

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** General Plan Amendment & Minor Subdivision for 890 Upland Road, Emerald Lake Hills
2. **County File Number:** PLN2022-00321
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:** 890 Upland Road at Foss Drive, located in the unincorporated Emerald Lake Hills area of San Mateo County.
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** APN 058-272-120 (44,721 sq. ft.[1.027 acres]; Subject Parcel).
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Same as Owner
8. **Owner:** Paul Goswamy, 152 Nevada Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
9. **General Plan Designation:** Low Density Residential; Urban
10. **Zoning:** Residential Hillside District/Design Review District (RH/DR)
11. **Description of the Project:** The project requires a Minor Subdivision, Grading Permit, and General Plan (GP) Amendment for a 3-lot subdivision of a 44,721 square feet (s.f.) single-family residential parcel, with proposed lot sizes of 12,010 s.f., 19,023 s.f., and 13,687 s.f. The GP amendment would change the Land Use Designation from Low Density Residential to Medium-Low Density Residential, which would allow the parcel's subdivision into 3 parcels. Applicant proposes to demolish a house built in 1920 and an existing septic system, build 3 new single-family residences, and connect the 3 new parcels to a public sewer and water system (property is not currently located in a sewer or water district). Project includes removal of a 54" d.b.h. Heritage Valley Oak tree (Tree #3), as well as 6 other significant trees. A total of 850 c.y. of cut is needed for driveway improvements.
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The property is located within an existing residential neighborhood and adjoins developed parcels on all sides, except along the street-front side on Upland Road. The property slopes upward from Upland Road with an average slope of approximately 12%.

13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** An Outside Service Agreement(s) for three (3) sewer and two (2) water connections (existing house has a water connection) is subject to the approval of Local Agency Formation (LAFCo) and the City of Redwood City.
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 Wukwasche Indian Tribe/Eschom Valley Band, and the Tamien Nation. On September 5 and 13, 2023, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment within 30 days. 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	X	Public Services
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Recreation
	Air Quality	X	Hydrology/Water Quality		Transportation/Traffic
X	Biological Resources	X	Land Use/Planning		Tribal Cultural Resources
X	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources	X	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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?			X	
Discussion: The project is not located near any waterbody or scenic roads. The site is not in the vicinity of a public park. The site is visible from adjoining areas within the residential area in which it is located. The three new residences would blend in with other houses in the area. The existing driveway from Upland Road would be improved to serve 2 of the proposed parcels and there would be one new driveway along Upland Road to serve Lot 3. The new house and driveway on Lot 3 and the new house on Lot 1 would be visible from Upland Road, where current development is minimally visible from Upland Road. The home on Lot 2 is in relatively the same location as the existing residence and would be minimally visible from Upland Road. As the subject property is located within an existing developed residential area and homes are required to comply with the County's Design Review standards, 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. Source: County GIS Maps				
1.c. In non-urbanized areas, significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings,			X	

including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				
Discussion: The site is located within an urban residential area. The project site is not located on a ridgeline. The project involves a significant amount of grading for improvement of the existing driveway and the construction of 2 additional driveways to serve 2 new homes. However, the proposed grading would not result in a significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, due to the moderate slope of the parcel. The existing driveway from Upland Road would be improved to serve 2 of the proposed parcels and there would be one new driveway along Upland Road to serve Lot 3. As proposed and mitigated, the project would not significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. 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 creation of 2 new residential parcels, and eventual construction of new residences, 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 11,000 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. New homes will require a Design Review Permit and are required to comply with applicable design review standards. Future homes will be reviewed by the Emerald Lake Hills Design Review Officer for compliance with applicable design review standards. The General Plan Amendment will allow for 3 homes instead				

of 2 to be built on the property. A detailed discussion of the potential impacts of the General Plan Amendment is in Section 11, below.

Source: County GIS Maps; County Zoning Regulations

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

X

Discussion: Please see Section 1.a 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:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a. For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X

Discussion: The project 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))? <i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>				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 subdivision improvements for access, drainage, and utilities, and construction of new homes on each of the 3 lots. 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 with the implementation of the required mitigation measures, below. 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, <i>All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures</i>, and other criteria, that, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 1.a-i requires the applicant to comply with BAAQMD's <i>All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures</i>. 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 850 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut. BAAQMD measures and compliance with criteria b. above are required by the mitigation measure provided below. Mitigation Measure 1: 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 1 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 with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 1. 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 residential nature 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 with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 1. See discussion in Section 3.a.

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

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

Discussion: The project site is located within a developed residential area on a disturbed parcel with an existing single-family residence and consists of grassland with many significant indigenous and exotic 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 species 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 2: 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 3: A pre-construction, migratory bird nesting survey shall be conducted prior to any proposed tree removal, ground disturbance, demolition, or any other 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: There is riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community located at the site, as there are no water features at the site and the site is disturbed with a residential use. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) does not show any protected plants or wildlife species in the project area. Please see the discussion in Sections 4.a and c. 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 with an existing single-family residence and consists of grassland with many significant indigenous and exotic trees. Based on the site's evenly-sloped topography, staff has concluded that there are no wetland features 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: The applicant has submitted a report by Jeremy Ingalls, Certified Arborist (Project Arborist), dated February 8, 2022, which describes the 47 trees, including heritage, significant (trees 6" or larger in diameter) and non-protected trees at the property.

The project would result in the removal of one heritage tree and 6 significant trees, as listed in Table 1, with a description of tree health and reason for removal.

Table 1 – Proposed Tree Removals				
<i>Tree No.</i>	<i>Size and Species</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Health</i>	<i>Reason for Removal</i>
Tree #3 (Heritage)	54.1" d.b.h. Heritage Valley Oak	Proposed Lot 1	Fair	Decay; Poor condition with a High Risk Failure.
Tree #1	45.3" d.b.h Significant Red Gum Eucalyptus	Proposed Lot 2	Fair vigor; poor form	Located in shared driveway and confines fire access
Tree #14	12.8" d.b.h. Significant Black Acacia	Proposed Lot 2	Mostly dead	Located in shared driveway and confines fire access
Tree #15	18.9" d.b.h. Significant Black Acacia	Proposed Lot 2	Mostly dead	Located in shared driveway and confines fire access
Tree #26	38.8" d.b.h. Significant Valley Oak	Proposed Lot 2	Fair	Decay; Poor condition with a Moderate to High Risk Failure
Tree #45*	13.6" d.b.h. Significant Coast Live Oak	Proposed Lot 3	Fair vigor and form.	In Driveway of Future Home
Tree #46	16.4" d.b.h. Significant California Pepper Tree	Proposed Lot 3	Mostly dead	Mostly dead
<i>*Tree #45 shall be retained through the subdivision improvement process, but may be removed for home construction on Lot 3.</i>				

Per Mitigation Measure 5, the applicant is required to protect all significant trees (no heritage trees are being retained) which are not approved for removal, including submittal of a tree protection plan, as prepared by a certified arborist, consistent with the County's Significant Tree Regulations, and responsive of comments from the County Arborist.

