ATTACHMENT E

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Thalapaneni/Jackson Residence, Septic System, and Improved Driveway

2. **County File Number:** PLN2020-00251

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

4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Camille Leung, Project Planner, 650/363-1826, cleung@smcgov.org (email is preferred method of communication)

5. **Project Location:** Development of vacant parcel located at Palomar Drive and Los Cerros Road (Subject Property), and minor associated work at 636 Palomar Drive and APN 051-022-250, located in the unincorporated Palomar Park area of San Mateo County.

6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** APN 051-022-380 (18,122 sq. ft.; Subject Parcel). Project also involves work on APN 051-022-360 (Approx. 0.359 Acres) at 636 Palomar Drive, the adjoining parcel to east which uses a shared driveway and APN 051-022-250, as well as a vacant parcel to east of 636 Palomar Drive which also uses the shared driveway.

7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Maurits de Gans, Senior Associate, M Designs Architects, 4131 El Camino Real, Suite 200, Palo Alto, CA 94306

8. **Owner:** Anusha Thalapaneni and David E. Jackson, 3988 Sutherland Drive, Palo Alto, CA 94303

9. **General Plan Designation:** Medium Low Density Residential; Urban

10. **Zoning:** One-Family Residential/Combining District (Minimum Lot Size 10,000 sq. ft.)/Design Review (R-1/S-91/DR)

11. **Description of the Project:** The project requires a Design Review Permit and a Grading Permit for the construction of a new 3-story, 4,214 sq. ft. single-family residence plus a 566 sq. ft. attached garage, on a 18,122 sq. ft. legal parcel (Lot Line Adjustment recorded April 26, 1983). The project also includes a 315 sq. ft. covered terrace and a 324 sq. ft. deck. The property is at the intersection of Palomar Drive and Los Cerros Road and would be accessed from an improved existing gravel driveway located on 636 Palomar Drive and APN 051-022-250. The project includes earthwork of 880 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 90 c.y. of fill and the removal of 7 significant trees.

12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The property is located within an existing residential neighborhood and adjoins developed parcels on the east, south, and southwest sides. Access is proposed via an access easement and an improved existing gravel driveway on 636

Palomar Drive and APN 051-022-250. The property slopes upward from Los Cerros Road with an average slope of approximately 34%.

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

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, has consultation begun?: No, consultation has not begun.** Planning staff has consulted with the following tribes, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC): Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan, Coastanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe, Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan, Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area, the Ohlone Indian Tribe, the Wuksasche Indian Tribe/Eschom Valley Band, and the Tamien Nation. On January 25, 2022, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment by February 25, 2022. No comments were received to date.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

X	Aesthetics		Energy		Public Services
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Recreation
	Air Quality	X	Hydrology/Water Quality		Transportation/Traffic
X	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning		Tribal Cultural Resources
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
X	Geology/Soils		Noise		Wildfire
	Climate Change		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 EIR is required.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?			X	
Discussion: The project is not located near any waterbody or scenic roads. The site is located over 2,000 feet north of Edgewood Road, a County-designated Scenic Route from Canada Road to Alameda de las Pulgas. The site is located 350 feet (as the crow flies) from Eaton Park in the City of San Carlos and may be minimally visible from some park trails, but only minimally due to intervening trees and distance. The site is visible from adjoining areas within the residential area in which it is located. As the new residence and driveway would abut developed residential property and blend in with other houses and driveways in the area, the project would not have a significant adverse effect on views from existing residential areas. Source: Site visit; County GIS Maps				
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
Discussion: The project is not located within a designated scenic corridor, nor would it impact areas within a state scenic highway. The site is located over 2,000 feet north of Edgewood Road, a County-designated Scenic Route from Canada Road to Alameda de las Pulgas. Source: County GIS Maps				
1.c. In non-urbanized areas, significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief		X		

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?				

Discussion: The site is located within an urban residential area. The project site is not located on a ridgeline.

The project would result in the removal of 7 significant trees (those over 6" inches in diameter), including:

- 2 multi-trunk Oak Trees (Tree #14: 21.1", 17.5" diameter at breast height (d.b.h.); Tree #17: 11.1", 7.8" d.b.h.),
- 3 Buckeye trees (Tree #8: 6"; Tree #15: 10", 6.4"; Tree #16: 10" d.b.h.), and
- 2 Eucalyptus trees (Tree # 18: 25.7", 17"; Tree #19: 12", 13.5", 19.5", 14" d.b.h.)

The applicant has submitted a report by Roy Leggitt, Certified Arborist (Project Arborist), dated December 12, 2020. The report states that Tree #8 should be removed as it is located within the area of the landslide repair, Tree #14 should be removed as it is within the footprint of the house, and Tree #15 should be removed as it is located within the area of the proposed leach field. All other trees to be removed have poor structure and, in the case of Tree #17, a decayed trunk.

The report states that another 12 trees would be impacted by the project. Mr. Leggitt includes a recommended construction procedures and a tree protection plan to protect the remaining trees. Mitigation Measure 2 requires project compliance with the recommendations of the Project Arborist.

Section 6565.21 of the Design Review (DR) Zoning District regulations requires replacement of a significant indigenous tree with three (3) or more trees of the same species using at least five (5) gallon size stock. For each loss of a significant exotic tree, there shall be a replacement with three (3) or more trees from a list maintained by the Planning Director. Section 6565.20(f) encourages planting of native and drought-tolerant plant tree species. The applicant proposes to plant two (2), 24" box Australian Willow trees at the front of the residence, as well as various shrubs surrounding the residence, as shown in the Planting Plan.

Staff has added Mitigation Measure 1 which requires the planting of 5 replacement trees, to include minimum of three (3), 24" box Oak trees, and requires the Planting Plan to be approved by the Project Arborist. The mitigation measure satisfies Section 6565.21 in that, while a fewer number of replacement trees is required (3 - 24" box oak trees and 2- 15 gallon trees, for the removal of 2 significant exotic trees and 5 significant indigenous trees), the sizes of the required replacement trees is much larger than the minimum 5 gallon stock required by Section 6565.21.

The project involves a significant amount of grading for the improved existing gravel driveway on 636 Palomar Drive and APN 051-022-250 and the construction of a new residence and septic system on the sloped parcel. However, the proposed grading would not result in a significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, as the existing driveway will be used to serve the project. The septic system would be underground with finished grades contoured to blend in with the natural topography. Also, a slope repair of the front portion of the parcel along Los Cerros Road has been completed and blends with natural topography of the site. As proposed in the Planting Plan, all portions of the property, excluding the area of the new house and driveway, will be planted or seeded.

As proposed and mitigated, the project would not significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall replace the 2 significant exotic trees and 5 significant indigenous trees proposed for removal with a total of 5 replacement trees, to include minimum of three (3), 24" box Oak trees, with the remaining trees to be a minimum of 15 gallon in size. Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residence, the Planting Plan shall be reviewed and subject to the approval of the Project Arborist and project planner.

Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to any land disturbance and throughout the grading operation, the applicant shall implement the tree protection measures consistent with the County's Significant Tree Ordinance in addition to the construction procedures and tree protection measures provided by the Project Arborist.

Source: Site visit; County GIS Maps

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

Discussion: 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 residence within an existing residential area. Additionally, design review standards of the Design Review (DR) District require downward-directed exterior light fixtures.

