

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Re-Zone, General Plan Amendment, and Major Subdivision for Six Townhouses
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2019-00252
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ruemel Panglao, Project Planner, 650/363-4582, rpanglao@smcgov.org
5. **Project Location:** 1301 and 1311 Woodside Road, Sequoia Tract
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 069-311-250 (0.22 acres) and 069-311-340 (0.08 acres)
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Moshe Dinar, Architect, PO Box 70601, Oakland, CA 94612
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** N/A
9. **General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential
10. **Zoning:** R-1/S-74 (One-Family Residential/S-74 Combining District)
11. **Description of the Project:** The applicant requests a General Plan Amendment, Major Subdivision, Zoning Amendment, and Grading Permit to construct a six (6) unit 18,550 sq. ft. townhouse complex. The project proposes to amend the General Plan designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential and rezone an existing 18,951 sq. ft. parcel from single-family residential (R-1/S-74) to multi-family residential (R-3/S-3) zoning. The project involves 220 cubic yards of cut and 60 cubic yards of fill and the removal of ten (10) significant trees. The two (2) existing single-family residences are proposed to be demolished.
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The subject parcels are zoned R-1/S-74 and are directly bordered by Rutherford Avenue to the north, Woodside Road to the west, single-family residences to the east, and a commercial building to the south. Across Rutherford Avenue to the north is an apartment complex and to the west across Woodside Road is an apartment complex and commercial development. The greater surrounding area is comprised of single-family residences, commercial buildings and apartment complexes. Along Woodside Road, all of the areas on the west side and many parcels on the east side are located within the incorporated areas of Redwood City rather than the unincorporated San Mateo County areas. Each subject parcel is currently developed with a single-family residence.

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

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

1. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project parcels are not located in a scenic vista area. The area in and around the project site is highly urbanized and developed with varying levels of density and intensity. The proposed development will not have an adverse impact on views from existing residential areas and Rutherford Avenue as there is no scenic vista or protected visual resource, as noted previously, and existing trees and structures on the project site already present a large and tall visual mass from the surrounding one- and two-story structures. From Woodside Road, the height and massing of the proposed structure will be similar to that found in the highly urbanized vicinity.</p> <p>Given the site and surrounding setting, future redevelopment of the property would not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcels are not located within a state scenic highway. In addition, there are no buildings of historical significance or rock outcroppings located on the property.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
1.c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, such as significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X

Discussion: The project location is in an urbanized area. The project involves a rezone and general plan amendment from single-family residential zoning and medium density land use designation to multi-family residential zoning and high-density residential land use designation to accommodate a six (6) unit townhouse complex. Given the highly urbanized area and surrounding development densities, there are no scenic qualities of unique or special interest that would be impacted by the project proposal. In addition, the project location is not located in a Design Review district, scenic corridor, or any jurisdictional area that would require compliance with regulations regarding scenic quality.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

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

Discussion: The project does not involve the introduction of significant light sources that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area as the project involves the construction of a townhouses within an existing residential area adjacent to a highly urbanized commercial area.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

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

Discussion: The project parcels are not located adjacent to a Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor.

Source: Project Location.

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

Discussion: The project parcels are not located within a Design Review District.

Source: Project Location.

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

Discussion: Refer to staff's discussion in Section 1.a, 1.b, and 1.c, above.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

<p>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a.	For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
<p>Discussion: According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project parcels are designated as "Urban and Built-up Land", and therefore does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map, accessed June 1, 2021.</p>					
2.b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcels are not zoned for agriculture or protected by an existing Open Space Easement or a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, County Zoning Regulations, County GIS Maps, County Williamson Act Contracts.</p>					
2.c.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcels are located in a densely urbanized area of unincorporated Redwood City and therefore is not in an area identified as Farmland, suitable for agricultural activities, or considered forestland area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>					

2.d. For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
2.e. Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcels have not been identified as containing agricultural lands. The project site is classified as "urban land" according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service. Given the size of the parcels and the urbanized nature of the project area, there is no damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land associated with the project, or that would result from future development.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey, accessed June 1, 2021.</p>				
2.f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? <i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>				X
<p>Discussion: The project will result in an increase in the allowable density of development but will continue the designated use of the property for residential. In addition, the project parcels are not located in an area identified as forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned for timberland production.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps.</p>				