The applicant has also submitted a report by Mr. Ingalls dated January 25, 2023, further evaluating Tree #3 and Tree #26.

Heritage Valley Oak Tree (Tree #3)

For Tree #3, the County Arborist reviewed the 2022 report and requested a Resistograph test to test for decay, with results as described in the 2023 report. Based on the reports submitted, the County Arborist determined that removal of Tree #3 is appropriate as resistance drill tests confirm the extent of decay in the lower trunk section and the arborist's observations of decay and defect in the upper canopy provide few options for adequate mitigation measures (pruning or bracing, etc.).

The 2023 report states that the valley oak is in fair health but poor condition. The canopy is showing fair vigor with buds about to break in the upper canopy. The structure of the tree is very poor. The tree has a main trunk to 12 feet in height at the top of which one large scaffold limb grows towards the north and several smaller scaffold limbs radiate out in other directions. The largest scaffold limb towards the north has a large scar and cavity where a previous large limb failed. The union of all the main scaffold limbs has a large, exposed area of concrete suggesting there is a large cavity down the trunk from a previous limb failure. There are many cavities throughout the scaffold limbs of the tree with pockets of decay. There are scars and cavities on the trunk. There are 2 cavities at the base of the tree in the root crown. Mr. Ingalls inserted a probe into the cavities which extend a foot inside the trunk before hitting wood.

Mr. Ingalls sounded the trunk with a hickory mallet and found the most decayed areas at around 4 feet above grade. He resistographed the lower trunk on the north, south, east and west sides of the tree at approximately 4 feet above grade. He found decay at 7", 10", 14" and 14.5" respectively, inside the trunk. This suggests an uneven column of decay with an average wall thickness of approximately 10". This is an acceptable level of decay to support a tree of this size and species with good sound wood at approximately 1/5th of the diameter of the tree.

The tree is in fair health but poor condition. The decay in the lower trunk is acceptable, however the visible decay at the top of the trunk, at a critical point in the structure of the tree is unacceptable and at high risk of failure. There is further decay and cavities throughout the main scaffold limbs of the tree which may lead to further large limb failure. The root crown is compromised with visible decay.

Significant Valley Oak Tree (Tree #26)

For Tree #26, the County Arborist reviewed the 2022 report and requested a resistograph test to test for decay, with results as described in the 2023 report. Based on the reports submitted, the County Arborist determined that removal of Tree #26 is appropriate as resistance drill tests confirm the extent of decay in the lower trunk section and the arborist's observations of decay and defect in the upper canopy provide few options for adequate mitigation measures (pruning or bracing, etc.).

The 2023 report states that the valley oak is in fair health but poor condition. The canopy is showing fair vigor with buds about to break in the upper canopy. The structure of the tree is very poor. The tree bifurcates into 2 trunks at approximately 5 feet above grade. One trunk stays mostly vertical whilst the second trunk heads out horizontally and then develops a second vertical trunk which is cabled to the main trunk. The horizontal trunk is propped with a 2 1/2" diameter steel pipe as a support. The trunks have many open cavities and decay. The root crown is partially buried but there are no signs of decay or oak root fungus.

Mr. Ingalls resistographed the lower trunk on the north and south side at 1 foot above grade and found decay and concrete at approximately 11 inches into the trunk on both sides which means

there is a column of decay, centrally located within the trunk of approximately 13" diameter at 1 foot above grade. The thickness and location of the sound wood is acceptable and not likely to fail in a tree of this size and age. He then resistographed the main trunk on the north and south side of the trunk above the bifurcation where the trunk diameter is 28.0" and found decay at 3" and 4" into the trunk. The thickness of the sound wood is below 1/6th diameter of the trunk and there are several open cavities which also affect the overall strength of the trunk. The trunk is at a moderate to high risk of failure.

Five (5) other Significant Trees

Based on health and reasons for removal listed in Table 1, above, the trees proposed for removal, with the exception of Tree #45, conflict with necessary subdivision improvements or should be removed based on the tree's health. Staff has added Mitigation Measure 4 to require maintenance and protection of Tree #45 during the subdivision improvement process, but may be proposed for removal at the time of the development, as it does not conflict with subdivision improvements nor is in poor health. Approval will be subject to County review and approval along with home construction on Lot 3.

Tree Replacement

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. It is County practice to allow for substitution of three (3) smaller replacement trees (e.g., 5 gallon) for one (1) large replacement tree (24"-48" box). Section 6565.20(f) encourages planting of native and drought-tolerant plant tree species.

The County Arborist requires that the issuance of a tree removal permit for Trees #3 and #26 will be conditioned on an issued building permit for residences on the subdivided parcels where the trees are located (Lots 1 and 2, respectively), and adequate replacement. Replacement for Tree #3 shall be 2 - 48" box Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*), and replacement for Tree #26 shall be 1 - 36" box Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*). Location of replacement trees for Trees #3 and #26 are shown in Attachment E3, except that the County Arborist has required the applicant to move the replacement tree shown on Lot 3 at least 6 feet from exterior property line. Trees shall be planted prior to final approval of building permits for homes on the proposed lots. The other 5 significant trees shall be replaced in a manner consistent with Section 6565.21. All replacement trees shall be shown on a landscape plan submitted prior to recordation of the subdivision map. These requirements have been added to Mitigation Measure 4.

Tree Protection during Grading and Construction

Mitigation Measure 5 requires that, prior to issuance of a building permit for subdivision improvements and residential development, the applicant shall protect all significant trees which are not approved for removal, including submittal of a tree protection plan, as prepared by a certified arborist and consistent with the protection measures of the County's Significant Tree Regulations. Tree protection measures shall be maintained during project-related work. Also, the County Arborist specifies that a root barrier shall be required at the existing driveway during driveway improvement construction for the Pistache and Oak trees along driveway.