Source: Project plans

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

Discussion: The parcel is not located within a State or County Scenic Corridor and is not adjacent to a State Highway. The proposed improvements on the subject parcel would not be visible from Interstate-280 (Junipero Serra Freeway), located over 7,500 feet to the west, due to the distance of the property and proposed structures from the freeway.

Source: County GIS Maps

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

Discussion: The site is located in a Design Review District. The project will require a Design Review Permit and is required to comply with applicable design review standards. The project will be reviewed by the Bayside Design Review Committee for compliance with applicable design review standards. Planning staff has reviewed the proposal and found it to be in substantial compliance with the design review standards.

Source: County GIS Maps; County Zoning Regulations

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

Discussion: Please see Section 1.c for discussion.

Source: Site visit; County GIS Maps

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

	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
2.a. For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
Discussion: The project is outside of the Coastal Zone and involves an urban, residential property located within a Single-Family Residential Zoning District within a developed area, which does not contain agricultural lands and is not farmed. There is no project impact to farmland, forestland or timberland. Source: Site visit; County GIS Maps				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: County GIS Maps				
2.c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: Project plans; County GIS Maps				

2.d. For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X
Discussion: Project site is not located in the Coastal Zone. See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: County GIS Maps				
2.e. Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: County GIS Maps				
2.f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? *Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.*				X
Discussion: See discussion under Section 2.a. Source: County GIS Maps				

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

	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
3.a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X		
Discussion: The project involves tree removal, grading, and construction activities associated with house and driveway construction within a lower density developed residential area. The site is designated Medium Low Density Residential with a minimum parcel size of 10,000 sq. ft. in the S-91 Zoning District. While the project may result in dust and odors associated with the grading and construction process, these impacts would be temporary and would not affect a significant number of people due to required mitigation measures and intervening trees and the distance of the project site from other development.				

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As described in the BAAQMD's 2017 California Environmental Quality Act (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 control measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures, *All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures,* and other criteria, that, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 3.a- 3.i requires the applicant to comply with BAAQMD's *All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures*. Other applicable BAAQMD criteria requires that construction-related activities exclude the below listed activities (followed by staff's evaluation of project compliance):

a. Demolition: The project site is undeveloped and would not require demolition of any existing buildings.

b. Simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously): Staff has added this as Mitigation Measure 3.i to require compliance with this criteria.

c. Simultaneous construction of more than one land use type (e.g., project would develop residential and commercial uses on the same site) (not applicable to high density infill development): The project only involves the construction of a single-family residential use.

d. Extensive site preparation (i.e., greater than default assumptions used by the Urban Land Use Emissions Model [URBEMIS] for grading, cut/fill, or earth movement): The project will not require extensive site preparation, and would disturb approximately 14,000 sq. ft.

e. Extensive material transport (e.g., greater than 10,000 cubic yards of soil import/export) requiring a considerable amount of haul truck activity: The project will not extensive material transport requiring off haul of approximately 880 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut.

BAAQMD measures and compliance with criteria b. above are required by the mitigation measure provided below.

Mitigation Measure 3: Upon the start of excavation activities and through to the completion of the project, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that the following dust control guidelines are implemented:

a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.

b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

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 California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

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 EPA. 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 3 in Section 3.a will 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 significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by Bay Area Air Quality Management District?		X		

Discussion: As proposed and mitigated, potential project-related air quality impacts to sensitive receptors (occupants of the surrounding residential area) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. 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: Project-related emissions would not adversely affect a substantial number of people due to the lower residential density of the area. As proposed and mitigated, potential project-related air quality impacts, including odor, to sensitive receptors (occupants of the surrounding residential area) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. See discussion in Section 3.a.

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

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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		
Discussion: The project site is located within a developed residential area on a disturbed parcel (previous slope repair completed) and consists of steep grassland with many significant indigenous and exotic trees, as well as other non-significant trees. Due to the disturbed and developed nature of the site, the potential for the presence of protected plant species is low. While the potential for protected wildlife specifies to be present is also low, the following standard mitigation measures have been added to further reduce potential biological impacts of the projects. **Mitigation Measure 4:** Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) or similar material shall not be used. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this requirement in plans submitted at the time of building permit application. **Mitigation Measure 5:** A pre-construction, migratory bird nesting survey shall be conducted prior to any proposed construction-related activities during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31). The survey shall be performed both in and within 250 feet of the proposed development area and the results reported to the County. If, for any reason, construction activities do not commence within 10 days of completion of the survey, the survey shall be repeated and results reported to the County. If active nests are discovered, no construction-related activities, including grading and tree removal, are allowed until birds have fledged from nests, as confirmed by a biologist. Sources: Standard biological mitigation measures.				
4.b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
Discussion: Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above. Sources: Standard biological mitigation measures.				

4.c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
Discussion: The project site is located within a developed residential area on a disturbed parcel (previous slope repair completed) and consists of steep grassland with many significant indigenous and exotic trees, as well as other non-significant trees. There are no federally protected wetlands at the project site. Sources: Planning GIS Map.				
4.d. Interfere significantly with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
Discussion: Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above. Sources: Planning GIS Map.				
4.e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?			X	
Discussion: See Section 1.c. Sources: Project plans				
4.f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
Discussion: The project site is not protected by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. The proposed area of work is located adjacent to existing residential homes in an area zoned for residential land use. Source: County General Plan; County GIS Maps				
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: County General Plan; County GIS Maps				
4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
Discussion: The project would not involve the removal of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands. Source: Site visit; County GIS Maps				

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

Discussion: The project involves earth-moving and construction impacts that could adversely affect archaeological resources should any exist in areas impacted by this project. The project was referred to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). In a letter dated February 1, 2022, CHRIS staff stated that, while the general area around the proposed project parcel has some archaeological sensitivity, the proposed project area itself, has a low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s). Therefore, no further study for archaeological resources is recommended by CHRIS. If archaeological resources are encountered during the project, work in the immediate vicinity of the finds should be halted until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the situation.

The following standard measures have been incorporated below:

Mitigation Measure 6: Although proposed project area itself has low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s), it is possible that subsurface deposits may yet exist or that evidence of such resources has been obscured by more recent natural or cultural factors such as downslope aggradation and alluviation and the presence of non-native trees and vegetation. Archaeological and historical resources and human remains are protected from unauthorized disturbance by State law, and supervisory and construction personnel therefore must notify the County and proper authorities if any possible archaeological or historic resources or human remains are encountered during construction activities and halt construction to allow qualified Archaeologists to identify, record, and evaluate such resources and recommend an appropriate course of action.

Mitigation Measure 7: 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 and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archeologist and any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archeologist shall be required to submit to the Community

Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

Sources: Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), dated February 1, 2022.

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

Discussion: Please see Section 5.a for discussion.

Sources: Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), dated February 1, 2022.

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

Discussion: To minimize potential impacts to human remains, the property owner shall implement the following standard mitigation measure:

Mitigation Measure 8: 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.

Sources: Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), dated February 1, 2022.

6. ENERGY. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	

Discussion: Energy conservation standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission) in June 1977 and are updated every 3 years (Title 24, Part 6, of the

California Code of Regulations). Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.