<p>3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
	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 Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP), developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), is the current regulating air quality plan for San Mateo County. The CAP was created to improve Bay Area air quality and to protect public health and the climate. The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2017 Clean Air Plan. During project implementation, air emissions would be generated from site grading, equipment, and work vehicles; however, any such grading-related emissions would be temporary and localized. Once constructed, use of the development as a six (6) unit townhouse complex would have minimal impacts to the air quality standards set forth for the region by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

The BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As defined in the BAAQMD's 2017 CEQA Guidelines, the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all feasible construction measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures that they have determined, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. These control measures have been included in Mitigation Measure 1 below:

Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:

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

Source: Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

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

Discussion: As of December 2012, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attains the 24-hour PM-2.5 national standard. However, the Bay Area will continue

to be designated as “non-attainment” for the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard until the BAAQMD submits a “re-designation request” and a “maintenance plan” to EPA and the proposed re-designation is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. A temporary increase in the project area is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations reduce the potential effects to a less than significant impact. Mitigation Measure 1 in Section 3.a. would minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level.

Source: Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

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

Discussion: See discussion in Section 3.a

Source: Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

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

Discussion: The proposed project is to construct a six (6) unit townhouse complex in a highly urbanized area of unincorporated Redwood City. Once constructed, the daily use of the residences would not create objectionable odors. The proposed project has the potential to generate odors associated with construction activities. However, any such odors would be temporary and are expected to be minimal.

Source: Project Plans.

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

<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area of unincorporated Redwood City with the project parcels supporting existing residential development. There are no State or Federal mapped protected species located on the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project location, California Natural Diversity Database.</p>					
4.b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities located within the project area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan (Sensitive Habitats Map).</p>					
4.c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no wetlands located within the project area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>					
4.d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites in the project area. Given the urbanized nature of the project area, there are no substantial threats to native or migratory wildlife species.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>					
4.e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?			X	
<p>Discussion: The trees on the proposed construction site were evaluated in an arborist report (Arbor Logic report) (Attachment C) prepared by ISA certified arborists James Lascot (WE-2110) and James Reed (WE-10237A). The nine (9) significant sized coast live oak trees and one (1) significant sized Italian stone pine tree proposed for removal are either in poor condition and/or</p>					

necessary to accommodate the proposed development, as these trees are within the footprint of the proposed development.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, County Zoning Regulations, Arbor Logic Arborist Report (dated September 23, 2019).

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 site is not located in an area with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved regional or State habitat conservation plan.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS map.

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

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

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS map, National Wildlife Refuge System Locator.

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

Discussion: The project site includes no oak woodlands or other timber woodlands.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X

Discussion: The project site is not listed on any State or local historical registry. Thus, the rezoning, or any future redevelopment of the site, will not cause a substantial adverse impact to a historical resource.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location; California State Parks Office of Historic Preservation; San Mateo County General Plan.

5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no known archaeological resources in the disturbed/developed area.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Project Location, California State Parks Office of Historic Preservation; San Mateo County General Plan.</p>				
5.c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		
<p>Discussion: There are no known human remains on the project site. In case of accidental discovery, the property owner shall implement the following mitigation measure:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 2: The applicants and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains, whether historic or prehistoric, during grading and construction. 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 subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, County GIS Maps.</p>				

6. ENERGY. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
<p>Discussion: Energy conservation standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission) in June 1977 and are updated every 3 years (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations). Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.</p> <p>On June 10, 2015, the California Energy Commission adopted the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards which went into effect on January 1, 2017. On May 9, 2018, the CEC adopted the 2019 Building Energy Efficient Standards, which took effect on January 1, 2020. The proposed project will be required to comply with the 2019 Building Energy Efficient Standards which will be verified by the</p>				

San Mateo County Building Inspection Section prior to the issuance of a building permit. The project would also be required to adhere to the provisions of CAL Green which established planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants.