Based on the foregoing, as proposed and mitigated, the project would not 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).

Mitigation Measure 4: The owner shall comply with the following requirements pertaining to the heritage tree and 6 significant trees proposed for removal:

- a. The issuance of a tree removal permit for Trees #3 and 26 will be conditioned on an issued building permit for homes on the subdivided parcels where the trees are located (Lots 1 and 2, respectively), and replacement as specified. Replacement for Tree #3 shall be 2 - 48" box Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*), and replacement for Tree #26 shall be 1 - 36" box Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*). Location of replacement trees for Trees #3 and #26 are shown in Attachment E3, except that the County Arborist has required the applicant to move the replacement tree shown on Lot 3 at least 6 feet from exterior property line. Replacement trees shall be planted prior to final approval of building permits for homes on the proposed lots.
- b. The owner shall maintain and protect Tree #45 (13.6" d.b.h Coast Live Oak), as it does not conflict with subdivision improvements nor is in poor health. The tree may be proposed for removal at the time of the development, subject to County review and approval along with home construction on Lot 3.
- c. The issuance of a tree removal permit for the other 4 significant trees shall be conditioned on an issued building permit for subdivision improvements. These trees shall be replaced in a manner consistent with Section 6565.21. Replacement trees shall be planted prior to final approval of building permits for homes on the proposed lots.
- d. All replacement trees shall be shown on a landscape plan submitted prior to recordation of the subdivision map.

Mitigation Measure 5: Prior to issuance of a building permit for subdivision improvements and residential development, the applicant shall protect all significant trees which are not approved for removal, including submittal of a tree protection plan, as prepared by a certified arborist and consistent with the protection measures of the County's Significant Tree Regulations and County Arborist, as listed below. Tree protection measures shall also be shown on the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan.

- a. A root barrier shall be required at the existing driveway during driveway improvement construction for the Pistache and Oak trees along driveway. The Project Arborist shall prepare root barrier details to be submitted at the time of a building permit application for subdivision improvements, subject to review by the County Arborist.
- b. Identify, establish, and maintain tree protection zones throughout the entire duration of the project.
- c. Isolate tree protection zones using 5-ft. tall, orange plastic fencing supported by poles pounded into the ground, located at the driplines as described in the arborist's report.
- d. Maintain tree protection zones free of equipment and materials storage; contractors shall not clean any tools, forms, or equipment within these areas.
- e. If any large roots or large masses of roots need to be cut, the roots shall be inspected by a certified arborist or registered forester prior to cutting as required in the arborist's report. Any root cutting shall be undertaken by an arborist or forester and documented. Roots to be cut shall be severed cleanly with a saw or topers. A tree protection verification letter from the certified arborist shall be submitted to the Planning Department within five (5) business days from the site inspection following root cutting.

f. Normal irrigation shall be maintained, but oaks shall not need summer irrigation, unless the arborist's report directs specific watering measures to protect trees. g. Street tree trunks and other trees not protected by dripline fencing shall be wrapped with straw wattles, orange fence, and 2x4 boards in concentric layers to a height of eight feet. h. Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit, the Planning and Building Department shall complete a pre-construction site inspection, as necessary, to verify that all required tree protection and erosion control measures are in place. 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 involves removal of trees, including three (3) oak trees, within a developed residential area. The project does not involve the removal of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands. Source: Site visit; County GIS Maps				

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource 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 20, 2023, 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) (Attachment D1). 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 20, 2023.

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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
Discussion: Energy conservation standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission) in June 1977 and are updated every 3 years (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations). Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. 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 for each new home, 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. <u>Construction</u> The construction of the project, including subdivision improvements and three (3) new homes, 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 three (3) new single-family residences, project implementation would result in a permanent increase in electricity over existing conditions. However, such an increase to serve three (3) single-family residences would represent an insignificant percent increase compared to overall demand in PG&E's service area, with impacts further off-set by energy generation through project compliance with solar photovoltaic system requirements. The nominal increased demand is expected to be adequately served by the existing PG&E electrical facilities and the projected electrical demand would not significantly impact PG&E's level of service. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during operation and construction of the project given the financial implication of the inefficient use of such resources. As such, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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

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

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

Source: Project Plans.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>		X		
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion: A geotechnical investigation (report), prepared by Silicon Valley Soil Engineering (SVSE) dated September 21, 2021 (Attachment C), was prepared for the project. The report was reviewed by the County's Geotechnical Section, and preliminarily approved.

Upland Road bounds the subject site to the southwest, existing residence to the northwest, northeast, and southeast. At the time of SVSE investigation, the site is an irregular shaped, moderately steep, southern-facing slope parcel occupied by an existing residence, a barn, and a secondary residence. Based on the preliminary plan for the subject site, the proposed development will include the demolition of the existing structures and the construction of three single-family residences with associated improvements.

Location of the proposed residences and our exploratory soil borings is shown on the Figure 2 – Site Plan of Attachment C.

Geology

The site lies in the Santa Clara Valley, which is part of the Coast Ranges geological province. The Santa Clara Valley occupies the structural trough formed by two northwest trending mountain ranges; the Santa Cruz Mountains to the southwest of the valley and the Diablo Range to the northeast. The Diablo Range is predominantly composed of Franciscan Formation, which is uppermost Jurassic to lower Upper Cretaceous eugosynclinal assemblage. The Santa Cruz Mountains are predominantly composed of material formed of Cenozoic shelf and slope deposits. A thick blanket of latest Cretaceous and Tertiary clastic sedimentary rocks and isolated intrusions of serpentine covers large parts of the province.

Folds, thrust faults, steep reverse faults, and strikeslip faults developed as a consequence of Cenozoic deformations that occur very often within the province and some of them are continuing today (CDMG; 1966). Earthquake probability and faults are shown on Figure 3 of Attachment C.

Sedimentary marine strata alternating with non-marine strata record the Quaternary history of the region. The changes of the depositional environment are related to the fluctuation of sea level corresponding to the glacial and interglacial periods. Late Quaternary deposits fill the center of the Santa Clara Valley and most of the strata are of continental origin characterized as alluvial and fluvial materials. The subject site is underlain by fluvial deposits (Helley and Brabb, 1971, Rogers & Williams, 1974).

