified to minimize exposure to the areas which encountered landslide activity and contain it on one parcel to respond to the geotechnical comments.

The revised tentative subdivision map has smaller parcels and the landslide area within Parcels 1 and 3 was reduced, while remaining virtually unchanged on Parcel 2. The active landslide feature measures approximately 900 feet in length and 600 feet in width, and is located approximately 350 feet to the west (downhill) of Parrott Drive and extends down to Crystal Springs Road, crossing Parcel 2 and portions of Parcels 1 and 3. The second mapped landslide is approximately 700 feet long and 500 feet wide and is located immediately south of the first landslide.

As the parcels have been made smaller, Parcel 4 boundaries have been shifted west and references to landslide activity on this parcel in the earlier reports is no longer relevant to the current proposal

Phase 1 of the project would include the repair of an active landslide feature located predominantly within Parcel 2, with slight encroachment on Parcel 1 and 3 of the referenced subdivision. Landslide repair activities would include the excavation, regrading and recompaction of the displaced slide mass. The existing landslide would be replaced with an engineered fill slope, designed with a keyway and benches gaining support in the underlying competent bedrock material. Additional improvements in the immediate vicinity of the landslide would include improved subsurface and surface drainage controls.

In the opinion of MEI's geotechnical investigation, the proposed residential subdivision is feasible from an engineering geologic and geotechnical perspective. The primary constraints to the project include the potential for shallow landsliding and/or debris flows developing along the steeper portions of the property, consolidation, creep, and/or shallow landsliding of the undocumented fill along the downhill side of Parrott Drive, and the potential for strong to very strong ground shaking during a moderate to large earthquake on the nearby San Andreas fault or one of the other nearby active faults. In general, the proposed residences will be located in the uphill portion of the lots, adjacent to Parrott Drive.

Peer review of the MEI, by CSA, stated that geotechnical feasibility of residential development of Parcels 1 through 4 was demonstrated as long as the area of active land sliding within Parcels 2 and 3 is stabilized as a subdivision-level improvement. CSA concluded that existing drainage and diversion wall improvements have historically mitigated significant landslide and debris flow hazards concerns to offsite areas. This improvement has been required by the County a part of the subdivision approval with the following mitigation measures to reduce the potential of landsliding to a

less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure 39: Prior to the recordation of the Subdivision Map, the landslide repair on Parcel 2 shall be completed to the satisfaction of the County's Geotechnical Section, to ensure that repair occurs prior to the construction of any residential structures.

Mitigation Measure 40: All fill material for the repair shall be keyed and benched into competent bedrock (not into soil as indicated on the referenced C-1). Construction plans at the building permit stage shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 41: The final design shall include intermediate surface drainage control measures. Construction plans at the building permit stage shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 42: A surveyed, as-built subdrain plan shall prepared and added to the proposed repair plan. Grading plans at the building permit stage shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 43: A modified design plan shall be prepared, with approval by the Project Geotechnical Consultant, and submitted to the County for approval prior to the initiation of grading repair work.

Mitigation Measure 44: No cut or fill exceeding 5 feet in vertical dimension shall be permitted on Parcels 1 through 4 unless supported by an engineered retaining wall. Construction plans at the building permit stage for each new residence shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 45: Grading and drainage plans for each lot shall be reviewed by the County Geotechnical Section, or designated consultant, prior to approval of building or grading permits on Parcels 1 through 4.

Mitigation Measure 46: Foundation design on Parcel 2 shall be checked against the as-built subdrain plan for the landslide repair. Construction plans at the building permit stage for the residence on Parcel 2 shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 47: Geotechnical Design Parameters – Final geotechnical design parameters to be utilized for residential construction on Parcels 1 through 4 shall fully meet or exceed design recommendations presented in the Engineering Geologic & Geotechnical Report by Murray Engineers, Inc., dated February 10, 2014. Construction plans at the building permit stage for each new residence shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 48: Future residences shall be supported on 12-inch diameter piers, extending at least 8 feet into competent materials. In addition, the property owner shall implement Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc., recommendation to construct an earth flow deflection wall above Building Site 1. Construction plans at the building permit stage for each new residence shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 49: All subdrain alignments within the repair shall be accurately surveyed during construction so that future pier-support foundations do not interfere with constructed subdrain systems. Construction plans at the building permit stage for each new residence shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 50: Unsupported large cuts and fills shall be avoided. Grading plans at the building permit stage shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 51: If site conditions vary from those described in the 2014 Murray Engineers, Inc. report, the geotechnical design of the project recommendations shall be updated and submitted to San Mateo County Planning and Building Department for approval, prior to associated project

construction.

Source: Figure A-4, San Mateo County Landslide Map and Figure A-5, San Mateo County Geotechnical Hazard Synthesis Map; Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc., Supplemental Geologic and Geotechnical Peer Review, dated June 24, 2015; and Murray Engineers, Inc., Geotechnical Plan Review, dated June 3, 2015 and July 14, 2015

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 site is not located on or adjacent to the coast.

Source: San Mateo County Maps

6.b.	Result in significant soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		

Discussion: The project involves a significant amount of earthwork, 5,600 cubic yards of cut and 5,600 cubic yards of fill, for landslide repair (Phase 1). House construction on Parcels 1 – 4 (Phase 2) will also require grading. The County requires the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" prior to the start of grading for each phase. Should there be any precipitation during project grading there is the potential for sedimentation in on-site areas downslope from the project area (off-site areas would not be affected due to the size of the parcel and project location). The applicant proposes an Erosion Control and Staging Plan, included as Page C-2 of Attachment R, which include measures that would contain and slow run-off, while allowing for natural infiltration.

Mitigation Measures listed below have been included to require that the Erosion Control and Staging Plan to include additional stormwater pollution prevention measures and require compliance with the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines." Implementation of erosion control measures are required throughout the term of the grading permit and building permit. Limits have been placed on project grading to confine it to the dry season, unless reviewed and recommended by the project geotechnical consultant and approved, in writing, by the Community Development Director. Erosion control measures must be inspected and maintained under the supervision of the project civil engineer. The applicant is required to obtain coverage under the State General Construction Activity NPDES Permit should the area of disturbance equal 1 acre or more (currently estimated at 33,215 sq. ft). Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce potential impact related to erosion to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure 52: The applicant shall use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the silt fence shall be 0.5 acre or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips shall have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.

Mitigation Measure 53: The applicant shall seed all disturbed areas with a native grassland mix as soon as grading activities are completed for each phase in order to minimize the potential establishment and expansion of exotic plant species into newly-graded areas, and to prevent potential future erosion.

Mitigation Measure 54 No site disturbance shall occur, including any land disturbance, grading, or vegetation or tree removal, until a building permit has been issued, and then only those trees

approved for removal shall be removed. Trees to be removed, including approximate size, species, and location, shall be shown on a plan.

Mitigation Measure 55: Erosion and sediment control during the course of this grading work shall be according to a plan prepared and signed by the Engineer of record, and approved by the Department of Public Works and the Current Planning Section. Revisions to the approved erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer.

Mitigation Measure 56: It shall be the responsibility of the applicant's engineer to regularly inspect the erosion control measures and determine that they are functioning as designed and that proper maintenance is being performed. Deficiencies shall be immediately corrected.