Construction

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

Operation

During operations, project energy consumption would be associated with resident and visitor vehicle trips and delivery trucks. The project is a residential development project served by existing road infrastructure. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) provides electricity to the project area. Due to the proposed construction of a six (6) townhouse complex, project implementation would result in a permanent increase in electricity over existing conditions. However, such an increase to serve six (6) townhouses would represent an insignificant percent increase compared to overall demand in PG&E's service area. The nominal increased demand is expected to be adequately served by the existing PG&E electrical facilities and the projected electrical demand would not significantly impact PG&E's level of service. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during operation and construction of the project given the financial implication of the inefficient use of such resources. As such, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

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

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

Source: Project Plans.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>		X		
<p>Discussion: A geotechnical report was prepared for the project by Summit Engineering, dated January 25, 2020, included as Attachment E.</p> <p>The project site is located in one of the most seismically active regions of the United States. The nearest active fault is the NW-trending San Andreas Fault, located 5 miles southwest of the site. The active Seal Cove Fault is mapped 14 miles southwest of the site. Although considered inactive, a number of geologic faults are mapped nearby in the peninsula. Such are the Pilarcitos and San Mateo Faults, etc. There are also a number of active faults in the East Bay. The Hayward and Calaveras Faults are located 12 miles northeast and 17 miles east-northeast of the site, respectively.</p> <p>All these faults are currently exhibiting creep movements and micro-seismic activity and are capable of producing major earthquakes with great damage potential to both man-made and natural structures. Major Bay Area earthquakes last occurred on the Hayward, San Andreas and Calaveras Faults in the year 1868, 1989 and 1861, respectively. Other small faults are mapped in the immediate area, although none are associated with any seismic activity or considered active.</p> <p>Per the Summit Engineering report, although it is not yet possible to accurately predict when and where an earthquake will occur, it is reasonable to assume that, during their useful life, the proposed structures will suffer at least one moderate to severe earthquake. During such event, the danger from fault offset through the site is very low, but strong local shaking is likely to occur. However, foundations built on competent strata, although may suffer some damage, should perform satisfactorily during a strong event. In addition, wood-framed buildings are generally flexible enough to sustain some seismic deformations with minor or moderate structural damage. An effective surface drainage will contribute to maintaining higher shear strength, and hence stable ground.</p> <p>According to Summit Engineering, the proposed development is feasible from a geotechnical engineering standpoint based on their field and office studies, provided that the recommendations given in their report are incorporated into the design and construction of the proposed structures. They recommend the new foundations to consist of properly reinforced, on-grade, concrete mats or slabs.</p>				

They further stated that ground shaking will be the major cause of earthquake damage. The controlling seismic event will be produced by the San Andreas Fault. A significant event will produce high response accelerations and therefore high shear stresses. The site may be vulnerable to seismically triggered soil displacements, particularly if a strong shaking occurs during the wet winter months. They provide drainage recommendations to mitigate significant impacts.

Since the project location and its distance from the cited fault zone can result in strong seismic ground shaking in the event of an earthquake, the following mitigation measure is recommended to minimize such impacts to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure 3: The design of the proposed development (upon application submittal of the Building Permit) on the subject parcel shall generally follow the recommendations cited in the geotechnical reports and letter prepared by Summit Engineering regarding seismic criteria, grading, concrete mat or slab on grade construction, and surface drainage. Any such changes to the recommendations by the project geotechnical engineer cited in this report and subsequent updates shall be submitted for review and approval by the County's Geotechnical Engineer.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Hazards Maps, Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020).

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

Discussion: Pursuant to the discussion in Section 7.a.i, strong seismic ground shaking may occur in the event of an earthquake. However, the mitigation measure provided in Section 7.a.i would minimize impacts to a less than significant level.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Hazards Maps, Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020).

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

Discussion: The surface deposits form part of the Qof unit consisting of Pleistocene, weathered, weakly consolidated, poorly sorted, silt, sand and gravel, often in a clay matrix, and with a generally low potential for seismic liquefaction.

The San Mateo County Hazards Map shows the subject site in Zone 3, which generally consists of unconsolidated materials mainly older, coarse-grained, alluvial fan deposits. This zone has generally low liquefaction potential, good earthquake stability, and good to fair foundation conditions.

In addition to the discussion above, the mitigation measure provided in Section 7.a.i would minimize impacts to a less than significant level.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Hazards Maps, Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020).

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

Discussion: The project area consists of land identified as "flat land", according to the ABAG Hazard Maps and therefore, is not in a landslide susceptibility area.