Soil Conditions

In Boring B-1, the existing driveway pavement section consists of 4.0 inches of Concrete (PCC) over 4.0 inches of Aggregate Base (AB). Below the pavement surface to a depth of 2 feet, a light tan/olive brown, damp, very stiff slit layer was encountered. This is colluvium soil. From the depths of 2 feet to the end of the boring at 15 feet, the soil became light tan, damp, hard siltstone/sandstone. A similar soil profile was encountered in other borings.

Groundwater was not encountered in the borings to the explored depth of 15 feet during the drilling operation. It should be noted that the groundwater table would fluctuate as a result of seasonal changes and hydrogeologic variations such as groundwater pumping and/or recharging. A detailed description of the soil profiles encountered is presented in Exploratory Boring Logs contained in the Appendix.

SVSE's Conclusions

The site covered by this investigation is suitable for the proposed development provided the recommendations set forth in this report are carefully followed. Based on the laboratory testing results of the near-surface soil, the soil material at the subject site has been found to have a low expansion potential for subjected to fluctuations in moisture.

Regarding grading and construction, SVSE states that the proposed residences should be supported on skin friction concrete drill pier and grade beam. The final exterior grade adjacent to the proposed structures should be such that the surface drainage will flow away from the structures. On the basis of the engineering reconnaissance and exploratory borings, it is our opinion that trenches excavated to depths less than 5 feet below the existing ground surface will not need shoring. However, for trenches or any excavation greater than 5 feet in depth, shoring will be required or excavated in accordance with OSHA guidelines. All earthwork including grading, pier drilling, foundation excavation and backfilling shall be observed and inspected by a representative from SVSE. SVSE has made specific recommendations pertaining to grading, water wells, cut and fill slopes, foundation design criteria, 2019 California Building Code seismic values, concrete slab-on-grade construction, retaining walls, excavation, drainage, and on-site utility trenching, are presented in full in Attachment C. Mitigation Measures 9 requires compliance with the SVSE report and recommendations.

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 Engineer as described in Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Silicon Valley Soil Engineering (SVSE) dated September 21, 2021.

Sources: See sources listed in this Section.

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

Discussion: Earthquake probability and faults are shown on Figure 3 of Attachment C. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 8, impact from ground shaking would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. See Section 7.a.i.

Sources: Sources listed in Section 7.a.

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

Discussion: Per the SVSE report, the site is not located in a potential liquefaction zone (CGS). Potential substantial adverse effects related to seismic-related ground failure related to differential settling, was not identified as a potential significant impact by the Project Engineer. See Section 7.a.

Sources: Sources listed in Section 7.a.

iv. Landslides?			X	
Discussion: Potential substantial adverse effects related to landslides was not identified as a potential significant impact by the Project Engineer. See Section 7.a. Sources: See sources listed in this Section.				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion? <i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i>				X
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: The project includes earthwork of 850 cubic yards (c.y.) and no proposed fill for driveway improvements, with a total area of land disturbance of over 1 acre, as the site is 45,000 sq.. ft. in size. Per Mitigation Measure 14, coverage under the State General Construction Permit will be required. 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. To prevent unauthorized/unpermitted use of fill on the subject site or other off-site properties, staff has added Mitigation Measure 10. Mitigation Measure 11 requires compliance with the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program “General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines.” Mitigation Measures 12 and 13 require implementation and monitoring of erosion control measures throughout the term of the grading permit and building permit. <u>Mitigation Measure 10:</u> 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. <u>Mitigation Measure 11:</u> 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: - 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. - 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. - Performing clearing and earth moving activities only during dry weather. - 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 12: 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 13: 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 14: The property owner shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Regional Water Quality Board to obtain coverage under the State General Construction Activity NPDES Permit. A copy of the project's NOI and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be submitted to the Current Planning Section, prior to the issuance a building permit and any land disturbance.

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 erosion and liquefaction, see discussion in Sections 7.a and 7.b, above. Landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, and collapse were not identified as potential geological concerns by the Project 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: Based on the SVSE report, the laboratory testing results of the near-surface soil show that the soil material at the subject site has been found to have a low expansion potential for subjected to fluctuations in moisture. 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: Not applicable. While the property currently uses a septic system for sewage treatment, the applicant proposes to connect to the City of Redwood City for sewer service, which require Outside Service Agreement(s) to both San Mateo LAFCo and the City of Redwood City for the proposed sewer connections for the three parcels. Source: Project plans				
7.f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
Discussion: By visual inspection, the property is evenly sloped and there does not appear to be any unique geological features at the site. Section 5 states that, while the proposed project area itself has low possibility of containing unrecorded archaeological site(s), Mitigation Measure 7 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		
Discussion: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO₂) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. 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 850 cubic yards (c.y.) and no proposed fill for driveway improvements. Excavated materials would be hauled off-site to an approved location, requiring off-haul of 850 c.y. (approximately 85 truckloads). 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 Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP), the County provides a development checklist. According to the Applicant-completed development checklist (Attachment H), the project incorporates several climate-impact reducing measures, including tree plantings to provide shade; solar photovoltaic systems; trash, recycling, and composting collection enclosures; smart water meters; outdoor electrical outlets for charging outdoor household equipment; and use of construction equipment for new development to comply with best management practices from Bay Area Air Quality Management District guidance. 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 16 in order to further reduce project-related GHG emissions. Compliance with and/or consideration of project specific development checklist measures and BAAQMD measures is required in order to reduce project-related GHG emissions. Mitigation Measure 15: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed development checklist (Attachment H) or equivalent measures, to the extent feasible. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.				

Mitigation Measure 16: 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 three new single family residences and associated driveways. 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: No such use is proposed. The project involves subdivision of a residential parcel into 3 lots and construction and operation of three single-family residences. 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 subdivision of a residential parcel into 3 lots and construction and operation of three single-family residences. Source: Project plans				

9.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
Discussion: No use involving the emission or handling of hazardous materials or waste is proposed. The project involves subdivision of a residential parcel into 3 lots and construction and operation of three single-family residences. 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 subdivision of a residential parcel into 3 lots and construction and operation of three single-family residences 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 17: All project related construction vehicle parking shall be limited to on-site areas. Should street parking be necessary, 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 not located within a designated State Responsibility Area (SRA) or Local Responsibility Area (LRA). See further discussion in Section 20, below.