Mitigation Measure 57: Prior to the issuance of the grading permit, the applicant shall submit, to the Department of Public Works for review and approval, a plan for any off-site hauling operations. This plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following information: size of trucks, haul route, disposal site, dust and debris control measures, and time and frequency of haul trips. As part of the review of the submitted plan, the County may place such restrictions on the hauling operation as it deems necessary.

Mitigation Measure 58: At the completion of work, the engineer who prepared the approved grading plan shall certify, in writing, that all grading, lot drainage, and drainage facilities have been completed in conformance with the approved plans, as conditioned, and the Grading Regulations.

Mitigation Measure 59: At the completion of work, the engineer who prepared the approved grading plan shall submit a signed "as-graded" grading plan conforming to the requirements of the Grading Regulations.

Mitigation Measure 60: Prior to the issuance of the grading permit "hard card," the applicant shall revise the Erosion Control and Sediment Control Plan, dated December 21, 2012, to include the proposed measures and additional measures as follows, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director:

a. Provide stabilized construction entrance(s) using a minimum 3"-4" fractured aggregate over geo-textile fabric and stabilize all on-site unpaved construction access routes (e.g., aggregate over path of travel). For unpaved routes, use ridges running diagonally across the road that run to a stabilized outlet

b. Provide a designated area for parking of construction vehicles, using aggregate over geo-textile fabric.

c. Show re-vegetation of fill deposit areas, to be performed immediate after soils spreading. Use seeding and/or mulching and the following, as necessary:

    i. (For slopes 3:1 or greater) Anchored erosion control blankets (rice straw or coconut).

    ii. (For slopes less than 3:1) Anchored fiber fabric/netting or surface roughening.

d. Protect areas to remain undisturbed. These areas shall be delineated and protected using a fence or other kind of barrier.

e. Use diversion berms to divert water from unstable or denuded areas (top and base of a disturbed slope, grade breaks where slopes transition to a steeper slope).

f. Show location of office trailer(s), temporary power pole, and scaffold footprint.

g. Show location of utility trenches, indicate utility type.

h. Show location, installation and maintenance of a concrete/stucco mixer, washout, and pits.

i. Show storage location and containment (as necessary) of construction materials for during

work, as well as afterhours/ weekends)

j. Show areas for stockpiling. Cover temporary stockpiles using anchored-down plastic sheeting. For longer storage, use seeding and mulching, soil blankets or mats.

k. Show location of garbage and dumpster(s).

l. If these measures conflict with measures prescribed by the geotechnical consultant, measures as recommended by the geotechnical consultant shall rule.

Mitigation Measure 61: The applicant shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including, but not limited to, the following:

a. Delineation with field markers clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.

b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.

c. Performing clearing and earth moving activities only during dry weather.

d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30. Stabilization shall include both proactive measures, such as the placement of hay bales or coir netting, and passive measures, such as re-vegetating disturbed areas with plants propagated from seed collected in the immediate area.

e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.

f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.

g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.

h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.

i. Limiting and timing application of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.

j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.

k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.

l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.

m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.

Mitigation Measure 62: Once approved, erosion and sediment control measures of the Erosion Control and Sedimentation Plan shall be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of the grading permit and building permit. Failure to maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until the corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time. Revisions to the approved erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared

and signed by the engineer and reviewed by the Department of Public Works and the Community Development Director.

Mitigation Measure 63: No grading shall be allowed during the winter season (October 1 to April 30) to avoid potential soil erosion unless reviewed and recommended by the project geotechnical consultant and approved, in writing, by the Community Development Director. An applicant-completed and County-issued grading permit "hard card" is required prior to the start of any land disturbance/grading operations. The applicant shall submit a letter to the Current Planning Section, at least, two (2) weeks prior to commencement of grading with the project geotechnical consultants review recommendations (if any) for winter grading, stating the date when erosion controls will be installed, date when grading operations will begin, anticipated end date of grading operations, and date of re-vegetation. If the schedule of grading operations calls for grading to be completed in one grading season, then the winterizing plan shall be considered a contingent plan to be implemented if work falls behind schedule. All submitted schedules shall represent the work in detail and shall project the grading operations through to completion.

Mitigation Measure 64: Should the area of disturbance equal one area or more, the applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Board to obtain coverage under the State General Construction Activity NPDES Permit. A copy of the project's NOI (containing the WDID No.) shall be submitted to the Current Planning Section and the Department of Public Works, prior to the issuance of the grading permit "hard card."

Source: Murray Engineers, Inc. Supplemental Evaluation and Response to Review Comments Response Letter, dated April 15, 2015.

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

Discussion: The Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Murray Engineers, Inc., does not lateral spreading, liquefaction or collapse as geologic hazards for the project site. For erosion, see discussion for Question 6.b of this section.

Source: Murray Engineers, Inc. Supplemental Evaluation and Response to Review Comments Response Letter, dated March 18, 2015, Project erosion control plan.

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

Discussion: The Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Murray Engineers, Inc., does not identify expansive soil as a geologic hazard for the project site.

Source: Cotton Shire and Associates, Inc., Supplemental Geologic and Geotechnical Peer Review, dated June 24, 2015, and Murray Engineers, Inc., Geotechnical Plan Review, dated June 3, 2015.

6.e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the				X

	disposal of wastewater?				

Discussion: The subject parcel is within the service area of Crystal Springs County Sanitation District. Any new residences will connect to this sewer system.

Source: Crystal Springs County Sanitation District, Parrott Drive Sanitary Sewer Alternative Study, dated February 2003

7. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:

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

Discussion: A minor, temporary increase in greenhouse gasses during grading act may occur. Vehicles are subject to California Air Resources Board emission standards. The landslide repair activity, which will precede residential development, will be required to comply with Mitigation Measure below, including minimizing of construction vehicle idling to minimize energy consumption.

The County has identified Energy Efficient Climate Action Plan (EECAP) goals which can be implemented in new development projects. Per Mitigation Measures X and Y below, the project is required to incorporate applicable measures from the County's Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP) Development Checklist and BAAQMD Best Management Practices (BMPs) that, once implemented, will reduce project impact on climate change.

Mitigation Measure 65: The applicant shall implement the following basic construction measures at all times:

a. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxic Control Measure Title13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

b. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.

c. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person, or his/her designee, shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

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

7.b.	Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan),		X		

	policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				
Discussion: The project does not conflict with the San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan provided that the mitigation measure outlined in 7.a, above, is implemented. **Source:** San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan					
7.c.	Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				X
Discussion: Construction activities, including the proposed grading would necessitate the removal of approximately, 16 trees greater than 17.5 inches in diameter (55 inches in circumference) at breast height (DBH). However, the property does not contain forestland and no conversion will occur. **Source:** Project Scope					
7.d.	Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				X
Discussion: The project is not located on or adjacent to a coastal cliff or bluff. **Source:** San Mateo County Map					
7.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
Discussion: The project is not located on or adjacent to the San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean. **Source:** San Mateo County Map					
7.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
Discussion: The subject parcel, and specifically the land to be subdivided, is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0165E, effective October 16, 2012. **Source:** FEMA Panel No. 06081C0165E, effective October 16, 2012					
7.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X

Discussion: The subject parcel, and specifically the land to be subdivided, is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0165E, effective October 16, 2012.