The County has adopted amendments to the 2019 Energy Code which require new buildings to be constructed without natural gas infrastructure and systems and meet solar photovoltaic system requirements, as well as amendments to the Green Building Code that require additional electric vehicle charging infrastructure (EVCI) for the construction of new buildings. The amendments would go into affect if and when the amendments are approved by California Energy Commission, which is pending.

At the time of building permit application, the project would be required to demonstrate compliance with the current Building Energy Efficiency Standards which would be verified by the San Mateo County Building Department prior to the issuance of the building permit. The project would also be required adhere to the provisions of CALGreen and GreenPoints, which establishes planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants.

Construction

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

Operation

During operations, 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 and the improved driveway. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) provides electricity to the project area. Due to the proposed construction of a single-family residence, project implementation would result in a permanent increase in electricity over existing conditions. However, such an increase to serve a single-family residence 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:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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? *Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.*		X		

Discussion: The project, including associated studies prepared by the Project Geologist and Project Geotechnical Engineers, was reviewed by the County's Geologic and Geotechnical consultant, Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc. (CSA), and preliminarily approved. Documentation of County review and approval is provided in the documents listed below:

- Geotechnical Peer Review, RE: Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS), PLN2020-00251, 634 Palomar Drive, prepared by Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc, dated June 14, 2021
- Supplemental Geotechnical Peer Review, RE: Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS), PLN2020-00251, 634 Palomar Drive, prepared by Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc, dated November 5, 2021 [*referred to in this report as "County approval of OWTS"].*
- Email from Craig Stewart, Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc, to Sherry Liu (County Geotechnical Section), dated August 28, 2020.

The County's review included the following Geotechnical Reports and letters submitted by the applicant (Sources for this Section):

- Geotechnical Report Update, Proposed Residential Development, 634 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated July 29, 2020 *[referred to in this report as "2020 Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., Geotechnical Report Update"].*

- Supplemental Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single Family Residence, 634 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated April 11, 2014.
- Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single Family Residence, 634 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated October 17, 2013 *[referred to in this report as "2013 Earth Investigations Consultants Geotechnical Investigation"].*
- Supplemental Engineering Geologic Study, Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS), Proposed Single-Family Residential Development, 634 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated October 4, 2021 *[referred to in this report as "2021 Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., Supplemental Engineering Geologic Study, OWTS"].*
- Geotechnical Plan Review, Civil and Landscape (only), prepared by Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated May 12, 2022.

Geologic Setting

The 2013 Earth Investigations Consultants (EIC) Geotechnical Investigation states that the site is at an approximate elevation of 450 feet above mean sea level on the northern flank of a dissected spur ridge (Plate 1). This area drains to a seasonal drainage channel tributary to Cordilleras Creek. According to Brabb and others (1998), this area is underlain by tightly folded, Jura-Cretaceous, Franciscan sandstone. In the site area, a strata dip steeply to the southwest. Leighton and Associates (1976) describe this bedrock material to include sandstone, siltstone and shale, and locally conglomerate. Relative stability of slopes ranged from poor to good depending on orientation of discontinuities relative to slopes. Earthquake stability is generally considered good relative to the capacity to support slopes. The site lies in a tectonic block between the active San Andreas fault, mapped approximately 2 miles to the southwest and the Hayward fault mapped approximately 18 miles to the northeast. The active San Gregorio fault is mapped approximately 9 miles to the southwest.

Site Characteristics

The 2013 EIC Geotechnical Investigation states that the site occupies a graded, moderately steep to steep northeasterly slope uphill of Palomar Drive (Plate 2, Site Plan). Undocumented grading that EIC understands occurred in 2012 created a benched topographic profile with an approximately 2-foot high vertical cut supported by post-supported plywood sheeting on the uphill margin of a gently sloping bench made for the proposed residence. A gently sloping gravel-surfaced bench separated from the upper bench by a steep fill slope (approx. 30 degrees) represents the proposed driveway extending across the eastern property line to the upper bench. There is another steep fill slope (approx. 25-35 degrees), which occurs on the downhill side of the driveway. Beyond the toe of the driveway fill slope, there is a steep, native slope (approx. 25 degrees) that extends to the northern property line adjoining Los Cerros Road.

The 2020 Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., Geotechnical Report Update includes observations from recent reconnaissance which confirmed the proposed development area surface conditions at the top of the slope described in the EIC reports have remained generally the same. The report notes that in 2017 a landslide to an approximate depth of 10 feet and involving sheared Franciscan bedrock occurred on the native slope between the proposed development area and Los Cerros Road (Plate 1; Earth Investigations Consultants, Inc., 2017). Geotechnical course-of-construction grading, and drainage of the slope repair approximately delineated on Plate 1 was under the direction of Geosphere. The project was approved by Geosphere and finaled by the County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department in 2019.

As stated in their 2020 Geotechnical Report Update, it is the opinion of Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc. (Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer), that the area residential

development as planned is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint. It appears undocumented fill in the proposed house development area will be mitigated by grading and/or retaining walls. They state that fill along the proposed driveway should be treated in accordance with the recommendations grading and/or retaining wall recommendations presented in Appendix A of the 2020 Geotechnical Report Update. Also, they provide supplemental recommendations to accommodate design and construction of the proposed swimming pool.

Recommendations from CSA and Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc. are included as Mitigation Measures 9 and 10.

Mitigation Measure 9: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for site development, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the recommendations of the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer, including but not limited to those pertaining to: 1) mitigation of undocumented fill in the proposed house development area, 2) treatment of fill along the proposed/improved driveway in accordance with the recommendations for grading and/or retaining wall construction presented in Appendix A of the 2020 Geotechnical Report Update and 3) supplemental recommendations to accommodate design and construction of the proposed swimming pool (Source: 2020 Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., Geotechnical Report Update).

Mitigation Measure 10: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for site development, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the recommendations of the County's Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer, including but not limited to those pertaining to: 1) Close coordination with the Project Geotechnical Consultant in design of proposed foundations, retaining walls, drainage improvements, and landscape irrigation which may benefit project performance; 2) Submittal of an updated geotechnical report with supplemental recommendations, design criteria, and supporting data, as appropriate; and 3) Project design and final plans should incorporate geotechnical recommendations and design criteria to mitigate site constraints as identified by the Project Geotechnical Consultant (Source: Craig Stewart, CSA, email to County, dated August 28, 2020).

Sources: See sources listed in this Section.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	

Discussion: Potential substantial adverse effects related to strong seismic ground shaking was not identified as a potential significant impact by the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer. See Section 7.a.

Sources: Sources listed in Section 7.a.

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

Discussion: Potential substantial adverse effects related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling was not identified as a potential significant impact by the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer. See Section 7.a.

Sources: Sources listed in Section 7.a.

iv. Landslides?		X		

Discussion: In an email dated May 13, 2022, the Project Geotechnical Engineer states that there are no unmitigated landslides within the area of influence to the site. The applicant has submitted reports (as listed in Section 7.a) prepared by the Project Geologist and Project Geotechnical Engineers, which notes past landslides and landslide repair at the property. As stated in their

2020 Geotechnical Report Update, it is the opinion of Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc. (Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer), that the area residential development as planned is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint. It appears undocumented fill in the proposed house development area will be mitigated by grading and/or retaining walls. They state that fill along the proposed driveway should be treated in accordance with the recommendations grading and/or retaining wall recommendations presented in Appendix A of the 2020 Geotechnical Report Update. Also, they provide supplemental recommendations to accommodate design and construction of the proposed swimming pool. Compliance with the recommendations of the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer is a standard requirement and required by Mitigation Measure 9.