Also, pursuant to the discussion in Section 7.a.i with the associated mitigation measure, the project impacts would be less than significant.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Hazards Maps, Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020), Association of Bay Area Governments, Hazards Map Viewer, accessed June 1, 2021.

v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?

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

X

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

Source: Project Location.

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

X

Discussion: The construction of the six (6) townhouses involves 220 cubic yards of cut and 60 cubic yards of fill. Total land disturbance is 0.304-acre. The project is exempt from coverage under a State General Construction Permit. The mitigation measure in Section 3.a. and the following mitigation measure are included to control erosion during both project construction activities. With this mitigation measure, the project impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 4: At the time of building permit and encroachment permit application, the applicant shall submit for review and approval, erosion and drainage control plans that show how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site will be minimized. The plans 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 plans shall include measures that limit the application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program “General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines,” including:

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

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

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Hazards Maps, Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020), San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program.

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

Discussion: Regarding potential for landslide, erosion, and liquefaction, see discussion in Sections 7.a and 7.b, above. Lateral spreading, subsidence, and collapse were not identified as potential geological concerns by the Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020).

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

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area with an identified risk for expansive soil.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020).

7.e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is currently served by a municipal wastewater provider. Preliminary approval has been provided by the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District to serve the proposed development.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District.</p>				
7.f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
<p>Discussion: Based on the developed project site being located in a highly urbanized area, it is not expected that the project property hosts any paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. However, in case of accidental discovery, Mitigation Measure 2 requires that, in the event that cultural, paleontological, or archeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery, County staff shall be notified, and the applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. As mitigated, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to the direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				

8. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		
<p>Discussion: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO₂) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. Project-related grading and construction of the proposed residence would result in the temporary generation of GHG emissions along travel routes and at the project site. In general, construction involves GHG emissions mainly from exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal vehicles of construction workers). Even assuming construction vehicles and workers are based in and traveling from urban areas, the potential project GHG emission levels from construction would be considered minimal. Additionally, the development of six (6) residential units is below the BAAQMD's GHG screening</p>				

criteria for multi-family residential development pursuant to Table 3-1 of the BAAQMD's May 2017 CEQA Guidelines.

Although the project scope for the project is not likely to generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases, the mitigation measure provided in Section 3.a would ensure that any impacts are less than significant.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (May 2017).

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

Discussion: The proposed project does not conflict with the County of San Mateo Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP). The project poses to comply with multiple measures include in the checklist such as, but not limited to, residential energy efficiency financing, tree planting, solar photovoltaic system installation, traffic calming, low carbon fuel infrastructure, smart water meters, and compliance with the Green Building Ordinance. The project complies with the applicable measures and criteria of the EECAP Development Checklist as exhibited in Attachment G.

Source: Project Plans, 2013 San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan, EECAP Checklist.

8.c. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and therefore is not defined as forestland.

Source: Project Location.

8.d. Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project site is not located near a coastal cliff or bluff.

Source: Project Location.

8.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area susceptible to impacts from sea-level rise.

Source: Project Location.

8.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
8.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
9.b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The routine use of hazardous materials is not proposed for this project.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					

<p>9.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p>				X
<p>Discussion: The emission or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste is not proposed for this project. Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
<p>9.d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p>				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and therefore would not result in the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Source: Project Location, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese), accessed June 1, 2021.</p>				
<p>9.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</p>				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of any known airport. Source: Project Location.</p>				
<p>9.f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed townhouses would be located on a privately-owned parcel. This parcel would be accessed from Rutherford Avenue via a proposed driveway. The proposed project would not impede, change, or close any roadways that could be used for emergency purposes and all existing roads would remain unchanged. There is no evidence to suggest that the project would interfere with any emergency response plan. Therefore, the project poses no impact. Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps.</p>				

9.g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within any local, state or federal fire risk zones. In addition, the project was reviewed by Menlo Park Fire Department and received conditional approval subject to compliance with the California Building Code. No further mitigation, beyond compliance with the standards and requirements of the Menlo Park Fire Department, is necessary.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, California State Fire Severity Zones Maps, Menlo Park Fire Department.</p>				
9.h. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
9.i. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, County GIS Maps, Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
9.j. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
<p>Discussion: No dam or levee is located in close proximity to the project site; therefore, there is no risk of flooding due to failure of a dam or levee.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, San Mateo County Hazards Maps.</p>				
9.k. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in a tsunami or seiche inundation area. The project site is in a highly urbanized flat-terrain area of the County where mudflow is not a concern.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, San Mateo County Hazards Maps.</p>				