Source: FEMA Panel No. 06081C0165E, effective October 16, 2012

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
8.a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: No such uses are proposed. Neither the subdivision of land, nor grading associated with the landslide repair, nor the construction or operation of four new single-family dwellings would result in a significant impact involving the transport, use, or dispersal of hazardous material or toxic substances. **Source:** Project Scope					
8.b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
Discussion: No significant use of hazardous materials is proposed. The project involves land division, earthwork to repair a landslide, residential construction, and permanent residential uses. **Source:** Project Scope					
8.c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
Discussion: No use involving significant emission of or handling of hazardous materials or waste is proposed. The project involves land division, earthwork to repair a landslide, residential construction, and permanent residential uses. **Source:** Project Scope					

8.d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
Discussion: The project site is not a listed hazardous materials site. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
8.e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
Discussion: The site is not located within an area regulated by an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
8.f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
Discussion: The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
8.g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
Discussion: The project involves the division of land, grading to repair a landslide, and construction of single-family residences only and would not permanently or significantly impede access on existing public roads. The plan has been reviewed by Cal-Fire for emergency vehicle access. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
8.h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		X		
Discussion: The subject parcel is located in the very high severity zone. To address high fire risk, Cal-Fire, which is the servicing fire district, has material requirements which would mitigate the risk of fire.					

Mitigation Measure 66: All roofing, attic ventilation, exterior walls, windows, exterior doors, decking, floors and underfloor protection shall meet California Residential Code, R327 or California Building Code Chapter 7A requirements. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
8.i.	Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
Discussion: The subject parcel, and specifically the land to be subdivided, is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0165E, effective October 16, 2012. Crystal Springs Dam is located approximately .75 miles away at a lower elevation than the subject property. The site of future development is along one of highest elevations of the property. Flooding from a dam is not possible. **Source:** FEMA Panel No. 06081C0165E, effective October 16, 2012					
8.j.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: See discussion for Question 8.i. **Source:** FEMA Panel No. 06081C0165E, effective October 16, 2012					
8.k.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
Discussion: See discussion for Question 8.i. **Source:** FEMA Panel No. 06081C0165E, effective October 16, 2012					
8.l.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
Discussion: Risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is considered nil, as the project site is located within a forested area and is not located near any large bodies of water. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo County Maps					

9.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***

9.a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?		X		
Discussion: As discussed in Section 6.b (above), should there be any precipitation during project grading or construction, there is the potential for sedimentation in on-site areas downslope from the Parrott Drive border of the parcel (off-site areas would not be affected due to the size of the parcel and project location). With the implementation of Mitigation Measures 41-49, potential project impacts related to sedimentation would be reduced to a less than significant level. **Source:** Project Scope					
9.b.	Significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere significantly with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
Discussion: The parcel is in a community water and sewer district. New water and sanitary connections will be installed in association with new residential development. **Source:** Crystal Springs County Sanitation District, Parrot Drive Sanitary Sewer Alternative Study, California Water Service Company Will Serve Letter, dated October 10, 2013.					
9.c.	Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in significant erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		X		
Discussion: The proposed grading and construction of four new residences would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site through the alteration of existing grades and construction of new impervious surface, including houses and driveways. The project will result in approximately 20,110 sq. ft. of new impervious surface, the project could potentially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Permit is mandatory and would prevent the significant degradation of surface or groundwater water quality. Mitigation Measures 67 and 68 below, requires post-construction project run-off to comply with Municipal Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy. Project compliance					

with these regulations will prevent the significant alteration of existing drainage patterns of the site and area. The project does not involve alteration of the course of a stream or river.

Mitigation Measure 67: At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan to the Department of Public Works in compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy.

Mitigation Measure 68: Projects subject to Provision C.3.i (individual single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2,500 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, and other projects that create and/or replace at least 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface but are not C.3 Regulated Projects) shall implement at least one (1) of the six (6) site design measures listed below:

a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.

b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas.

c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas.

d. Direct runoff from driveways and/or uncovered parking lots onto vegetated areas.

e. Construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces.

f. Construct bike lanes, driveways, and/or uncovered parking lots with permeable surfaces.

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

Source: San Mateo County's Drainage Policy and Provisions

9.d.	Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	

Discussion: The project does not involve alteration of the course of a stream or river. All development will be on a hillside where flooding would not occur. Existing drainage patterns will be altered by proposed grading and construction of impervious surface; however, site design measures would reduce stormwater runoff and would prevent a significant increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff.

Source: San Mateo County's Drainage Policy and Provisions

9.e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide significant additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	

Discussion: Compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Permit is mandatory and would prevent the creation of significant additional sources of polluted runoff. There are no existing or planned stormwater

drainage systems in the area as the project site is undeveloped. **Source:** San Mateo County's Drainage Policy and Provisions					
9.f.	Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?			X	
Discussion: See discussion for Question 9.c. **Source:** San Mateo County's Drainage Policy and Provisions					
9.g.	Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?		X		
Discussion: See discussion for Question 9.e. **Source:** San Mateo County's Drainage Policy and Provisions					

10.	**LAND USE AND PLANNING**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
10.a.	Physically divide an established community?				X
Discussion: The subject parcel is adjacent to residential development in the city of Hillsborough on two sides. The proposed parcels will be developed with residences along Parrott Drive. Residential development is the prevalent land use in the vicinity. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
10.b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
Discussion: The project complies with the County's General Plan land use designation and density limit for the property, proposing 1 dwelling unit /0.67-acre where the density minimum is one per parcel and maximums are determined by the development potential of a parcel. The project complies with the existing RM Zoning District regulations. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps					
10.c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Discussion: There is no habitat conservation plans which will conflict with the proposal. The proposed subdivision includes a proposal for the creation of a conservation easement over approximately 48 acres of the 60-acre parcel. **Source:** Project Scope				
10.d. Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?				X
Discussion: The subdivision of land, landslide repair, residential construction, nor permanent residential uses would not result in the congregation of 50 or more people on a regular basis. **Source:** Project Scope				
10.e. Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?				X
Discussion: The project site is located within the residential community of the San Mateo Highlands and is adjacent to residential development in the Town of Hillsborough. Development of the property with a residential use would not result in the introduction of activities not currently found vicinity. The subject parcel is adjacent to both undeveloped rural land and residential development. **Source:** San Mateo County Zoning Maps, Project Scope				
10.f. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?				X
Discussion: The project site is a 60-acre parcel within the existing unincorporated County region of San Mateo Highlands. It is adjacent to residential development in the Town of Hillsborough. The project includes the provision of services to meet the demands of the proposed project only and would not encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas. The proposed conservation easement would prevent additional residential development of the remainder parcel. **Source:** Project Scope				
10.g. Create a significant new demand for housing?			X	
Discussion: The project would provide four additional units of housing and would not increase the demand for housing in any other areas. **Source:** Project Scope				

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	

		Potentially Significant Impacts	*Significant Unless Mitigated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
11.a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
Discussion: The project does not involve any mining or commercial extraction of minerals. **Source:** Project Scope					
11.b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
Discussion: The project would not affect any nearby mineral resource recovery site, if such a site should exist nearby. **Source:** Project Scope					

12.	**NOISE**. Would the project result in:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	*Significant Unless Mitigated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
12.a.	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
Discussion: The project will generate temporary noise associated with grading and construction and drilling of piers. However, such noises will be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (*Exemptions*) of the County Ordinance Code. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance					
12.b.	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	
Discussion: See discussion for Question 12.b. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance					

12.c. A significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
Discussion: The project will result in permanent residential uses only, but will generate temporary noise associated with grading and construction. The project does not involve a significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance				
12.d. A significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
Discussion: See discussion for Question 12.a. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance				
12.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: The site is not located within an area regulated by an airport land use plan nor is it located within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport, San Francisco International, is approximately 9 miles to the northeast. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps				
12.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. **Source:** San Mateo County Maps				