In a letter dated August 2020 from Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc. (CSA), CSA reviewed the project and associated studies on behalf of the County Planning and Building Department and determined that they do not have geotechnical objections to planning project approval, subject to the following recommendations: 1) that the project performance may benefit greatly from close coordination with the Project Geotechnical Consultant in design of proposed foundations, retaining walls, and drainage improvements; 2) An updated geotechnical report with supplemental recommendations, design criteria, and supporting data, as appropriate, should be submitted at the building permit stage for final peer review along with project plans; and 3) Project design and final plans should incorporate anticipated geotechnical recommendations and design criteria to mitigate site constraints as identified by the Project Geotechnical Consultant. Compliance with the recommendations of the County Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer is required by Mitigation Measure 10.

Investigation of the Proposed Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS)

The design of the proposed OWTS and associated studies were reviewed by the County's Geologic and Geotechnical consultant, Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc., on behalf of the Environmental Health Department.

The 2021 Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., Supplemental Engineering Geologic Study, OWTS, includes a description of tasks undertaken to arrive at the findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in this report including the following:

- Review of pertinent in-house documents, and documents by San Mateo County Environmental Health Department files;

- Supplemental characterization of topo-morphology and engineering geology in the OWTS area of influence from supplemental reconnaissance mapping, interpretation of recent drone imagery, 1953 USGS topographic mapping (Plate 1), 1956 vertical, panchromatic stereo aerial photography, interactive Google Earth Pro imagery, and 2017 315-degree azimuth hillshade LiDAR imagery (Plate 3, Geomorphic Map; Plate 4, Photo Gallery);

- Supplemental subsurface exploration and sampling to characterize the geologic profile to a depth of 19 feet at the locations depicted on Plate 2 (Appendix A, Logs of Soil Exploration and Laboratory Test Results);

- Evaluation of the distribution and maintenance of California Water Service mains in the local area of influence (Appendix B, San Carlos District Water System Map and Legend)

- Review and preliminary analysis of available geotechnical, and geohydrologic data pertaining to seepage from perched ground water onto Los Cerros Road, and landsliding on neighboring 13 Los Cerros Road and 738 Loma Court (Appendix C, Evaluation of Seepage and 2017 Landsliding on 13 Los Cerros Road and 738 Loma Court).

The 2021 report states that the supplemental subsurface exploration and surface mapping revealed competent sandstone to be underlying the proposed leachfield. Sandstone exposed in the cut slope above Boring 1 exhibited a favorably steep inclination relative to slope stability, and steep closely spaced jointing relative to optimum OWTS performance over the project lifetime (Plate 2). The 2021 report states that, in the opinion of Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., these findings buttress conclusions and recommendations pertaining to other principal geotechnical aspects of the project presented in their previous reports (Geosphere Consultants, Inc. 2019; Atlas Technical Consultants LLC, 2020).

In a letter dated November 5, 2021, from CSA, CSA reviewed the project and associated studies on behalf of the County Planning and Building Department and determined that they do not have engineering geologic or geotechnical engineering objections to approval of the subject OWTS application. The proposed OWTS has received preliminary approval from County Environmental Health Services.

The County's review also included the following Geotechnical Reports prepared for APN 051-022-310 (Vacant parcel that adjoins the project site to the northwest), provided by the property owner of 738 Loma Court (who also owns APN 051-022-310) and comment letter from the Palomar Park Owner's Association:

- Engineering Geologic Consultations, APN 051-022-180, 738 Loma Court, San Mateo County, California, prepared by Steven F. Connelly, C.E.G., dated August 10, 2021
- Comments on the Proposed Leach Field, Enea Property, 738 Loma Court, Redwood City, California, prepared by GeoForensics Inc., dated March 16, 2020
- Spring Source and Protection Reconnaissance, prepared by Balance Hydrologics, Inc., for APN 051-022-310, dated April 16, 2014
- Landslide Area, 0 Los Cerros APN 051-022-310, prepared by Kilik General Engineering, dated November 4, 2017.
- APN 051-022-301 (vacant) – Mueller, O'Neill, prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., dated September 3, 2014
- Letter from Palomar Park Owner's Association, dated October 28, 2021.

Concerns are summarized below, with a response from Planning Staff:

Concern 1: General concern regarding historical landslides at the subject site and neighboring properties and why the County would allow the project site to be developed.

Staff's Response to Concern 1: As discussed in this Section, the applicant has submitted comprehensive, site-specific reports, including subsurface exploration and testing, for the proposed residence and septic system, which have reviewed by the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer as well as by the County's Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer, and received preliminary approval from County Environmental Health Services.

Concern 2: A 2014 Balance Hydrologics, Inc. letter for APN 051-022-310 (undeveloped parcel to the immediate west of the subject site) has found near-surface groundwater and a flowing spring on that parcel, as well as on the parcel at 738 Loma Court (developed parcel which adjoins APN 051-022-310 to the west). A 2017 Kilik General Engineering letter also identifies subterranean water sources emanating from the subject site. In general, both letter recommend proceeding with caution as earthwork and additional water into the slope (such as from a septic system) could cause unstable conditions elsewhere. A 2020 letter from GeoForensics, Inc., the letter recommends that a leach field should be located no higher than 20 feet above the elevation of Los Cerros Road, with 50 feet of horizontal separation between the work conducted at the off-site properties listed. A 2014 Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc. letter also describes a spring and water seep in the area and warns against the removal of vegetation at the property which may contribute

to slope instability. A 2021 Engineering Geologic Consultation by Steven F. Connelly, C.E.G. of 738 Loma Court, APN 051-022-310, and the subject site includes a review of previous investigations at the site, as well as a 2021 Geotechnical Peer Review letter by CSA for the OWTS, and states that effluent from the adjacent proposed leachfield system should not be allowed to contribute to the drainage system of the landslide repair at 738 Loma Court and should be carefully assessed.

Staff's Response to Concern 2: With the exception of the 2021 Connelly letter, the letters by the listed firms describe recommendations based on brief reviews of the adjoining off-site properties at 738 Loma Court and APN 051-022-310. It is unclear if the letters represent a study of the project site, which make general reference to the site address, with no enclosed maps and no mention of specific site locations or the site APN. The 2021 Connelly report includes a review of the subject site but does not include subsurface exploration and testing.

The applicant has submitted comprehensive, site-specific reports, including subsurface exploration and testing, for the proposed residence and septic system, which have been reviewed by the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer as well as by the County's Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer, and received preliminary approval from County Environmental Health Services. In an email dated May 13, 2022, the Project Geotechnical Engineer states that the 2013 Earth Investigations Consultants Geotechnical Investigation mentions no observed seepage from the ground surface (i.e., spring), and all the borings drilled on 634 Palomar Drive site encountered no ground water, with the exception of in the 2017 Earth Investigations Consultants Geotechnical Investigation when slight seepage perched at the top of bedrock 3' below the ground surface B-2 in the lower northeast corner (approx. site elevation 68), well below subdrains on neighboring property. Numerous other borings encountered no ground water to support pervasive springs on the project site.