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 new residences would be connected to public water system through the City of Redwood City 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: The project site is 44,721 sq. ft. (1.027 acres). The existing site impervious area is 7,384 sq. ft. The proposed site impervious area is 14,218 sq. ft., where no areas of existing paving would be retained.					

Due to the proposed increase in impervious surface area, 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 new driveway and new homes and 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.

As project impervious surface exceeds 10,000 sq. ft., the project is subject to Provision C.3 of the 2022 Municipal Regional Permit (application preceded MRP requirements effective on and after July 1, 2023), which requires stormwater treatment facilities. The project proposes on-site bioretention basins, a self-retaining area, an interceptor tree, and an infiltration trench.

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.

The project would disturb 0.9 acres. The applicant has submitted an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (see Page T-2 of Attachment B) that upon implementation would minimize erosion or siltation on- or off-site during site grading and construction. Per Mitigation Measure 18, should land disturbance equal or exceed 1 acre, a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Board to obtain coverage under the NPDES Permit is required. As proposed and mitigated, the project would have a less than significant impact relative to erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Mitigation Measure 18: Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project, a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Board, including WDID number, to obtain coverage under the NPDES Permit, shall be submitted to the Project Planner, if project land disturbance is an acre or larger.

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: With the implementation of mitigation measures as discussed in Section 10.c.i, 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. The site is not located in a flood hazard zone. 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 in a flood hazard zone, 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 project does not involve maintenance of any existing or construction of any new septic systems and includes an Outside Service Agreement(s) for three (3) sewer connections, subject to the approval of Local Agency Formation (LAFCo) and the City of Redwood City. Sources: Project plans					

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a. Physically divide an established community?			X	
Discussion: The project proposes to divide a single-family residential parcel into 3 residential parcels within an existing residential neighborhood. As further discussed in Section 11.b, development of the property with three residential parcels would not introduce land development patterns not seen in the area and, therefore, 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: While the project complies with the lot size and slope requirements of the Residential Hillside (RH) Zoning District, the proposed project density does not comply with the Low Density Residential land use designation of the County's General Plan, which allows for 0.3-2.3 dwelling units per net acre (du/ac). The project density will be 2.92 du/net ac and, therefore, the applicant proposes a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation from Low Density Residential to Medium-Low Density Residential, which allows for 2.4-6.0 du/net ac. The property is not contiguous to any County properties designated for Medium-Low Density Residential land use, however an area designated for Medium-Low Density Residential is located approximately 300 feet to the northwest, on the north side of Hillcrest Drive. Also, across Upland Road to the south, denser residential areas in the City of Redwood City are located within close proximity of the parcel. These areas are shown on a map included as Attachment F. Based on the above and the proposed change in the Land Use Designation from Low Density Residential to Medium-Low Density Residential, the project would not 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. 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 change in the Land Use Designation from Low Density Residential to Medium-Low Density Residential of the project site may result in other property owners of parcels in the area undertaking a similar change. However, Senate Bill 9 (SB9) already allows for densification of residentially-zoned parcels to allow up to four residences, subject to an on-site owner occupancy requirement. Therefore, the project would not directly serve to significantly encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas, as densification is already allowed under SB9.

Sources: Project plans; County GIS Maps

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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

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:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	

Discussion: The project would 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 Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Silicon Valley Soil Engineering dated September 21, 2021, the proposed house foundations will be drilled pier foundations, not a pile-driven pier foundations. Mitigation Measure 19 prohibits use of pile-driven pier foundations. 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
Discussion: 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 a residential parcel containing a single-family residence and improvements support this use. The project would provide two additional single-family residential units of housing. The potential displacement of residents in the existing house would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and such potential displacement would be justified by the construction of three new homes. 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?			X	
15.b. Police protection?			X	
15.c. Schools?			X	
15.d. Parks?			X	
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?			X	

Discussion: The project involves the subdivision of a single-family residential parcel into 3 new parcels. 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.

Regarding sewer and water service, the project would build 3 new single-family residences, and connect the 3 new parcels to a public sewer and water system (property is not currently located in a sewer or water district). An Outside Service Agreement(s) for three (3) sewer and two (2) water connections (existing house has a water connection) is required and subject to the approval of Local Agency Formation (LAFCo) and the City of Redwood City. The approval of an Outside Service Agreement(s) and compliance with utility provider requirements associated with such agreement would minimize substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of sewer and water services to the property.

Regarding impacts to park services, the applicant is required by current regulation to pay an in-lieu park fee for the additional 2 parcels to off-set intensified park use related to the project.

Regarding impacts to school services, the applicant is required by current regulation to pay school impact fees at the time of the construction of the new residences to off-set intensified school use related to the project.

Sources: Project plans

16. RECREATION. Would the project:

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

Discussion: The project involves the subdivision of a single-family residential parcel into 3 new parcels. Regarding impacts to park services, the applicant is required by current regulation to pay an in-lieu park fee for the additional 2 parcels to off-set intensified park use related to the project. Therefore, the project would not 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.

Sources: Project plans

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

Discussion: The project does not include recreational facilities, nor would it directly result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. See discussion in Section 16.a above.

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 subdivision of a single-family residential parcel into 3 new parcels and would result in a temporary increase in traffic levels during construction and a negligible permanent increase in traffic levels after construction. The private development is located on an existing County-maintained public road within an existing residential neighborhood and would provide 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) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts</i> ?			X	
<i>Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.</i> Discussion: CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts</i>, 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 subdivision of a single-family residential parcel into 3 new parcels and the construction of three new single-family residences 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 private driveway accessed from Upland Road. The configuration of the driveway relative to Upland Road would not change. The applicant has performed a sight distance study dated July 14, 2023 (Attachment G) that was reviewed and approved by the Department of Public Works and shows that there are no sight distance hazards associated with the driveway location.

Sources: Project plans

17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

X

Discussion: The private development is located on an existing County-maintained public road within an existing residential neighborhood and would provide adequate on-site parking. Street parking which may narrow the road clearance would not be needed to meet parking requirements. Additionally, Mitigation Measure 17 limits project construction-related street parking. The project was reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Department of Public Works and the San Mateo County Fire Department. Therefore, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Sources: Project plans

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				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: The applicant has submitted a Historical and Architectural Evaluation for the property, dated March 13, 2022, prepared by Bonnie Bamburg of Urban Programmers (Attachment D3). The following discussion is contained in the Historical and Architectural Evaluation.