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?			X	
<p>Discussion: The proposed project has the potential to generate polluted stormwater runoff during site grading and construction-related activities. The project would be required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy requiring post-construction stormwater flows to be at, or below, preconstruction flow rates. A hydrology report was prepared by SMP Engineers, dated December 2020, detailing the proposed drainage system (Attachment F). The hydrology report's calculations outlines that the proposed detention system is designed such that post-development runoff would be less than pre-development runoff, and no runoff would be diverted from one drainage area to another.</p> <p>The proposed project, including the discussed hydrology report and plans, were reviewed and conditionally approved by the Building Inspection Section's Drainage Section for compliance with County drainage standards. Based on the hydrology report and review by the County's Drainage Section, the project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Based on these findings, the project impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, SMP Engineers Hydrology Report (dated December 2020), County Drainage Section.</p>				
10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
<p>Discussion: In order to evaluate the geotechnical engineering characteristics of the soil layers underlying the project site, the Summit Engineering report (discussed in Section 7.a.i.) discussed the three borings drilled on the project parcels. According to the report, groundwater was not encountered. The development would receive water service from the California Water Service-Bear Gulch and does not involve the well construction.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Hazards Maps, Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020).</p>				

10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;		X		
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not involve the alteration of the course of a stream or river. The project involves the construction of 6,134 sq. ft. of impervious surface. The proposed development on the project parcel would include drainage features that have been approved by the Drainage Section. With Mitigation Measure 4 to address potential impacts during construction activities, the project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, SMP Engineers Hydrology Report (dated December 2020), County Drainage Section.</p>				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussion in Section 10.a, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, SMP Engineers Hydrology Report (dated December 2020), County Drainage Section.</p>				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussion in Section 10.a, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, SMP Engineers Hydrology Report (dated December 2020), County Drainage Section.</p>				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussion in Section 10.a, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, SMP Engineers Hydrology Report (dated December 2020), County Drainage Section.</p>				

10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussion in Section 9.k, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, San Mateo County Hazards Maps.</p>				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	
<p>Discussion: The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) of 2015 requires local regions to create groundwater sustainability agencies (GSA's) and to adopt groundwater management plans for identified medium and high priority groundwater basins. San Mateo County has nine identified water basins. These basins have been identified as low-priority, are not subject to the SGMA, and there is no current groundwater management agency or plan that oversees these basins. Also, see discussion in Section 10.b.</p> <p>The project includes an on-site drainage system that complies with the San Mateo County Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP) which enforces the State requirements for stormwater quality control.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans; San Mateo County Office of Sustainability, Groundwater Website https://www.smcsustainability.org/energy-water/groundwater/</p>				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or groundwater water quality?			X	
<p>Discussion: As discussed in Section 10.b, the project does not project involve any new wells and would have water service from California Water Service-Bear Gulch. Thus, the project would pose a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, California Water Service-Bear Gulch.</p>				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?		X		
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussion in Section 10.c and the cited mitigation measures, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, SMP Engineers Hydrology Report (dated December 2020), County Drainage Section.</p>				

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a. Physically divide an established community?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not require the construction of new road infrastructure and would not result in the division of an established community.</p> <p>In addition, the project site is located in the Sequoia Tract area of San Mateo County, where residentially zoned parcels abut commercially zoned and developed parcels fronting Woodside Road. The project site is relatively larger in size compared to the surrounding residential parcels within the same existing R-1/S-74 zoning district, and abuts both commercial and multi-family development/zoned parcels. The proposed project will allow for better utilization of the larger parcel for multi-family residential development between the higher intensity commercial development along Woodside Road, the existing adjacent multi-family residential development, and the lower density single-family residential Sequoia Tract neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed rezone will not result in the division of an established community.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed rezoning would be consistent with the type and density of development in the surrounding area, which includes commercial, multi-family and single-family residential development. Further, see staff's discussion in 11.a. above. The subject initial study considers the applicable County General Plan and Zoning Regulations and supports that the proposed change in zoning and general plan designations would not result in any adverse impacts to plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan, and Zoning Regulations.</p>				
11.c. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project would not serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas. The project proposes amending the zoning and general plan designation of the project site only, which will allow for increased development density on the project site than exists today. The project would be connected to already available municipal water from California Water Service-Bear Gulch and sewer services from the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District.</p>				