As listed above, the Project Geotechnical Engineer has submitted a Geotechnical Plan Review letter (Attachment C6), dated May 12, 2022, stating that he has reviewed the geotechnical aspects of the Drainage Plan and Landscape Improvement Plan, and found the plans to be in general conformance with the recommendations presented in the geotechnical study report performed for the current project. Additionally, Mitigation Measure 10 requires, at the time of building permit application for final County peer review, that the Project Geotechnical Consultant review relevant aspects of the project, including drainage improvements, submit an updated geotechnical report with supplemental recommendations, design criteria, and supporting data, and for the applicant to incorporate geotechnical recommendations and design criteria into project plans to mitigate site constraints as identified by the Project Geotechnical Consultant. Therefore, as proposed and mitigated, potential substantial adverse effects related to landslides would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Sources: See sources listed in this Section.

v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion? *Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).*				X
Discussion: The project site is not located on or adjacent to a coastal cliff or bluff. Source: County GIS Maps.				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		

Discussion: In an email dated May 13, 2022, the Project Geotechnical Engineer states that there are no areas of existing significant unmitigated soil erosion within the area of influence to the project site.

The project includes earthwork of 880 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 90 c.y. of fill, with a total area of land disturbance of less than 1 acre (14,369 sq. ft.). The applicant proposes an Erosion Control Plan which includes measures that would contain and slow run-off, while allowing for natural infiltration. Due to the potential for erosion and sedimentation during land disturbing and earth-moving activities, the following mitigation measures have been included.

As stated above, the Project Geotechnical Engineer has submitted a Geotechnical Plan Review letter (Attachment C6), dated May 12, 2022, stating that he has reviewed the geotechnical aspects of the Drainage Plan and Landscape Improvement Plan, and found the plans to be in general conformance with the recommendations presented in the geotechnical study report performed for the current project. Staff has added Mitigation Measure 10 to require the Project Geotechnical Engineer to review proposed landscape irrigation at the site to minimize infiltration or drainage which may have a negative impact to site stability. To prevent unauthorized/unpermitted use of fill on the subject site or other off-site properties, staff has added Mitigation Measure 11. Mitigation Measures 12 and 13 require revision of the Erosion Control Plan to include additional stormwater pollution prevention measures and to require compliance with the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines." Mitigation Measures 14 and 15 require implementation and monitoring of erosion control measures throughout the term of the grading permit and building permit.

Mitigation Measure 11: Prior to issuance of the grading permit hard card, the applicant shall demonstrate that all cut spoils will be hauled off-site to a County-approved location.

Mitigation Measure 12: Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residence, the applicant shall revise the Erosion Control Plan to include the additional measure as follows, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director:

Construction Entrance: The Project Civil Engineer shall propose a method for stabilizing the area of the existing driveway (access easement) that will be re-graded on APN 051-022-250, while still allowing access over the driveway by the neighbors. The applicant shall move the temporary parking area, storage container, construction office, and sanitation unit to an area which does not block the construction entrance.

Mitigation Measure 13: The applicant shall adhere to the San Mateo County-wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including, but not limited to, the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measure 14: Once approved, erosion and sediment control measures of the revised Erosion Control Plan shall be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of grading and construction, until all disturbed areas are stabilized. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time. Revisions to the approved erosion control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer and submitted to the Building Inspection Section.

Mitigation Measure 15: It shall be the responsibility of the engineer of record to regularly inspect the erosion control measures for the duration of all grading remediation activities, especially after major storm events, and determine that they are functioning as designed and that proper maintenance is being performed. Deficiencies shall be immediately corrected, as determined by and implemented under the observation of the engineer of record.

Source: Project C3C6 form, Project Plans.

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 and erosion, see discussion in Sections 7.a and 7.b, above. Liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, and collapse were not identified as potential geological concerns by the Project Geologist or Project Geotechnical Engineer.

Source: See source list in Section 7.a.

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 2020 Geotechnical Report Update prepared by Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., provide recommendations for construction as highly expansive colluvium and undocumented fill may be encountered. Recommendations from CSA and Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc. are included as Mitigation Measures 9 and 10.

Source: See source list in Section 7.a.

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

Discussion: The 2021 Supplemental Engineering Geologic Study, OWTS, prepared by Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., states that, given the apparent satisfactory OWTS performance on neighboring residential properties, it is their opinion that operation of the proposed OWTS over the project lifetime presents a Low Risk for surfacing of effluent on the descending site slope below the proposed/improved driveway. In addition, they judge the proposed OWTS presents a Low Risk for contaminating water quality in the site slope repair subdrain system adequately located approximately 70 feet downslope from the Primary Leachfield (PL) and approximately 80 feet from the Expansion Leachfield (EL) (Plates 2 and 3). Similarly, the proposed PL and EL are respectively located approximately 170 and 102 feet from the southern margin of the slope repair subdrain system spanning 13 Los Cerros into 738 Loma Court (Plate 3).

As discussed in Section 7.a, the proposed location of the septic system has been reviewed by the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer as well as by the County's Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer, and received preliminary approval from County Environmental Health Services. With the implementation of mitigation measures as discussed in this Section, the potential for soils to be incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems is less than significant.

Source: Project plans

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

Discussion: Mitigation Measure 22 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.

Sources: Standard condition.

8. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:

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

Discussion: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO2) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. Grading involves GHG emissions mainly from exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal cars of construction workers, and operation of grading equipment). Due to the site's hilly, suburban location and assuming construction vehicles and workers are based largely in city or larger urban areas, potential project GHG emission levels from construction would be increased from general levels.

The project includes earthwork of 880 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 90 c.y. of fill. Excavated materials would be hauled off-site to an approved location, requiring off-haul of 880 c.y. (approximately 88 truckloads). At this time, the applicant proposed to haul the spoils to Guadalupe Rubbish Disposal Facility in San Jose (approximately 34 miles from the project site). The project would also require importation of drain rock and aggregate rock, however the volume of imported rock is also anticipated to be small.

To ensure new development projects are compliant with the County's Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP), the County provides the EECAP Development Checklist. According to the Applicant-completed EECAP Development Checklist (Attachment H), the project incorporates several EECAP measures, including tree plantings to provide shade, non-propane heating, CALGreen Tier 1 efficiency standards, use of "cool" exterior surfaces, solar photovoltaic system, pre-wired solar, use of smart water meters, compliance of construction equipment with BAAQMD guidance for idling, and electrification of outdoor household equipment. The project would be required to comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen).

While the above described measures would reduce GHG emissions associated with project construction and operation, the BAAQMD encourages lead agencies to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction, including, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. These Best Management Practices have been included in Mitigation Measure 17 in order to further reduce project-related GHG emissions.

Compliance with and/or consideration of EECAP and BAAQMD measures is required in order to reduce project-related GHG emissions.

Mitigation Measure 16: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed EECAP Development Checklist (Attachment H) or equivalent measures, to the extent feasible. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

Mitigation Measure 17: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the following measures, to the extent feasible, where such measures shall be shown on building plans:

a. BAAQMD BMP: Use alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet;
b. BAAQMD BMP: Use local building materials of at least 10 percent;
c. BAAQMD BMP: Recycle or reuse at least 50 percent of construction waste.

Source: Project plans; San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP); Bay Area Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act, Air Quality Guidelines, Updated May 2011.

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 project involves construction of a single family residence and associated driveway. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) exempts construction and operation of residential uses from permit requirements (Regulation 2-1-113).