Historical Context

The development of the Highlands of Emerald Lake contained several subdivisions, including the Oak Knoll Manor, which preceded several of the Emerald Lake and Emerald Lake Hills developments. Emerald Lake Hills 1, or Lower Emerald Hills, was the first to be developed and sold reasonably well. In 1927, the owners established Emerald Lake Country Club, a mutual benefit corporation, and purchased the lake with plans for adding stables, a bar, laundry, hospital, and undertaker, amenities which were never developed. Without control of the attraction and amenity to spur sales, the subdivision sales appeared to slump. The Leonard and Holt Company moved their development to the upper hills, where they dammed a creek and constructed a second lake. Here they proposed 3,000 home sites around Emerald Lake Hills 2. Following WWII, the Bay Area experienced a population explosion. The educational opportunities brought veterans with the GI Bill to study at Stanford University, the University of California, State Colleges, and community colleges. Often these returning students brought families with them and needed housing. At the same time, the new "high-tech" companies that started during the war were adapting to more general products and were hiring from all over the world. Established subdivisions were again recognized as attractive places for families who wanted a more rural or rustic lifestyle.

History of the Property

The subject property is part of the 2,000 acres sold by William Carey Jones to Horace Hawes in 1857. Hawes constructed a house (currently the location of Sequoia High School) and named the land Redwood Fran. Prior to moving to San Mateo County, he lived in San Francisco, where he held a number of civic positions, including being the California Assemblymember who introduced the Consolidation Act, which created the City and County of San Francisco (1856). The remaining land to the south became San Mateo County (1857). After his death in 1872, the land was distributed to his two children and wife. The subject parcel was part of that sold to Moses Hopkins c. 1880. Moses was the brother of Mark Hopkins (Big Four investors in the Central Pacific Railroad, Mark Hopkins, Leland Stanford, Charles Crocker, and Porter Huntington). During this period, the area may have been used for grazing, particularly as cattle were moved from the coast to the rails or slaughterhouses in the north county and for the thoroughbred horses raised by Moses Hopkins. In 1902, the 2,000 acres were sold to cement magnate William J. Dingee, who remodeled the house and created Dingee Park. The 1906 earthquake destroyed the house and structures on the site. The next owner was San Francisco Architect, Albert Pissis, and his wife, Georgia. No structures were constructed on the subject lot, and there is no visible evidence of past owners prior to 1920, when the land was further subdivided. Constructed c. 1920, the "country cabin" was a second home for Zerah Y. Howard and Florence Carthew Howard, who purchased the property in 1919. Zerah Yates Howard was born in San Francisco in 1876, and it appears he was educated locally. A resident of San Francisco in 1896, he was a clerk living at 120 Palm Avenue- a family residence he maintained until the 1930s. His career progressed to a purchasing agent (shipping) for the Hakalau Plantation Corporation in the 1920s. By 1927, Zerah is listed in the Voter Registration records as living in Redwood City (likely on Upton Road). The 1928-30 Voter Rolls show him living on Upland Road, and within a year, he retired. However, he went back to work as the Vice President of Welch and Company. In 1933 he applied for membership in the Sons of the Revolution and was accepted. The couple was active in civic and social activities including the IOOF Lodge. He passed away on December 24, 1942. The property was transferred to Florence in February 1944. Florence was born in England in 1874 and became a naturalized American Citizen. The San Mateo newspapers carried many articles describing social and religious activities where Florence participated. She continued to live in the house on Upland Road and worked at the Redwood Medical Clinic for several years. She passed away in 1968. The next owners of the property were Guy Collingwood and Georgina B. Collingwood, who owned the property until selling it in 1974 to Robert Eugene Roller and Gail Nadine Roller. Robert and Gail Roller were police officers in San Mateo. Gail was the first female officer to be hired in San Mateo. Prior to being accepted in San Mateo, she was a "meter maid" for

two years and had worked with the San Mateo County Sheriff and spent two years in the Oakland Police Department. In 1976, when she became pregnant, the Police Department fired her. She appealed to the City Council to be reinstated, but her appeal was denied. A suit in U.S. District Court found that although disabled male officers were given inside positions, she was not eligible, and thus, she was not discriminated against due to pregnancy. She then filed a suit under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The couple divorced in 1979. It appears Gail continued to live in the house until 1984 when it was sold to Marco A. Casazza and Janice Casazza. Robert Roller continued as a San Mateo Police officer. When the Casazza's purchased the property, Marco was employed as an electrician, a position he held until he retired. The property was sold in 2022.

Description of the property and buildings

The property is located at the bend in Upland Road with the house set back from the street. A small cottage and shed are on the property. The house building is an irregular form with two rectangular sections, one in front and to the side of the other. Originally a "cabin" style building, it has been enlarged and altered, reflecting a Craftsman vernacular style throughout the additions. The side rear section steps up the slightly sloping site. The building has many recycled elements, including art glass windows. The end facing the street is a gable with the garage under the living space. The garage has double-hinged doors in panel style with three-over-three panes in the top section. A similar six-pane window is on the side. The second story has a pair of similar windows and a single one offset in the wall. All windows have plain board frames. Siding on the lower level is vertical board with horizontal in the upper section. The roof has a plain fascia with exposed rafters beneath and knee braces in the peak and at each end of the wall. The side of the garage element is similar, with multi-pane windows and a single door. A path leads to the main entrance that is set back on the side atop a stair where a former porch has been enclosed, and the entry door is now flush with the wall. The façade is open lattice panels at the ground level and solid panels above, with five nine-pane windows extending the length of the wall beneath the header. On the other side of the building, a large deck has been added to blend the two sections together. The building wall has a wide French-style door, a single door, and a multi-pane window off the deck. Art glass, flowering windows c. 1950 are grouped along a former porch and are the most interesting aspects of the design.

In summary, the building is in good condition and has been extensively altered by the addition of non-original materials, replacing the windows with art glass from a different period as well as various other modifications that have changed the character of the original design.

The small cottage is a vernacular form wood frame, side-facing gable style building c. 1970 (no permits were found).