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, California Water Service-Bear Gulch, Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project neither involves nor results in any extraction or loss of mineral resources. Therefore, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
12.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no known mineral resources on the project parcel; therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				

13. NOISE. Would the project result in:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would not produce any long-term significant noise source. However, the project would generate short-term noise associated with grading and construction activities. The short-term noise during grading and construction activities would be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code for Noise Control.</p>				

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Ordinance.				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?		X		
Discussion: The habitation of the proposed six (6) townhouses is not expected to generate excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels. The project proposes to utilize a concrete slab foundation which will prevent excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Ordinance.				
13.c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of a public airport. Source: Project Location.				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
Discussion: The project will serve to accommodate six additional units in an already highly urbanized area and therefore would not result in substantial population growth. See additional discussion in Section 11.c, above. Source: Project Plans.				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
Discussion: The project will serve to accommodate a greater number of housing units than the two single-family residences currently present onsite; therefore, the project will not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing.				

Source: Project Plans.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?				X
15.b. Police protection?				X
15.c. Schools?				X
15.d. Parks?				X
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X

Discussion: The proposed project is to construct a townhouse complex in a residential area abutting a commercial area. The proposed project does not involve and is not associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, nor will it generate a need for an increase in any such facilities. The project has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Menlo Park Fire Department. The project site is in a highly urbanized area, where police, school and park services presently exist.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

16. RECREATION. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X

Discussion: The addition housing units to the area could generate an increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities; however, any potential increase in use as a result of six additional units to the already highly urbanized area is not expected to result in a substantial physical deterioration of such facilities.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.				
16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
Discussion: The project does not involve the construction of any recreational facilities. The project involves the construction of a six (6) unit townhouse complex on a residential parcel and would not require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities.				
Source: Project Plans.				

17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?		X		
<p>Discussion: A Traffic Impact Analysis (Hexagon analysis) (Attachment H), dated December 16, 2019, was prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultant, Inc., was prepared for the project. According to the Hexagon analysis, the proposed development would generate a net 38 daily trips, with 3 trips (1 inbound and 2 outbound) occurring during the AM peak hour and 4 trips (3 inbound and 1 outbound) occurring during the PM peak hour. Per the Screening Thresholds for Land Use Projects section of the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA document published by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, the proposed project “may be assumed to cause a less-than significant transportation impact” because it generates or attracts fewer than 110 trips per day. With respect to compliance with the Department of Public Works’ 2013 Traffic Impact Study Requirements, the project does not meet the threshold of a significant adverse impact on traffic conditions in San Mateo County because it does not meet their minimum threshold of 100 trips an hour and/or 500 trips daily.</p> <p>Though the California Environmental Quality Act no longer allows Level of Service (LOS) to be utilized as a metric to determine traffic impacts, the Hexagon analysis states that the added project trips would not degrade the levels of service and are not expected to result in a noticeable increase in vehicle delay at the study intersections. The Woodside Road and San Carlos Avenue intersection would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service with the added project trips. The Woodside Road/Rutherford Avenue intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour. However, the added project trip would not cause a noticeable increase in vehicle delay on the westbound stop-controlled approach.</p> <p>The Hexagon analysis correctly states that the proposed parking supply (2 vehicle spaces per townhouse) meets the required parking as stipulated by the County Zoning Regulations.</p>				

According to the Hexagon analysis, the proposed development would provide compliant standard and emergency access to and circulation around the project site. The site plan shows adequate site access and on-site circulation, and no significant operational issues are expected to occur as a result of the project. The project would not have an adverse effect on the existing transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities in the study area.

The adequacy of access to and from the site has been reviewed by both the County's Department of Public Works and the Menlo Park Fire Department, who have concluded that such access complies with their respective policies and requirements.