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District

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 would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, as the project site does not contain forestland.

Sources: County GIS Maps; Project plans

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 is not located on or adjacent to a coastal cliff or bluff.

Source: County GIS Maps

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

Discussion: The project is not located on or adjacent to the San Francisco Bay or Pacific Ocean.

Source: County GIS Maps

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
Discussion: The project site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0282E, effective October 16, 2012. Source: County GIS Maps				
8.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: See discussion in Section 8.f. Source: County GIS Maps				

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
9.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: No such use is proposed. The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence. Source: Project plans				
9.b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
Discussion: No use involving the storage or release of hazardous materials is proposed. The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence. Source: Project plans				
9.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous				X

materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
Discussion: No use involving the emission or handling of hazardous materials or waste is proposed. The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence. Source: Project plans; County GIS Maps				
9.d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
Discussion: The project site is not a listed hazardous materials site. Source: County GIS Maps				
9.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
Discussion: The project is not located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Source: County GIS Maps				
9.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
Discussion: The project site is located within a residential area and, based on a review of aerial satellite imagery, is not within the immediate vicinity of a private airstrip. Source: County GIS Maps				
9.g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		X		
Discussion: The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence only and would not permanently or significantly impede access on existing public roads. However, temporary construction street parking may impede pedestrian and vehicle access on nearby narrow, windy roads. Mitigation Measure 18 has been added should on-street construction vehicle parking become necessary.				

Mitigation Measure 18: Any and all project-related on-street construction parking is subject to review and approval by the Project Planner and the County Department of Public Works. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall show location of all on-street construction parking on plans submitted for the building permit application. Sources: Project plans, County GIS Maps				
9.h. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X	
Discussion: The project site is located within a designated State Responsibility Area (SRA) Very High fire hazard zone. Requirements pertaining to the fire rating of exterior building materials in fire severity zones are incorporated into the adopted Fire Code. Compliance with applicable requirements will be reviewed during the building permit application process and confirmed prior to issuance of a building permit. Source: County GIS Maps.				
9.i. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
Discussion: The project site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0282E, effective October 16, 2012. Source: County GIS Maps.				
9.j. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
Discussion: See discussion in Section 9.i. Source: County GIS Maps.				
9.k. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: See discussion in Section 9.i. Source: County GIS Maps.				

10.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**. Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impacts	*Significant Unless Mitigated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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		
Discussion: Regarding the potential impact of construction-related erosion and sedimentation to water quality, please see discussion in Section 7.b, above. Regarding potential post-construction impacts to water quality, see Section 10.d, below. Source: Project plans; See Section 7.a for source list.					
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
Discussion: While the project would involve the construction of impervious surfaces, most of the project site will remain pervious. The project would be connected to public water system, California Water Service - San Carlos, for domestic water service and would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Source: Project plans					
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	
Discussion: According to the project Hydrology Study, the Gross Lot Area of the project site is 18,122 sq. ft. (0.416 acre). The Existing Site Impervious Area is 2,638 sq, ft. (0.061 acre). The Proposed Site Impervious Area is 4,294 sq. ft. (0.099 acre). The Net Change of Impervious Area is +1,656 sq. ft. (+ 0.038 acre).					

The project could potentially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. The project proposes new drainage facilities, which have been reviewed by the County's Planning and Building Department's Drainage Section, to handle post-construction drainage from the house other new impervious surfaces. As a standard building permit requirement, a site drainage plan is required that demonstrates how roof drainage and site runoff will be directed to an approved location. In compliance with the County's Drainage Manual, this plan must demonstrate that post-development flows and velocities to adjoining private property and the public right-of-way shall not exceed those that existed in the pre-developed state.

Additionally, Mitigation Measure 10 requires, at the time of building permit application for final County peer review, that the Project Geotechnical Consultant review relevant aspects of the project, including drainage improvements, submit an updated geotechnical report with supplemental recommendations, design criteria, and supporting data, and for the applicant to incorporate geotechnical recommendations and design criteria into project plans to mitigate site constraints as identified by the Project Geotechnical Consultant.

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

Sources: Project C3C6 form, Project Site Plan and Drainage Plan.

	ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	

Discussion: Please see Section 10.c.i for discussion. The project would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river.

Sources: Project plans

	iii. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	

Discussion: Please see Section 10.c.i, above, for discussion.

Sources: Project plans

10.d.	Significantly degrade surface or groundwater water quality?			X	

Discussion: An Engineering Geologic Consultation by Steven F. Connelly, C.E.G. of 738 Loma Court, APN 051-022-310, submitted by a neighbor, includes a review of previous investigations at the site, as well as a 2021 Geotechnical Peer Review letter by CSA for the OWTS, and states that effluent from the adjacent proposed leachfield system should not be allowed to contaminate natural spring water on 738 Loma Court or contribute to the drainage system of the landslide repair at 738 Loma Court and should be carefully assessed.

The 2021 Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., Supplemental Engineering Geologic Study, OWTS, submitted by the applicant states that, given the apparent satisfactory OWTS performance on

neighboring residential properties, is their opinion operation of the proposed OWTS over the project lifetime presents a Low Risk for surfacing of effluent on the descending site slope below the proposed/improved driveway.

In addition, they judge the proposed OWTS presents a Low Risk for contaminating water quality in the site slope repair subdrain system adequately located approximately 70 feet downslope from the Primary Leachfield (PL) and approximately 80 feet from the Expansion Leachfield (EL) (Plates 2 and 3). Similarly, the proposed PL and EL are respectively located approximately 170 and 102 feet from the southern margin of the slope repair subdrain system spanning 13 Los Cerros into 738 Loma Court (Plate 3).

As discussed in Section 7a., the applicant has submitted comprehensive, site-specific reports, including subsurface exploration and testing, for the proposed residence and septic system, which have reviewed by the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer as well as by the County's Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer, and received preliminary approval from County Environmental Health Services.

With the implementation of mitigation measures as discussed in Section 7, potential project impacts related to degraded surface or groundwater water quality is less than significant.

Sources: Project plans

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

Discussion: Please see Section 10.c.i for discussion.

Sources: Project plans

	iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				X

Discussion: The project would not impede or redirect flood flows There is no work proposed within an existing drainage channel or creek.

Sources: Project plans

10.f.	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, create or contribute runoff water which would risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X

Discussion: The site is not located within proximity of a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone.

Sources: Project plans

10.g.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	

Discussion: The site is not located within the area of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The proposed OWTS has received preliminary approval from County Environmental Health Services.

Sources: Project plans

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
11.a. Physically divide an established community?				X
Discussion: The project proposes a new residential to be located within an existing residential neighborhood. Development of the property with a residential use would not result in the physical division of an established community. Sources: County GIS Maps				
11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
Discussion: The project complies with the R-1/S-91/DR Zoning District, the County's Local Coastal Program, and the County's General Plan. Source: County GIS Maps				
11.c. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?				X
Discussion: The site is a vacant parcel located at the end of an existing driveway. The site will be served from the water main in Los Cerros Road. The site would be served by an on-site wastewater treatment system, that would not be used by any other properties. Sources: Project plans; County GIS Maps				

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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
Discussion: The project does not involve any mining or extraction of minerals. Sources: Project plans				
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
Discussion: The project would not affect any nearby mineral resource recovery site, if such a site should exist nearby. Sources: Project plans; County GIS Maps				

13. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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	
Discussion: The project will generate additional non-substantial, temporary noise associated with grading and construction. However, such noises will be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the County Ordinance Code. Sources: Project plans				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	
Discussion: Per the 2013 Earth Investigations Consultants Geotechnical Investigation, the proposed foundation will be a drilled pier foundation, not a pile-driven pier foundation. Mitigation Measure 19 prohibits use of a pile-driven pier foundation. As proposed and mitigated, the project				

would not result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

Mitigation Measure 19: The project shall not use a pile-driven pier foundation.