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
13.a. Induce significant population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
Discussion: The project is a minor land subdivision that will create four new parcels that can be developed with single-family residences in an area that is an existing residential area served by public utilities. The project does not require the expansion or extension of facilities or infrastructure. The required infrastructure is available on Parrot Drive and can be brought to each parcel. The project will result in the development of four single family residences which can be sold separately, based on development density credits allocated to the property which allowed four residences. Therefore, the project will not be growth inducing directly or indirectly. **Source:** Project Scope				
13.b. Displace existing housing (including low- or moderate-income housing), in an area that is substantially deficient in housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
Discussion: The project site is a large parcel developed with a single-family residence and is adjacent to the residential Town of Hillsborough. The project would provide four additional units of housing and would not displace any existing housing. **Source:** Project Scope				

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in significant adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
14.a. Fire protection?			X	
14.b. Police protection?			X	
14.c. Schools?			X	
14.d. Parks?			X	

14.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?			X	

Discussion: The project involves the creation of four residential parcels where single-family residences will be developed. The new parcels are bordered by existing residential development and would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The County's Subdivision Regulations require the applicant to pay in-lieu park fees for each new parcel. Building permit fees will include school impact fees. Additionally, the property owners of the new parcels will be taxed to contribute to the support and maintenance of these facilities. The increase use of public services related to this project is minor and would not result in significant adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities.

Source: Utility Will Serve Letters

15. RECREATION. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
15.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that significant physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X

Discussion: The project involves the creation of four new parcels which will allow for future construction of four single-family residences next to and across from existing residential development. The development of four new residences would not significantly impact existing public service levels. Also, the County's Subdivision Regulations requires the applicant to pay in-lieu park fees for each new parcel.

Source: Project Scope

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

Discussion: The project involves the creation of four new parcels which will allow for the construction of one single-family residence on each. This low density development will not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The project does not include any recreational facilities. The County's Subdivision Regulations requires the applicant to pay in-lieu park fees for each new parcel.

Source: Project Scope

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
16.a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X
Discussion: The project involves the creation of four new parcels from one larger parcel, which will allow for future construction of four single-family residences (one per parcel) next to and across from existing residential development. The proposed parcels take access from Parrott Drive, an existing public road. No travel demand or level of service concerns were identified by San Mateo County Department of Public Works. The grading work and any future construction associated with the new residences will result in a temporary increase in traffic levels and a negligible permanent increase in traffic levels after construction. It is estimated that there will be 4-6 truck trips for approximately 45 days. Therefore, the project does not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The proposed grading will have no impact on transportation. **Source:** Project Scope, Review by San Mateo County Department of Public Works				
16.b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
Discussion: See discussion for Question 16.a. **Source:** Project Scope, Review by San Mateo County Department of Public Works				
16.c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in significant safety risks?			X	

Discussion: The project involves the creation of four new parcels for single-family residences and will not require or result in a change in air traffic patterns, such that the change poses significant safety risks. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo County Airport Overlay Maps				
16.d. Significantly increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
Discussion: The project involves the creation of four new driveways from Parrott Drive. Preliminary driveway designs have been reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works and would not create a new traffic hazard. Residential housing use is considered a compatible use to the RM Zoning District. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations				
16.e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
Discussion: The project has been reviewed and approved by Cal-Fire and would not result in inadequate emergency access. **Source:** Review by Cal-Fire				
16.f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
Discussion: The proposed parcels have existing road frontage on Parrott Drive. New houses will be required to incorporate a pedestrian sidewalk. There are no changes required to any transportation modalities to accommodate the future construction of four single-family residences. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo General Plan Transportation Element				
16.g. Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?				X
Discussion: See discussion for Question 16.f. **Source:** Project Scope, San Mateo General Plan Transportation Element				
16.h. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
Discussion: The proposed use is the creation of four parcels for private, single-family residential development. Residential development is required by the existing county regulation to have on-site parking. The proposed building sites on the tentative map show that the proposal meets all parking requirements. Construction work will temporarily utilize street parking while completing the landslide repair.				

Source: Project Scope, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations

17. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
17.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:			X	
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)				

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

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

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

Discussion:

Staff requested a Sacred Lands file search of the project vicinity, which was conducted by the Native American Heritage Council (NAHC), and resulted in no found records. While the project parcel is

currently largely undeveloped, the site of the proposed parcels and future residential development is adjacent to the Town of Hillsborough and existing residential development is in the immediate project vicinity. Previous development in the project vicinity did not encounter any resources which could be considered significant to a California Native American tribe. Therefore, the project is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change to any potential tribal cultural resources.

The project is not subject to Assembly Bill 52 for California Native American tribal consultation requirements, as no traditionally or culturally affiliated tribe has requested, in writing, to the County to be informed of proposed projects in the geographic project area. However, in following the NAHC's recommended best practices, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize any potential significant impacts to unknown tribal cultural resources.

Mitigation Measure 69: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources be taken prior to implementation of the project.

Mitigation Measure 70: In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall stop until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resource in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource, and those measures shall be approved by the Current Planning Section prior to implementation and continuing any work associated with the project.

Mitigation Measure 71: Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

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

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
18.a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?		X		

Discussion: The newly created parcels will connect to the existing sanitary sewer system, Crystal Springs Sanitation District (District), operated by the County of San Mateo Department of Public Works. In a letter dated December 3, 2013, the District stated that it is able to provide sewer service to the proposed new parcels. No request for an additional wastewater treatment facility was required. However, conditions have been added by the District to address downstream capacity. These conditions have been added as mitigation measures and must be satisfied prior to the connecting to the District sewer main on Parrott Drive. As proposed and mitigated, the project would result in a less than significant impact to the sewer system.

Mitigation Measure 72: The project shall minimize its impact on the downstream systems by completing capital improvement projects within the Crystal Springs Sanitation District (District) that

would reduce inflow and infiltration into the District's system in an amount equal to the projected sewage discharge amount to the District from the project.

Mitigation Measure 73: The applicant shall demonstrate that the District sewer mains utilized to transport sewage from the subdivision has the peak wet weather capacity for conveying the additional flow generated from the four residences. If it is determined that the lines are insufficient to convey the additional flow, the developer may need to upgrade the sewer lines to accommodate this subdivision.

Mitigation Measure 74: Should a pump system be utilized to deliver sewage from the four parcels to the District's sewer main on Parrott Drive, the District will require that a covenant for each parcel be prepared, signed, notarized, recorded with the San Mateo County Recorder's Office, and a copy provided to the District prior to final sewer sign-off for the building permit.

Mitigation Measure 75: Each new parcel will require a 4-inch lateral with a minimum of 2% slope and a standard cleanout installed at the property line or the property within 5 feet of the property line.

Source: Crystal Springs Sanitation District (District), letter dated December 3, 2013.

18.b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X		

Discussion: The California Water Service Company has indicated that the subject property is located within the service area boundaries and that water service can be provided to four single-family homes. See discussion for Question 18.a. for the discussion about potential impacts to wastewater treatment facilities.

Source: California Water Service Company Letter, dated October 10, 2013.

18.c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	

Discussion: In order to comply with San Mateo County's drainage policies on-site stormwater measures must be installed in association with the proposed project. These measures were designed by a licensed civil engineer and have been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the San Mateo County Department of Public Works. There is no indication that the installation of these measures will cause any significant environmental effects.