Evaluation of Significance

For purposes of this study, the criteria used to evaluate the significance of potential historical resources is that of the California Register of Historical Resources and the San Mateo County Criteria for the Designation of County Historic Landmarks and Historic Districts (Section 7732).

The San Mateo County Criteria contains five categories:

- 7732.1 It exemplifies or reflects elements of the County's cultural, Social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering or architectural history; or
- 7732.2 It has special aesthetic or artistic interests or values; or
- 7732.3 It is identified with persons or events significant in local, State or national history; or
- 7732.4 It embodies distinctive architectural characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials of craftsmanship; or

- 7732.5 It is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, or architect.

While the categories do not specifically address the integrity of a historic resource, it is necessary to first consider integrity to evaluate potential resources. The California Register of Historical Resources defines integrity as the majority of seven aspects: location, design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, and association. A resource must be able to communicate the reason for its significance.

The property at 890 Upland Road is associated with the 1920-1940 period of expansion and industrialization that swept the Bay Area after WWI. The wealth of the early 1920s led to a trend for summer homes for San Franciscans who came down the peninsula to escape the summer fog and chill of San Francisco. Subdivisions of large and small parcels were recorded, some with recreational amenities, others just a small lot for a cabin. The subject property was part of this trend in the Oak Knoll Manor subdivision, which had 3,000 home sites. The style and design were originally basic wood frame in a vernacular style, with board siding window of multi-pane sash. Since the original construction, the building has had extensive alterations. From the exterior, the original design is present only on two sides of the front element of the building. Original materials in the roof, brackets design, and materials of the buildings and property have been compromised, negatively affecting the integrity.

The property does not exemplify elements of the County's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, or architectural history. It is a remnant of a recreational subdivision of second homes that was not successful. Developments of this type were conceived for lower Emerald Hills and the nearby communities where the summer weather was warmer than in San Francisco (7732.1).

The main house is a mix of elements and materials, including the addition of art glass windows. However, it does not exceed to the level of special aesthetic or artistic interests or values (7732.2).

The property was part of the trend for subdivisions of second homes that occurred after WWI. This association is within a broad category of real estate subdivisions in the 1920s and is not directly associated with persons or events that were significant in local, State, or national history (7732.3).

As stated above, the main building on the property does not embody distinctive architectural characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction and is not a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials of craftsmanship. The vernacular design of the original structure has been extensively altered by different materials and systems, leaving only a section of the original (7732.4).

The architect was not identified; however, the alterations to the building have so changed the original design that the architect can no longer be identified with the building (7732.5).

In summary, the property at 890 Upland Road, when compared to the criteria of San Mateo County, does not appear to meet the level of original design or significant associations required to be recommended for a County Landmark. 4

California Register of Historical Resources

The criteria for listing historical resources in the California Register of Historical Resources are consistent with those for listing resources in the National Register of Historic Places but have been modified for state use in order to include a range of historical resources that better reflect the history of California. The California Register eligibility or listing is the threshold for CEQA to consider a resource significant. A historical resource must retain integrity and be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following four criteria:

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history;
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values; or
4. It has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

In addition, the resource must retain enough of its historic character or appearance to be recognizable as a historic property and to convey the reason for its significance. The subject property has diminished integrity due to the alterations.

Criteria 1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States. The single-family residence is not associated with an event that contributed significantly to local or regional history or cultural heritage.

Criteria 2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history. The history of the property does not show a direct and significant association with persons important to the history of San Mateo County, the State of California, or the nation.

Criteria 3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values. The subject building represents a vernacular style that has been modified with additions and alterations. The building does not exhibit significant characteristics that possess high artistic style or values that would be important to the local history or to the State. Thus, the property does not appear eligible for individual listing in the California Register under Criteria 3.

Criteria 4. It has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nations. During the excavation and development for residential use, the native soils have been disturbed to construct foundations for the house, driveway, and small orchard. It is unlikely that significant information important to prehistory or history would be found on this site.

The property at 890 Upland Road does not meet the criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources.

On March 15, 2023, after review of the Historical and Architectural Evaluation prepared by Urban Programmers for the subject property, the County Historical Review Advisory Board (HRAB) found that the house and other structures at the property are not architecturally or historically significant. HRAB found that the structures could be demolished with the following stipulations:

- 1) Photograph (with high resolution camera) the exterior and interior of the house and outbuildings.
- 2) Salvage and save special elements such as art glass windows, redwood beams, built ins, and the like.

Staff has added Mitigation Measure 20 to require the owner to comply with HRAB's stipulations for demolition of the existing structures:

Mitigation Measure 20: Prior to issuance of a demolition permit for the house and outbuildings, the owner shall provide evidence of having complied with HRAB's stipulations for demolition of the existing structures:

- a. Photograph (with high resolution camera) the exterior and interior of the house and outbuildings. Such photos shall be provided to the County Historical Review Advisory Board.
- b. Salvage and save special elements such as art glass windows, redwood beams, built ins, and the like.

Source: Historical and Architectural Evaluation for the property, dated March 13, 2022, prepared by Bonnie Bamburg of Urban Programmers.

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

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 D2). Planning staff has consulted with the following tribes, as identified by the 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 Wukwasche Indian Tribe/Eschom Valley Band, and

On September 5 and 13, 2023, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment within 30 days of the letter date. 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 21: 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 22: 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 23: 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
Discussion: The project is required to demonstrate compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3 of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Permit, which require the construction of new on-site stormwater treatment measures to reduce stormwater runoff and associated negative environmental impacts. The applicant proposes to connect to the City of Redwood City for water and sewer service to the project, which requires an Outside Service Agreement(s) subject to the approval of Local Agency Formation (LAFCo). City of Redwood City staff have reviewed the project plans and the project will be subject to service requirements. Therefore, the project would not directly require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities, nor electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. 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 City of Redwood City for water and sewer services; City of Redwood City staff have reviewed the project plans, have service capacity to serve the project, 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: Please see discussion in Sections 19.a and b, above. Source: Project Plans				
19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the				X

capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
Discussion: The project involves the construction of three single-family residences 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 three single-family residences 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
Discussion: The project site is not located within a designated Local Responsibility Area (LRA) or State Responsibility Area (SRA), but is located less than 100 feet east of a Very High fire hazard severity zone LRA. 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 moderately 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				X

result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
Discussion: The project would not require any new roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities. The site is located along an existing publicly-maintained road. Also, new electrical lines 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.				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
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			X	

other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				
Discussion: The project involves the subdivision of a single-family residential parcel into 3 new parcels and construction and operation of three single-family residences within an existing residential neighborhood. Due to the infill nature of the proposed residential construction, proposed connection to sewer and water service in the area, and the proposed General Plan Amendment and subdivision potential allowed under Senate Bill 9, 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: Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)	X		Outside Service Agreement for Water and Sewer Service
National Marine Fisheries Service		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
Sewer/Water District: MWSD		X	
State Department of Fish and Wildlife		X	