The Hexagon analysis does note that, since street parking is allowed on Rutherford Avenue, parked cars along the street could obstruct the vision of exiting drivers if there were cars parked next the driveway. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is recommended to minimize such impacts to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure 5: To provide adequate sight distance, a fifteen-foot curb segment next to the driveway on Rutherford Avenue should be painted red to indicate no parking is allowed. The applicant shall apply for this through the Department of Public Works and attain approval.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location, Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. Traffic Operations Study and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis for the Proposed Townhomes at 1301-1311 Woodside Road in San Mateo County (dated December 16, 2019), Screening Thresholds for Land Use Projects section of the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, Menlo Park Fire Department.

<p>17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts?</i></p> <p><i>Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.</i></p>				X
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts, describes specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. It states that, generally, vehicle miles traveled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. "Vehicle miles traveled" refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. The project involves the construction of six-unit townhouse complex within a highly urbanized residential and commercial area. The project will result in a temporary increase in traffic levels during construction and a negligible permanent increase in traffic levels after construction. Therefore, the project does not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3.

The project is also screened from the requirement for a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743 and Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines as a "small project" based on the State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) December 2018 Technical Advisory for Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA to achieve compliance with SB 743 as the project would generate a future potential of less than 110 daily trips. See further discussion in Section 17.a.

Source: Project Plans, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (c) Applicability.

17.c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussion in Section 17.a., the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. Traffic Operations Study and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis for the Proposed Townhomes at 1301-1311 Woodside Road in San Mateo County (dated December 16, 2019), Menlo Park Fire Department.</p>				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
<p>Discussion: Pursuant to the discussion in Section 17.a., the proposed project would have a less than significant impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. Traffic Operations Study and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis for the Proposed Townhomes at 1301-1311 Woodside Road in San Mateo County (dated December 16, 2019), Menlo Park Fire Department.</p>				

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

Discussion: The project 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), the project poses no impact.

Source: Project Location, California Register of Historical Resources.

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

Discussion: A Sacred Lands File and Native American Contacts List Request was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission on June 3, 2021. A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission Sacred Lands File was completed, and the results were negative. Although the project is not subject to Assembly Bill 52 (Tribal Consultation), as the County has no records of written requests for formal notification of proposed projects within the County from any traditionally or culturally affiliated California Native American tribes, the County seeks to satisfy the Native American Heritage Commission's best practices to consult with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project to avoid inadvertent impacts on tribal cultural resources. On June 23, 2021, a letter was mailed via certified mail to the tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission. To date, no request for consultation was received. Therefore, while the project is not expected to cause a substantial adverse change to any potential tribal cultural resources pursuant to discussion in Sections 5.a. and 5.b., the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize any potential significant impacts to unknown tribal cultural resources:

Mitigation Measure 6: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process as required by State Assembly Bill 52 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 7: 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 8: 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 Commission, State Assembly Bill 52, California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter (dated June 15, 2021).

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
<p>Discussion: The proposed project would connect to and receive sewage services from the Fair Oaks Sewer District and water service from California Water Service-Bear Gulch. The proposed project does not involve or require any water or wastewater treatment facilities that would exceed any requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. In addition, the project would connect to PG&E infrastructure for electric power.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 10.a., the permanent project would be required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy requiring post-construction stormwater flows to be at, or below, pre-construction flow rates. The proposed drainage system design, reviewed and approved by the County Drainage Section, would accommodate the proposed project, and ensure pre-construction runoff levels are maintained or reduced. Based on these findings, the project impact is expected to be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, SMP Engineers Hydrology Report (dated December 2020), County Drainage Section, Fair Oaks Sewer District, California Water Service-Bear Gulch.</p>				
19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcels are currently served by California Water Service-Bear Gulch. The project has been preliminarily reviewed by California Water Service-Bear Gulch, and they did not raise any objections to the ability to continue serving the properties with the newly proposed units. Therefore, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, California Water Service-Bear Gulch.</p>				
19.c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X