Source: Project Plans

18.d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitle-ments and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	

Discussion: See discussion for Question 18.a.

Source: California Water Service Company Letter, dated October 10, 2013.

18.e.	Result in a determination by the waste-water treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?		X		
Discussion: See discussion for Question 18.a. **Source:** Project Scope					
18.f.	Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
Discussion: The project will have a negligible impact on the capacity of local landfills. Future development of four single-family residences will also have no significant impact on landfill capacity. **Source:** Project Scope					
18.g.	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
Discussion: The project involves creation of four parcels which can be developed with single-family residences within an existing residential community and will result in a negligible increase in solid waste disposal needs. The earthwork associated with the landslide repair involves the disposal of up to 5,300 c.y. of landslide spoils to landfill. The applicant is required to pay separate fees (as set by the landfill operator) related to soil disposal. All elements of the project will comply with regulations related to solid waste. **Source:** Project Scope					
18.h.	Be sited, oriented, and/or designed to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy; incorporate water conservation and solid waste reduction measures; and incorporate solar or other alternative energy sources?		X		
Discussion: The County has identified Energy Efficient Climate Action Plan (EECAP) goals which can be implemented in new development projects. The landslide repair activity, which will precede residential development, will be required to comply with Mitigation Measure 76, including minimizing of construction vehicle idling to minimize energy consumption. Any future residential development is required to comply with County, regional and state regulations which address energy conservation applicable for single-family residential development. To meet EECAP goals the applicant has indicated that future residential development will include tree replanting, zero waste, use of 15% recycled materials, installation of energy-efficient equipment, reduced hardscape and compliance with the Green Building Ordinance. Additionally, the new houses will be subject to Title 24 requirements which encompasses the state's Energy Efficiency Standards for construction, and requires the integration of a combination of features to demonstrate					

compliance.

Mitigation Measure 76: The proposed residential development will be required to comply with all currently applicable efficiency standards (Title-24, CALGreen, etc.), and is located in an area that could support solar or alternative energy sources (none are proposed at this time).

Source: Project Scope, EECAP Development Checklist, completed by the applicant on November 21, 2016

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

Discussion: All public services have indicated that services will be available to the newly created parcels, with the exception of potential sewer line capacity constraints which are addressed by Mitigation Measure 76.

Source: California Water Service Company Will Serve letter, dated October 10, 2013, PG&E Will Serve Letter, dated October 10, 2013

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

		Potentially Significant Impacts	*Significant Unless Mitigated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
19.a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, significantly reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		

Discussion: As discussed in Section 4 Biological Services, the project could result in potential impacts to wetlands, migratory birds, and special species animals and plants on the subject parcel. Implementation of mitigation measures included in this document would adequately reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.

Source: Biological reports reference in section 4, project scope

19.b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively consider-able" 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		X		

projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				

Discussion: Grading activities associated with the landslide repair will involve the transport of approximately 3,000 cubic yards of soil. This has been estimated to be approximately 4-5 truck trips a day for approximately 45 days. The County has approved two subdivisions (Highlands and Ascension Heights) within the past three years. Each subdivision has been mitigated, is in a different stage of development and most impacts are temporary.

Potential impacts which may occur include a temporary increase in traffic, dust and noise. As previously discussed in this study, due to the scope and the temporary nature of work the cumulative effect of the project will not be cumulatively considerable. All impacts are less than significant, with the implementation of project mitigation measures.

Source: Project Scope

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

Discussion: As discussed in this report, the project, as proposed and mitigated, will not result in significant environmental effects.

Source: Project Scope

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

AGENCY	Maybe*	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)	X		Clean Water Act – Section 404
State Water Resources Control Board		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board	X		Section 401
State Department of Public Health		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
CalTrans		X	
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		X	
Coastal Commission		X	
City		X	

AGENCY	Maybe*	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Sewer/Water District:		X	
Other: CA Department of Fish and Wildlife	X		Lake and Streambed Alteration Permit
*If field conditions for vegetation have changed at time of issuance of grading permit.			

MITIGATION MEASURES

	Yes	No
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.		X

The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:

Mitigation Measure 1: Immediately upon completion of the landslide repair work, the disturbed areas of the hillside shall be stabilized using erosion control measures as recommended by project geologist and approved by the County. If seeds are to be applied, the applicant shall use a local, non-invasive seed mixture consistent with the surrounding vegetation. Measures shall remain in place and replaced/repaired as necessary to provide adequate erosion control, as determined by the County, until grading/construction of future houses has commenced.

Mitigation Measure 2: A comprehensive tree replacement plan shall be developed for all protected trees (55-inches or greater in circumference), which are removed during landslide repair, grading, and future construction activities associated with residential development. Replacement shall occur at completion of future residential development. The replanting ratio shall achieve either a 1:1 replacement with 5-gallon sized trees, or a 3:1 replacement ratio with trees 15 gallons or greater in size proposed, of native species. A master planting and monitoring plan, including any necessary irrigation, for all four lots shall be prepared by a landscape designer or architect and submitted to the Planning and Building Department for review. The tree replanting for lots shall be made a condition of the final approval of the certificate of occupancy for each new residence.

Mitigation Measure 3: Prior to the beginning of any grading construction activities, including landslide repair work, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan for each phase (landslide repair, grading, and construction) showing conformance with applicable erosion control related mitigation measures and County Erosion Control Guidelines. 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, apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall also demonstrate adherence to the following measures recommended by Murray Engineering Inc., (Attachments K and L):

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 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 weeks of seeding/planting.

e. Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and control dust.

f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.

g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 feet from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.

h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.

i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.

j. Install storm drain inlet protection that traps sediment before it enters any adjacent storm sewer systems. This barrier shall consist of filter fabric, straw bales, gravel, or sand bags.

k. Install sediment traps/basins at outlets of diversions, channels, slope drains, or other runoff conveyances that discharge sediment-laden water. Sediment traps/basins shall be cleaned out when 50% full (by volume).

Mitigation Measure 4: Prior to the issuance of the grading permit "hard card," the applicant shall submit a dust control plan for review and approval by the Current Planning Section. The plan, at a minimum, shall include the following measures:

a. Water all construction and grading areas at least twice daily.

b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

c. Pave, apply water two times daily, or (non-toxic) soil on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at the project site.

d. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

Mitigation Measure 5: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the contractor and the biologist shall meet in the field to identify the limits of riparian and wetland habitat and the extent of excavation within the environmentally sensitive area (ESA). A report/letter summarizing the meeting and with details of how construction may impact the ESA and/or reduce the efficacy of any mitigation measures or conditions, shall be submitted to the County prior to the commencement of such grading.

Mitigation Measure 6: Under the supervision of the biologist, the limits of wetland habitat shall be

marked in the field with high visibility construction fencing, and the area shall be designated as an ESA. No equipment shall be permitted to operate within the ESA without prior coordination with and inspection by the project biologist.

Mitigation Measure 7: Prior to the commencement of any land disturbing activities, all mitigation measures contained in this document which are applicable to the protection of the wetlands shall be explained in detail by the biologist to the construction site manager so they can be implemented in the field.

Mitigation Measure 8: Removal of any willow trees is prohibited without a federal or state permit. Grading shall be permissible only if excavation that extends within the canopy of the willows does not involve root disturbance or removal.