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
State Department of Public Health		X	
State Water Resources Control Board		X	

<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed (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: <u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> 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: - All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. - All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. - 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. - All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. - 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. - 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. - 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. - 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. - Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously). <u>Mitigation Measure 2:</u> 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 3: A pre-construction, migratory bird nesting survey shall be conducted prior to any proposed tree removal, ground disturbance, demolition, or any other 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 4: The owner shall comply with the following requirements pertaining to the heritage tree and 6 significant trees proposed for removal:

- e. The issuance of a tree removal permit for Trees #3 and 26 will be conditioned on an issued building permit for homes on the subdivided parcels where the trees are located (Lots 1 and 2, respectively), and replacement as specified. Replacement for Tree #3 shall be 2 - 48" box Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*), and replacement for Tree #26 shall be 1 - 36" box Valley Oak (*Quercus lobata*). Location of replacement trees for Trees #3 and #26 are shown in Attachment E3, except that the County Arborist has required the applicant to move the replacement tree shown on Lot 3 at least 6 feet from exterior property line. Replacement trees shall be planted prior to final approval of building permits for homes on the proposed lots.
- f. The owner shall maintain and protect Tree #45 (13.6" d.b.h Coast Live Oak), as it does not conflict with subdivision improvements nor is in poor health. The tree may be proposed for removal at the time of the development, subject to County review and approval along with home construction on Lot 3.
- g. The issuance of a tree removal permit for the other 4 significant trees shall be conditioned on an issued building permit for subdivision improvements. These trees shall be replaced in a manner consistent with Section 6565.21. Replacement trees shall be planted prior to final approval of building permits for homes on the proposed lots.
- h. All replacement trees shall be shown on a landscape plan submitted prior to recordation of the subdivision map.

Mitigation Measure 5: Prior to issuance of a building permit for subdivision improvements and residential development, the applicant shall protect all significant trees which are not approved for removal, including submittal of a tree protection plan, as prepared by a certified arborist and consistent with the protection measures of the County's Significant Tree Regulations and County Arborist, as listed below. Tree protection measures shall also be shown on the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan.

- c. A root barrier shall be required at the existing driveway during driveway improvement construction for the Pistache and Oak trees along driveway. The Project Arborist shall prepare root barrier details to be submitted at the time of a building permit application for subdivision improvements, subject to review by the County Arborist.

- d. Identify, establish, and maintain tree protection zones throughout the entire duration of the project.
- c. Isolate tree protection zones using 5-ft. tall, orange plastic fencing supported by poles pounded into the ground, located at the driplines as described in the arborist's report.
- d. Maintain tree protection zones free of equipment and materials storage; contractors shall not clean any tools, forms, or equipment within these areas.
- e. If any large roots or large masses of roots need to be cut, the roots shall be inspected by a certified arborist or registered forester prior to cutting as required in the arborist's report. Any root cutting shall be undertaken by an arborist or forester and documented. Roots to be cut shall be severed cleanly with a saw or topers. A tree protection verification letter from the certified arborist shall be submitted to the Planning Department within five (5) business days from the site inspection following root cutting.
- f. Normal irrigation shall be maintained, but oaks shall not need summer irrigation, unless the arborist's report directs specific watering measures to protect trees.
- g. Street tree trunks and other trees not protected by dripline fencing shall be wrapped with straw wattles, orange fence, and 2x4 boards in concentric layers to a height of eight feet.
- h. Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit, the Planning and Building Department shall complete a pre-construction site inspection, as necessary, to verify that all required tree protection and erosion control measures are in place.

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 Engineer as described in Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Silicon Valley Soil Engineering (SVSE) dated September 21, 2021.

Mitigation Measure 10: 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 11: 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 12: 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 13: 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 14: The property owner shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Regional Water Quality Board to obtain coverage under the State General Construction Activity NPDES Permit. A copy of the project's NOI and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be submitted to the Current Planning Section, prior to the issuance a building permit and any land disturbance.

Mitigation Measure 15: At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed development checklist (Attachment H) or equivalent measures, to the extent feasible. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

Mitigation Measure 16: 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 17: All project related construction vehicle parking shall be limited to on-site areas. Should street parking be necessary, 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 18: Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the project, a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Board, including WDID number, to obtain

coverage under the NPDES Permit, shall be submitted to the Project Planner, if project land disturbance is an acre or larger.

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

Mitigation Measure 20: Prior to issuance of a demolition permit for the house and outbuildings, the owner shall provide evidence of having complied with HRAB's stipulations for demolition of the existing structures:

- a. Photograph (with high resolution camera) the exterior and interior of the house and outbuildings. Such photos shall be provided to the County Historical Review Advisory Board.
- b. Salvage and save special elements such as art glass windows, redwood beams, built ins, and the like.

Mitigation Measure 21: 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 22: 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 23: 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)

October 19, 2023

Camille Leung, Project Planner

Date

(Title)

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Silicon Valley Soil Engineering dated September 21, 2021.
- D. Cultural Resource Letters
 - 1. Letter from California Historical Resources Information System, dated February 20, 2023.
 - 2. Letter from Native American Heritage Council (NAHC), dated September 8, 2023
 - 3. Historical and Architectural Evaluation for the property, prepared by Bonnie Bamburg of Urban Programmers, dated March 13, 2022.
- E. Trees:
 - 1. Arborist Report by Jeremy Ingalls, Certified Arborist, dated February 8, 2022
 - 2. Arborist Report re: 2 Valley Oaks at front of property, by Jeremy Ingalls, Certified Arborist, dated January 25, 2023
 - 3. Map showing location of replacement trees for Trees #3 and #26
- F. Land Use Designations Map
- G. Sight distance study dated July 14, 2023
- H. EECAP Development Checklist