<p>Discussion: The Fair Oaks Sewer District has indicated that they have adequate capacity to serve the project's sanitary sewerage demands. Therefore, the project poses no impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Fair Oaks Sewer District.</p>				
19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
<p>Discussion: The construction of the project would generate some solid waste, both during construction and after completion (on an ongoing basis typical for that generated by residential uses). The six (6) townhouses would receive municipal trash and recycling pick-up service by Recology. The County's local landfill facility is the Corinda Los Trancos (Ox Mountain) Landfill, located at 2310 San Mateo Road (State Highway 92), a few miles east of Half Moon Bay. This landfill facility has permitted capacity/service life until 2034.</p> <p>Therefore, the project impact is less than significant.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.</p>				
19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site would receive solid waste service by Recology. The landfill cited in Section 19.d. is licensed and operates pursuant to all Federal, State and local statutes and regulations as overseen by the San Mateo County Health System's Environmental Health Services. Therefore, the project impact would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.</p>				

<p>20. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Fire Hazard Severity Maps).</p>				

20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and is not within or near an area of wildfire hazard concern.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Fire Hazard Severity Maps).</p>				
20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and is not located within or near an area of wildfire hazard concern. Therefore, the project does not require the provision of roads or fuel breaks, or additional powerlines or other utilities that may exacerbate fire risk or result in impacts to the environment.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Fire Hazard Severity Maps).</p>				
20.d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located on a flat parcel in a highly urbanized area without any nearby topographic slopes that could be subject to downslope flooding or landslides following a wildfire.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
<p>Discussion: No sensitive habitats are mapped in the project area. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area of the County and supports existing residential development.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, California Natural Diversity Database.</p>				
21.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X		
<p>Discussion: Based on the discussions in the previous sections where the project impact was determined to be less than significant or required mitigation measures to ensure a less than significant impact, the proposed project would not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable. This project would have a less than significant cumulative impact upon the environment and no evidence has been found that the project would result in broader regional impacts.</p> <p>Source: All Applicable Sources Previously Cited in This Document.</p>				
21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X
<p>Discussion: As discussed in the previous sections, the proposed project is to construct a new six (6) unit townhouse complex. Based on the discussions in the previous sections where project impacts were determined to be less than significant, or mitigation measures were required to result in an overall less than significant impact, the proposed project would not cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.</p>				

Source: All Applicable Sources Previously Cited in This Document.

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

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

MITIGATION MEASURES

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.		X
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:</p>		

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

Mitigation Measure 2: The applicants and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains, whether historic or prehistoric, during grading and construction. 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 subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.

Mitigation Measure 3: The design of the proposed development (upon application submittal of the Building Permit) on the subject parcel shall generally follow the recommendations cited in the geotechnical reports and letter prepared by Summit Engineering regarding seismic criteria, grading, concrete mat or slab on grade construction, and surface drainage. Any such changes to the recommendations by the project geotechnical engineer cited in this report and subsequent updates shall be submitted for review and approval by the County's Geotechnical Engineer.

Mitigation Measure 4: At the time of building permit and encroachment permit application, the applicant shall submit for review and approval, erosion and drainage control plans that show how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site will be minimized. The plans 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 plans shall include measures that limit the application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

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

- d. Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e. Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and to control dust.
- f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 ft., or to the extent feasible, from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j. Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acres or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly, and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 of fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion resistant species.
- k. Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.
- l. No erosion or sediment control measures will be placed in vegetated areas.
- m. Environmentally-sensitive areas shall be delineated and protected to prevent construction impacts.
- n. Control of fuels and other hazardous materials, spills, and litter during construction.
- o. Preserve existing vegetation whenever feasible.

Mitigation Measure 5: To provide adequate sight distance, a fifteen-foot curb segment next to the driveway on Rutherford Avenue should be painted red to indicate no parking is allowed. The applicant shall apply for this through the Department of Public Works and attain approval.

Mitigation Measure 6: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process as required by State Assembly Bill 52 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 7: 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.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. Arbor Logic Arborist Report (dated September 23, 2019)
- D. California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter (dated June 15, 2021)
- E. Summit Engineering Geotechnical Report (dated January 25, 2020)
- F. SMP Engineers Hydrology Report (dated December 2020)
- G. EECAP Checklist
- H. Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. Traffic Operations Study and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis for the Proposed Townhomes at 1301-1311 Woodside Road in San Mateo County (dated December 16, 2019)

RSP:cmc – RSPFF0694_WCH.DOCX