Mitigation Measure 9: A federal permit is required for any excavation that requires the removal of willows within the limits of federal jurisdiction. Should removal be deemed necessary, at this point, work shall cease until all appropriate permits have been issued by the USACE and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) pursuant to the Clean Water Act, and by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the County of San Mateo shall be notified. Prior to commencement of grading activities copies of all regulatory permits and proof of the successful implementation of all permit conditions and mitigation measures shall be provided to the Planning and Building Department.

Mitigation Measure 10: If a Clean Water Act permit is required for impacts to waters of the U.S., a formal consultation with the USFWS under Section 7 of Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) shall be required, and the USFWS would issue a Biological Opinion, which would include an incidental take permit and an outline of mandatory minimization and/or mitigation measures. Compliance with Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) can also facilitate compliance with the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Conditions of all permits issued by these agencies shall be implemented in full to reduce impacts to special-status species.

Mitigation Measure 11: At the conclusion of ground disturbance, a biological report shall be submitted to the County which discusses if the measures were executed correctly and which if any additional restoration measures need to be implemented and/or monitored.

Mitigation Measure 12: All temporarily disturbed aquatic habitat shall be restored to pre-project conditions, which may include revegetation of denuded areas with native aquatic or emergent vegetation that complement the native vegetation of adjacent habitats. A revegetation plan shall be prepared by a biologist, reviewed and subject to the approval by the County and proper execution of the plan shall be confirmed by a biologist, and written confirmation shall be submitted to the County.

Mitigation Measure 13: Regulatory permits may be expected to require mitigation for temporal or permanent impacts to riparian habitat. All required mitigation from any required regulatory permit for temporal or permanent impacts to riparian habitat shall be implemented. Mitigation may include in situ restoration by planting, and long-term monitoring for plant survival and habitat restoration.

Mitigation Measure 14: The Project sponsor shall comply with the federal and State Endangered Species Acts for all species with potential habitat which may be impacted.

Mitigation Measure 15: Thirty days prior to development of the residence on Parcel 4, a survey identifying any western leatherwood plants shall occur. Any plants which are identified shall be protected by fencing to prevent damage from construction activities.

Mitigation Measure 16: Prior to the removal or significant pruning of any trees, they shall be inspected by a qualified biologist for the presence of raptor nests. This is required regardless of season. If a suspected raptor nest is discovered, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) shall be notified. Pursuant to CFGC Section 3503.5, raptor nests, whether or not they are

occupied, may not be removed until approval is granted by the CDFW.

Mitigation Measure 17: If clearing, grubbing or tree removal/pruning are to be conducted outside of the breeding season (i.e., September 1 through January 31), no preconstruction surveys for nesting migratory birds is necessary.

If clearing, grubbing or tree removal or pruning are to be conducted during the breeding season (i.e., February 1 through August 31), a preconstruction nesting bird survey shall be conducted. The survey shall be performed by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks prior to the initiation of work. If no nesting or breeding activity is observed, work may proceed without restrictions. To the extent allowed by access, all active bird nests identified within 250 feet for raptors and 50 feet for passerines shall be mapped.

Mitigation Measure 18: For any active bird nests found near the construction limits (i.e., within 250 feet for raptors and 50 feet for passerines of the limits of work) the Project Biologist shall make a determination as to whether or not construction activities are likely to disrupt reproductive behavior. If it is determined that construction would not disrupt breeding behavior, construction may proceed. If it is determined that construction may disrupt breeding, a no-construction buffer zone shall be designated by the Project Biologist; avoidance is the only mitigation available. The ultimate size of the no-construction buffer zone may be adjusted by the Project Biologist based on the species involved, topography, lines of site between the work area and the bird nest, physical barriers, and the ambient level of human activity. Site evaluations and buffer adjustments shall be made in consultation with the CDFW and/or the USFWS Division of Migratory Bird Management.

If it is determined that construction activities are likely to disrupt raptor breeding, construction activities within the no-construction buffer zone may not proceed until the Project Biologist determines that the nest is long longer occupied.

Mitigation Measure 19: If maintenance of a no-construction buffer zone is not feasible, the Project Biologist shall monitor the bird nest(s) to document breeding and rearing behavior of the adult birds. If it is determined that construction activities are causing distress of the adult birds and are thus likely to cause nest abandonment, work shall cease immediately. Work may not resume in the area until the Project Biologist has determined that the young birds have fledged and the bird nest is no longer occupied.

Mitigation Measure 20: Preconstruction surveys for nesting migratory birds and roosting bats shall be conducted no more than two weeks prior to the start of grading and construction for work for each phase scheduled to occur during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31) or wintering period for each phase(September 1 to January 31).

Mitigation Measure 21: If active nests/roosts of migratory birds and roosting bats are identified within 300 feet of the project site, non-disturbance buffers shall be established at a distance sufficient to minimize disturbance based on the nest/roost location, topography, cover and species' tolerance to disturbance. Buffer size shall be determined in cooperation with the CDFW and the USFWS.

Mitigation Measure 22: If active nests/roosts of migratory birds are found within 300 feet of the project site and non-disturbance buffers cannot be maintained, a qualified biologist shall be on-site to monitor the nests/roosts for signs of nest disturbance. If it is determined that grading and/ or construction activity is resulting in nest/roost disturbance, work shall cease immediately and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted.

Mitigation Measure 23: For each phase, the applicant shall implement the following measures to avoid or minimize impacts to special status animals including performing pre-construction surveys for snakes within the daily work area, having a USFWS-approved biologist on-site during work within suitable habitat, conducting environmental awareness training, constructing exclusion fencing along the project perimeter within suitable habitat 30 days prior to disturbance, implementing

erosion control BMPs, refueling vehicles/equipment off-site, and restoring the habitat to pre-project conditions.

Mitigation Measure 24: A qualified biologist should perform a ground survey to locate and mark all woodrat nests in the proposed grading and construction area. The survey shall be performed no less than 30 days prior to the initiation of ground disturbances for each phase. The contractor shall also walk the site to assist in determining which nests would be affected.

Mitigation Measure 25: The woodrat nests to be avoided shall be fenced off with orange construction fencing and their locations marked on construction plans as being off limits to all activities.

Mitigation Measure 26: Any woodrat nest that cannot be avoided shall be manually disassembled by a qualified biologist pending authorization from CDFW to give any resident woodrats the opportunity to disperse to adjoining undisturbed habitat. Nest building materials shall be immediately removed off-site and disposed of to prevent woodrats from reassembling nests on-site.

Mitigation Measure 27: To ensure woodrats do not rebuild nests within the construction area, a qualified biologist shall inspect the construction corridor no less than once per week. If new nests appear, they shall be disassembled and the building materials disposed of off-site. If there is a high degree of woodrat activity, more frequent monitoring shall be performed, as recommended by a qualified biologist.

Mitigation Measure 28: All appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs shall be implemented. Application of erosion control BMPs shall utilize native weed-free and plastic-free fiber rolls, mats, straw mulch, hydroseed, etc., to the maximum extent possible.

Mitigation Measure 29: All future development shall comply the County policies and ordinances for removal and replacement.

Mitigation Measure 30: Whenever possible, trees shall be planted in areas of grading disturbance for hillside stabilization, to minimize the visual impact of the grading activities, and compliance with the County's RM Zoning District Regulations.

Mitigation Measure 31: A discovery of a paleontological specimen during any phase of the project could result in a work stoppage in the vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a professional paleontologist. Should loss or damage be detected, additional protective measures or further action (e.g., resource removal by a professional paleontologist) may be needed to mitigate the impact, as determined by a professional paleontologist.