Sources: Project plans

12.e. 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 in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Please see discussion in Section 9.e, above.

Sources: Project plans; Planning GIS Map.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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: Please see discussion in Section 11.c, above.

Sources: Project plans

14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion: The project site is an undeveloped, residential parcel and proposed improvements support this use. The project would provide one additional single-family residential unit of housing and would not displace any existing housing.

Sources: 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:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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 project involves the construction of one single-family residence on a legal parcel within an existing residential neighborhood in unincorporated Palomar Park, California. The project has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the County Fire Department. The project site is located in an established residential neighborhood, where police, school and park services presently exist in this area. Sources: Project plans					

16.	**RECREATION**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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 project involves the construction of one single-family residence on a legal parcel and would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The parcel is legal, resulting from a Lot Line Adjustment (LLA 82-10) recorded on April 26, 1983. Sources: Project plans					
16.b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of				X

	recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				

Discussion: The project does not involve the construction of any recreational facilities. The project involves the construction of one single-family residence on a residential parcel and would not require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities.

Sources: Project plans

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

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

Discussion: The project involves the construction of one single-family residence and an associated driveway and would result in a temporary increase in traffic levels during construction and a negligible permanent increase in traffic levels after construction. The proposed use is a private single-family residential use and provides adequate on-site parking. Therefore, the project does not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

Sources: Project plans, Local Coastal Program (LCP)

17.b.	Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) *Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts*? *Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.*			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 one single-family residence within an existing residential neighborhood. 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.

Sources: Project plans

17.c. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
Discussion: The project site involves the improvement of an existing gravel driveway accessed from Palomar Drive. The configuration of the driveway relative to Palomar Drive and two other properties which use the driveway would not change. Sources: Project plans				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?		X		
Discussion: Mitigation Measure 12 requires the applicant to move the temporary parking area storage container, construction office and sanitation unit to an area which does not block the construction entrance. The project has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the County Fire Department and would not result in inadequate emergency access. Sources: Project plans				

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				X
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				X
Discussion: There are no structures on the property. The project site is not listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. Furthermore, the project is not listed in a local register of historical resources, pursuant to any local ordinance or resolution as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).				

Sources: Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), dated February 1, 2022.				
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. (In applying the criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)				

Discussion: Staff requested a Sacred Lands file search of the project vicinity, which was conducted by the Native American Heritage Council (NAHC), and resulted in no found records (Attachment F2). Planning staff has consulted with the following tribes, as identified by the NAHC:

- Amah MutsunTribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista
- Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
- Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
- Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area
- The Ohlone Indian Tribe
- Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eschom Valley Band

On January 25, 2022, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment by February 25, 2022. A letter was also sent to the Tamien Nation, a traditionally or culturally affiliated tribe, as the tribe has requested in writing to the County, to be informed of proposed projects in the geographic project area, per Assembly Bill 52 for California Native American tribal consultation requirements. No comments were received to date.

Based on the NAHC's recommended best practices, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize any potential significant impacts to unknown tribal cultural resources.

Mitigation Measure 20: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources be taken prior to implementation of the project.

Mitigation Measure 21: Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

Mitigation Measure 22: 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.

Source: Native American Heritage Council (NAHC) letter, dated January 21, 2022.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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		
Discussion: The project is required to demonstrate compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Permit, which require the construction of new site design measures to reduce stormwater runoff and associated negative environmental impacts. The project proposes a new on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS) which will only serve the subject site. Please see Section 7a.iv for potential significant unless mitigated impacts related to construction and operation of the OWTS. The project will connect to California Water Service - San Carlos for domestic water service. California Water Service - San Carlos has reviewed the project plans and the project will be subject to service requirements. Therefore, the project would not 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. Source: Project Plans; County Planning GIS Maps.				
19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X
Discussion: The project includes proposes to connect to the California Water Service - San Carlos for domestic water services. California Water Service - San Carlos has reviewed the project plans and the project will be subject to service requirements. Project landscape irrigation will be subject to the Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance (WELO). Source: Project Plans				
19.c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
Discussion: Not applicable; Please see discussion in Section 19.a, above.				

Source: Project Plans				
19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				X
Discussion: The project involves the construction of one single-family residence and would result in a negligible increase in solid waste disposal needs. Source: Project Plans				
19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
Discussion: The project involves the construction of one single-family residence and would result in a negligible increase in solid waste disposal needs. Source: Project Plans				

20. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	***Potentially Significant Impacts***	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
Discussion: The project site is located within a designated State Responsibility Area (SRA) in a Very High fire hazard severity zone. Requirements pertaining to the fire rating of exterior building materials in fire severity zones are incorporated into the adopted Fire Code. Compliance with applicable requirements will be reviewed during the building permit application process and confirmed prior to issuance of a building permit. Source: County GIS Map.				
20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
Discussion: The site is steeply sloped. Please see discussion in Section 20.a. Source: County GIS Map.				

20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
Discussion: The project would not require any new roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities. The site is located at the end of an existing driveway. Also, new electrical line will be undergrounded. Please see discussion in Sections 20.a and 20.b. Source: County GIS Map.				
20.d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X
Discussion: Please see discussion in Sections 20.a and 20.b. Source: County GIS Map.				

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
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		
Discussion: Yes, as discussed in this document, the project has the potential to result in environmental impacts as discussed in this report. Implementation of mitigation measures included in this document would adequately reduce project impacts to a less than significant level. Source: Subject document.				

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	
Discussion: The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence within an existing residential neighborhood on a previously undeveloped property, located at the end of an existing driveway. Due to the infill nature of the proposed residential construction, proposed OWTS, and existing water service in the area, the project is not likely to result in a cumulatively considerable impact when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. Source: Subject document.				
21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
Discussion: As discussed in this document, the project could result in environmental impacts that could both directly and indirectly cause impacts on human beings. However, implementation of mitigation measures included in this document would adequately reduce project impacts to less than significant levels. Source: Subject 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	
City		X	
Coastal Commission		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
Other: None		X	
National Marine Fisheries Service		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
Sewer/Water District: MWSD		X	
State Department of Fish and Wildlife		X	
State Department of Public Health		X	
State Water Resources Control Board		X	

MITIGATION MEASURES

	Yes	No
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed (as listed below):	X	

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

Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall replace the 2 significant exotic trees and 5 significant indigenous trees proposed for removal with a total of 5 replacement trees, to include minimum of three (3), 24" box Oak trees, with the remaining trees to be a minimum of 15 gallon in size. Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residence, the Planting Plan shall be reviewed and subject to the approval of the Project Arborist and project planner.

Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to any land disturbance and throughout the grading operation, the applicant shall implement the tree protection measures consistent with the County's Significant Tree Ordinance in addition to the construction procedures and tree protection measures provided by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation Measure 3: Upon the start of excavation activities and through to the completion of the project, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that the following dust control guidelines are implemented:

a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.

b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.

c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

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 California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

Mitigation Measure 4: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting) or similar material shall not be used. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this requirement in plans submitted at the time of building permit application.

Mitigation Measure 5: A pre-construction, migratory bird nesting survey shall be conducted prior to any proposed construction-related activities during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31). The survey shall be performed both in and within 250 feet of the proposed development area and the results reported to the County. If, for any reason, construction activities do not commence within 10 days of completion of the survey, the survey shall be repeated and results reported to the County. If active nests are discovered, no construction-related activities, including grading and tree removal, are allowed until birds have fledged from nests, as confirmed by a biologist.

Mitigation Measure 6: Although proposed project area itself has low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s), it is possible that subsurface deposits may yet exist or that evidence of such resources has been obscured by more recent natural or cultural factors such as downslope aggradation and alluviation and the presence of non-native trees and vegetation. Archaeological and historical resources and human remains are protected from unauthorized disturbance by State law, and supervisory and construction personnel therefore must notify the County and proper authorities if any possible archaeological or historic resources or human remains are encountered during construction activities and halt construction to allow qualified Archaeologists to identify, record, and evaluate such resources and recommend an appropriate course of action.

Mitigation Measure 7: 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 and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archeologist and any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

Mitigation Measure 8: 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 9: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for site development, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the recommendations of the Project Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer, including but not limited to those pertaining to: 1) mitigation of undocumented fill in the proposed house development area, 2) treatment of fill along the proposed/improved driveway in accordance with the recommendations for grading and/or retaining wall construction presented in Appendix A of the 2020 Geotechnical Report Update and 3) supplemental recommendations to accommodate design and construction of the proposed swimming pool (Source: 2020 Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., Geotechnical Report Update).

Mitigation Measure 10: Prior to the issuance of a building permit for site development, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the recommendations of the County's Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer, including but not limited to those pertaining to: 1) Close coordination with the Project Geotechnical Consultant in design of proposed foundations, retaining walls, drainage improvements, and landscape irrigation which may benefit project performance; 2) Submittal of an updated geotechnical report with supplemental recommendations, design criteria, and supporting data, as appropriate; and 3) Project design and final plans should incorporate geotechnical recommendations and design criteria to mitigate site constraints as identified by the Project Geotechnical Consultant (Source: Craig Stewart, CSA, email to County, dated August 28, 2020).

Mitigation Measure 11: Prior to issuance of the grading permit hard card, the applicant shall demonstrate that all cut spoils will be hauled off-site to a County-approved location.

Mitigation Measure 12: Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residence, the applicant shall revise the Erosion Control Plan to include the additional measure as follows, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director:

Construction Entrance: The Project Civil Engineer shall propose a method for stabilizing the area of the existing driveway (access easement) that will be re-graded on APN 051-022-250, while still allowing access over the driveway by the neighbors. The applicant shall move the temporary parking area, storage container, construction office, and sanitation unit to an area which does not block the construction entrance.

Mitigation Measure 13: The applicant shall adhere to the San Mateo County-wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including, but not limited to, the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measure 14: Once approved, erosion and sediment control measures of the revised Erosion Control Plan shall be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of grading and construction, until all disturbed areas are stabilized. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time. Revisions to the approved erosion control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer and submitted to the Building Inspection Section.

Mitigation Measure 15: It shall be the responsibility of the engineer of record to regularly inspect the erosion control measures for the duration of all grading remediation activities, especially after major storm events, and determine that they are functioning as designed and that proper maintenance is being performed. Deficiencies shall be immediately corrected, as determined by and implemented under the observation of the engineer of record.

Mitigation Measure 16: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed EECAP Development Checklist (Attachment H) or equivalent measures, to the extent feasible. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

Mitigation Measure 17: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the following measures, to the extent feasible, where such measures shall be shown on building plans:

a. BAAQMD BMP: Use alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet;
b. BAAQMD BMP: Use local building materials of at least 10 percent;
c. BAAQMD BMP: Recycle or reuse at least 50 percent of construction waste.

Mitigation Measure 18: Any and all project-related on-street construction parking is subject to review and approval by the Project Planner and the County Department of Public Works. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall show location of all on-street construction parking on plans submitted for the building permit application.

Mitigation Measure 19: The project shall not use a pile-driven pier foundation.

Mitigation Measure 20: Should any traditionally or culturally affiliated Native American tribe respond to the County's issued notification for consultation, such process shall be completed and any resulting agreed upon measures for avoidance and preservation of identified resources be taken prior to implementation of the project.

Mitigation Measure 21: Any inadvertently discovered tribal cultural resources shall be treated with culturally appropriate dignity taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource, protecting the traditional use of the resource, and protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

Mitigation Measure 22: 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.

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared by the Planning Department.
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because of the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

(Signature)

July 2, 2022 — Date

Camille Leung, Project Planner — (Title)

***Attachments available at*:** https://www.smcgov.org/planning/mitigated-negative-declaration-thalapanenijackson-residence-septic-system-and-improved

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Vicinity Map

B. Project Plans

C. Geotechnical Reports provided by the Applicant:
   1. Supplemental Engineering Geologic Study, Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS), Proposed Single-Family Residential Development, 634 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated October 4, 2021.
   2. Geotechnical Report Update, Proposed Residential Development, 634 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated July 29, 2020.
   3. Geotechnical Investigation, Landslide Mitigation, Lower Slope at 634 & 636 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, Inc., dated June 16, 2017.
   4. Supplemental Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single Family Residence, 634 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated April 11, 2014.
   5. Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single Family Residence, 634 Palomar Drive, Redwood City, California, prepared by Earth Investigations Consultants, dated October 17, 2013.
   6. Geotechnical Plan Review, Civil and Landscape (only), prepared by Atlas Geosphere Consultants, Inc., dated May 12, 2022.

D. Reports and Comments provided by Neighbors:
   1. Letter from Palomar Park Owner's Association, dated October 28, 2021.
   2. Engineering Geologic Consultations, APN 051-022-180, 738 Loma Court, San Mateo County, California, prepared by Steven F. Connelly, C.E.G., dated August 10, 2021
   3. Comments on the Proposed Leach Field, Enea Property, 738 Loma Court, Redwood City, California, prepared by GeoForensics Inc., dated March 16, 2020
   4. Landslide Area, 0 Los Cerros APN 051-022-310, prepared by Kilik General Engineering, dated November 4, 2017.
   5. APN 051-022-301 (vacant) – Mueller, O'Neill, prepared by Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc., dated September 3, 2014

E. County Geotechnical Approval Letters
   1. Email from Craig Stewart, Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc, to Sherry Liu (County Geotechnical Section), dated August 28, 2020.
   2. Supplemental Geotechnical Peer Review, RE: Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS), PLN2020-00251, 634 Palomar Drive, prepared by Cotton, Shires and Associates, Inc, dated November 5, 2021.

F. Cultural Resource Letters

1. Letter from California Historical Resources Information System, dated February 1, 2021.
2. Letter from Native American Heritage Council (NAHC), dated January 21, 2022.

G. Arborist Report for 634 Palomar Drive, Ca, prepared by Roy C. Leggit, III, dated December 12, 2020.

H. EECAP Development Checklist