Mitigation Measure 32: Contractors and workers shall use existing roads to the maximum extent feasible to avoid additional surface disturbance.

Mitigation Measure 33: During all phases of the project, the applicant shall keep equipment and vehicles within the limits of the previously disturbed construction area. The applicant shall delineate all areas to remain undisturbed on the Erosion Control and Staging Plan and the plan shall include measures, such as chain-link fencing or other kind of barrier, to demarcate the "limit of disturbance." The property owner shall demonstrate the implementation of these measures prior to issuance of the grading permit "hard card."

Mitigation Measure 34: The property owner, applicant, and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall

recommend the subsequent measures for disposition of the remains, including but not limited to the following:

a. That all excavation crews, including landscapers, receive cultural sensitivity training for Native American cultural resources;

b. That a California-trained Archaeological Monitor with field experience be present for all earth movement including landscaping; and

c. That a qualified and trained Native American Monitor be present for all earth-moving activities, including landscaping.

Mitigation Measure 35: The improvements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with current earthquake resistance standards.

Mitigation Measure 36: All future development shall meet or exceed, the standards prescribed in the Murray Engineers, Inc., report dated February 2014.

Mitigation Measure 37: For the final approval of the grading permit, the property owner shall ensure the performance of the following activities within thirty (30) days of the completion of grading for each phase, at the project site:

a. The Engineer who prepared the approved grading plan shall be responsible for the inspection and certification of the grading as required by Section 8606.2 of the Grading Ordinance. The Engineer's responsibilities shall include those relating to noncompliance detailed in Section 8606.5 of the Grading Ordinance.

b. The engineer shall submit written certification that all grading has been completed in conformance with the approved plans, conditions of approval, mitigation measures, and the County's Grading Regulations, to the Department of Public Works and the Planning and Building Department's Geotechnical Engineer.

c. The geotechnical consultant shall observe and approve all applicable work during construction and sign Section II of the Geotechnical Consultant Approval form, for submittal to the Planning and Building Department's Geotechnical Engineer and Current Planning Section.

Mitigation Measure 38: At the building permit application stage, the applicant shall provide documentation demonstrating that the proposed residences and associated retaining walls shall be supported on drilled pier foundations extending through the fill and colluvium and gaining support in the underlying bedrock.

Mitigation Measure 39: Prior to the recordation of the Subdivision Map, the landslide repair on Parcel 2 shall be completed to the satisfaction of the County's Geotechnical Section, to ensure that repair occurs prior to the construction of any residential structures.

Mitigation Measure 40: All fill material for the repair shall be keyed and benched into competent bedrock (not into soil as indicated on the referenced C-1). Construction plans at the building permit stage shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 41: The final design shall include intermediate surface drainage control measures. Construction plans at the building permit stage shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 42: A surveyed, as-built subdrain plan shall prepared and added to the proposed repair plan. Grading plans at the building permit stage shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 43: A modified design plan shall be prepared, with approval by the Project Geotechnical Consultant, and submitted to the County for approval prior to the initiation of grading

repair work.

Mitigation Measure 44: No cut or fill exceeding 5 feet in vertical dimension shall be permitted on Parcels 1 through 4 unless supported by an engineered retaining wall. Construction plans at the building permit stage for each new residence shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 45: Grading and drainage plans for each lot shall be reviewed by the County Geotechnical Section, or designated consultant, prior to approval of building or grading permits on Parcels 1 through 4.

Mitigation Measure 46: Foundation design on Parcel 2 shall be checked against the as-built subdrain plan for the landslide repair. Construction plans at the building permit stage for the residence on Parcel 2 shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 47: Geotechnical Design Parameters – Final geotechnical design parameters to be utilized for residential construction on Parcels 1 through 4 shall fully meet or exceed design recommendations presented in the Engineering Geologic & Geotechnical Report by Murray Engineers, Inc., dated February 10, 2014. Construction plans at the building permit stage for each new residence shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 48: Future residences shall be supported on 12-inch diameter piers, extending at least 8 feet into competent materials. In addition, the property owner shall implement Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc., recommendation to construct an earth flow deflection wall above Building Site 1. Construction plans at the building permit stage for each new residence shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 49: All subdrain alignments within the repair shall be accurately surveyed during construction so that future pier-support foundations do not interfere with constructed subdrain systems. Construction plans at the building permit stage for each new residence shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 50: Unsupported large cuts and fills shall be avoided. Grading plans at the building permit stage shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure 51: If site conditions vary from those described in the 2014 Murray Engineers, Inc. report, the geotechnical design of the project recommendations shall be updated and submitted to San Mateo County Planning and Building Department for approval, prior to associated project construction.

Mitigation Measure 52: The applicant shall use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the silt fence shall be 0.5 acre or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips shall have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.

Mitigation Measure 53: The applicant shall seed all disturbed areas with a native grassland mix as soon as grading activities are completed for each phase in order to minimize the potential establishment and expansion of exotic plant species into newly-graded areas, and to prevent potential future erosion.

Mitigation Measure 54 No site disturbance shall occur, including any land disturbance, grading, or vegetation or tree removal, until a building permit has been issued, and then only those trees approved for removal shall be removed. Trees to be removed, including approximate size, species, and location, shall be shown on a plan.

Mitigation Measure 55: Erosion and sediment control during the course of this grading work shall be according to a plan prepared and signed by the Engineer of record, and approved by the

Department of Public Works and the Current Planning Section. Revisions to the approved erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer.

Mitigation Measure 56: It shall be the responsibility of the applicant's engineer to regularly inspect the erosion control measures and determine that they are functioning as designed and that proper maintenance is being performed. Deficiencies shall be immediately corrected.

Mitigation Measure 57: Prior to the issuance of the grading permit, the applicant shall submit, to the Department of Public Works for review and approval, a plan for any off-site hauling operations. This plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following information: size of trucks, haul route, disposal site, dust and debris control measures, and time and frequency of haul trips. As part of the review of the submitted plan, the County may place such restrictions on the hauling operation as it deems necessary.

Mitigation Measure 58: At the completion of work, the engineer who prepared the approved grading plan shall certify, in writing, that all grading, lot drainage, and drainage facilities have been completed in conformance with the approved plans, as conditioned, and the Grading Regulations.

Mitigation Measure 59: At the completion of work, the engineer who prepared the approved grading plan shall submit a signed "as-graded" grading plan conforming to the requirements of the Grading Regulations.

Mitigation Measure 60: Prior to the issuance of the grading permit "hard card," the applicant shall revise the Erosion Control and Sediment Control Plan, dated December 21, 2012, to include the proposed measures and additional measures as follows, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director:

a. Provide stabilized construction entrance(s) using a minimum 3"-4" fractured aggregate over geo-textile fabric and stabilize all on-site unpaved construction access routes (e.g., aggregate over path of travel). For unpaved routes, use ridges running diagonally across the road that run to a stabilized outlet

b. Provide a designated area for parking of construction vehicles, using aggregate over geo-textile fabric.

c. Show re-vegetation of fill deposit areas, to be performed immediate after soils spreading. Use seeding and/or mulching and the following, as necessary:

    i. (For slopes 3:1 or greater) Anchored erosion control blankets (rice straw or coconut).

    ii. (For slopes less than 3:1) Anchored fiber fabric/netting or surface roughening.

d. Protect areas to remain undisturbed. These areas shall be delineated and protected using a fence or other kind of barrier.

e. Use diversion berms to divert water from unstable or denuded areas (top and base of a disturbed slope, grade breaks where slopes transition to a steeper slope).

f. Show location of office trailer(s), temporary power pole, and scaffold footprint.

g. Show location of utility trenches, indicate utility type.

h. Show location, installation and maintenance of a concrete/stucco mixer, washout, and pits.

i. Show storage location and containment (as necessary) of construction materials for during work, as well as afterhours/ weekends)

j. Show areas for stockpiling. Cover temporary stockpiles using anchored-down plastic sheeting. For longer storage, use seeding and mulching, soil blankets or mats.

k. Show location of garbage and dumpster(s).

l. If these measures conflict with measures prescribed by the geotechnical consultant, measures as recommended by the geotechnical consultant shall rule.

Mitigation Measure 61: The applicant shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including, but not limited to, the following:

a. Delineation with field markers clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.

b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.

c. Performing clearing and earth moving activities only during dry weather.

d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30. Stabilization shall include both proactive measures, such as the placement of hay bales or coir netting, and passive measures, such as re-vegetating disturbed areas with plants propagated from seed collected in the immediate area.

e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.

f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.

g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.

h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.

i. Limiting and timing application of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.

j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.

k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.

l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.

m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.

Mitigation Measure 62: Once approved, erosion and sediment control measures of the Erosion Control and Sedimentation Plan shall be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of the grading permit and building permit. Failure to maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until the corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time. Revisions to the approved erosion and sediment control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer and reviewed by the Department of Public Works and the Community Development Director.

Mitigation Measure 63: No grading shall be allowed during the winter season (October 1 to April 30) to avoid potential soil erosion unless reviewed and recommended by the project geotechnical consultant and approved, in writing, by the Community Development Director. An

applicant-completed and County-issued grading permit "hard card" is required prior to the start of any land disturbance/grading operations. The applicant shall submit a letter to the Current Planning Section, at least, two (2) weeks prior to commencement of grading with the project geotechnical consultants review recommendations (if any) for winter grading, stating the date when erosion controls will be installed, date when grading operations will begin, anticipated end date of grading operations, and date of re-vegetation. If the schedule of grading operations calls for grading to be completed in one grading season, then the winterizing plan shall be considered a contingent plan to be implemented if work falls behind schedule. All submitted schedules shall represent the work in detail and shall project the grading operations through to completion.

Mitigation Measure 64: Should the area of disturbance equal one area or more, the applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Board to obtain coverage under the State General Construction Activity NPDES Permit. A copy of the project's NOI (containing the WDID No.) shall be submitted to the Current Planning Section and the Department of Public Works, prior to the issuance of the grading permit "hard card."

Mitigation Measure 65: The applicant shall implement the following basic construction measures at all times:

a. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxic Control Measure Title13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

b. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.

c. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person, or his/her designee, shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Mitigation Measure 66: All roofing, attic ventilation, exterior walls, windows, exterior doors, decking, floors and underfloor protection shall meet California Residential Code, R327 or California Building Code Chapter 7A requirements.

Mitigation Measure 67: At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan to the Department of Public Works in compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy.

Mitigation Measure 68: Projects subject to Provision C.3.i (individual single-family home projects that create and/or replace 2,500 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, and other projects that create and/or replace at least 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface but are not C.3 Regulated Projects) shall implement at least one (1) of the six (6) site design measures listed below:

a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.

b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas.

c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas.

d. Direct runoff from driveways and/or uncovered parking lots onto vegetated areas.

e. Construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces.

f. Construct bike lanes, driveways, and/or uncovered parking lots with permeable surfaces.

Mitigation Measure 69: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe

respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources be taken prior to implementation of the project.

Mitigation Measure 70: In the event that tribal cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during project implementation, all work shall stop until a qualified professional can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate measures to avoid and preserve the resource in place, or minimize adverse impacts to the resource, and those measures shall be approved by the Current Planning Section prior to implementation and continuing any work associated with the project.

Mitigation Measure 71: 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 72: The project shall minimize its impact on the downstream systems by completing capital improvement projects within the Crystal Springs Sanitation District (District) that would reduce inflow and infiltration into the District's system in an amount equal to the projected sewage discharge amount to the District from the project.

Mitigation Measure 73: The applicant shall demonstrate that the District sewer mains utilized to transport sewage from the subdivision has the peak wet weather capacity for conveying the additional flow generated from the four residences. If it is determined that the lines are insufficient to convey the additional flow, the developer may need to upgrade the sewer lines to accommodate this subdivision.

Mitigation Measure 74: Should a pump system be utilized to deliver sewage from the four parcels to the District's sewer main on Parrott Drive, the District will require that a covenant for each parcel be prepared, signed, notarized, recorded with the San Mateo County Recorder's Office, and a copy provided to the District prior to final sewer sign-off for the building permit.

Mitigation Measure 75: Each new parcel will require a 4-inch lateral with a minimum of 2% slope and a standard cleanout installed at the property line or the property within 5 feet of the property line.

Mitigation Measure 76: The proposed residential development will be required to comply with all currently applicable efficiency standards (Title-24, CALGreen, etc.), and is located in an area that could support solar or alternative energy sources (none are proposed at this time).

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 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)

April 4, 2018
Date

Planner III
(Title)

Attachments

A. Floristic Analysis for the Beeson Property, San Mateo County, by Wood Biological Consulting, Dated September 30, 2007
B. Letter Report for Mission Blue Butterfly Habitat Survey at Lands of Zmay Property, by Coast Ridge Ecology, Dated July 22, 2016
C. Wetland Delineation and Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination for the Beeson Property, by Wood Biological Consulting, Dated June 18, 2007
D. Revised Wetland Evaluation, by Wood Biological Consulting, Dated March 11, 2015, Revised June 6, 2017
E. Revised Wetlands Evaluation, by Wood Biological Consulting, Dated August 16, 2017
F. Biological Site Assessment for the Proposed Zmay Property Subdivision, by Wood Biological Consulting, Inc., Dated August 13, 2014 and Revised March 10, 2015
G. Revised Botanical Evaluation, Zmay Property Subdivision, by Wood Biological Consulting, Inc., Dated March 11, 2015
H. Revised Creek Setback Evaluation, Zmay Property Subdivision, by Wood Biological Consulting, Inc., Dated March 11, 2015
I. Arborist report, by Kielty Arborist Services LLC, Dated September 6, 2016
J. Applicant EECAP Development Checklist
K. Engineering Geologic and Geotechnical Investigation, by Murray Engineers, Dated February 2014
L. Geotechnical Plan Review, Zmay 4 Lot Subdivision, by Murray Engineers, Inc., Dated, June 3, 2015 and Supplemental Evaluation and Response, dated March 18, 2015
M. Supplemental Geologic and Geotechnical Peer Review comments, by Cotton Shires and Associates, Dated: December 4, 2014, June 24, 2014, and July 14, 2015
N. Draft Conservation Easement
O. Cultural Resources Survey Report, by Daniel Shoup RPA, Dated August 10, 2015
P. Parrot Drive Sanitary Sewer Alternatives Study by Crystal Springs County Sanitation District, Dated February 2003
Q. Sewer Service for Proposed Parrott Drive Subdivision, by County of San Mateo, Department of Public Works, Dated December 3, 2013
R. Project plans submitted November 21, 2016

EA:pac - EDACC0140_WPH.DOCX