


San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Meeting

Owner/Applicant:

Attachment:

File Numbers:



San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Meeting

Owner/Applicant: _____

Attachment: _____

File Numbers: _____



County of San Mateo

Planning & Building Department

455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, California 94063
650/363-4161 Fax: 650/363-4849

Mail Drop PLN122

plngbldg@smcgov.org

www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/planning

October 3, 2013

Mr. Roger Benson
4156 Vineyard Avenue
Pleasanton, CA 94566

Dear Mr. Benson:

SUBJECT: Summary of Comments and Questions Received at a Public Workshop
Held on September 18, 2013 for a Proposal to Rezone a Parcel
From R-1 to R-3 and to Change its General Plan (GP) Designation
From "Medium Density Residential" to "High Density Residential"
Located at 1811 Woodside Road in the unincorporated Sequoia Tract
Area of San Mateo County (APN: 069-261-440)

County File Number PLN 2013-00259

Thank you for your participation in the public workshop held on September 18, 2013. The information and comments exchanged were invaluable in fostering an understanding of the concerns of the surrounding community. The purpose of this letter is to summarize the comments received at the workshop and include additional comments received from other reviewing agencies and interested parties.

Public's Key Comments and Responses

Besides those representing the project, there were three neighbors in attendance at the Workshop. All three attending residents from the area expressed concerns over anticipated spillover parking (be it from tenants as well as guests) as generated from this development, pursuant to the plans they saw. They indicated that a spillover of off-site parking is already occurring from the many other apartment developments along that side of Woodside Road (whether in unincorporated or Redwood City limits area), generating parking onto Woodside Road and down along the side streets (i.e., Cerrito, Santiago, and Santa Clara Avenues). In response to this, looking at the project site plan, the applicant suggested they could add two additional spaces to that area of the rear yard on the site. This would exceed what the parking regulations require, eliminate the need for an Off-Street Parking Exception, resulting in the provision for two full, on-site spaces per unit (more realistic per the neighbors' thoughts on what 11 apartments would generate). However, whether or not the provision of two additional spaces would resolve the heightened and realistic need for visitor parking that a

development of this density would generate is unknown, as well as beyond what the parking regulations require.

See Planning's broader comments below about the submitted project's compliance with County Parking Regulations, as well as whether or not the formal application needs to include specific development plans.

Comments From Other Reviewing Agencies

To date, Staff has received tentative comments from the following agencies:

County Planning Department

The Need to Include Project Plans with Rezoning Application. As noted at the meeting, this proposal will require a Rezoning and General Plan (GP) Amendment. An important point to make is that while the applicant included in his proposal plans for the cited 3-story, 11-unit apartment building, it is not a requirement that the applicant include those plans with the formal rezoning and GP application. Unless the proposed rezoning was to "Planned Unit Development" (PUD), an applicant is otherwise allowed to propose such changes to a parcel's zoning and GP designation without accompanying plans detailing the applicant's actual proposal for development should their request be subsequently approved. In the event the proposed Rezoning/GP Amendment were approved (albeit with no specific plans), the applicant could then submit plans (in conjunction with a building permit application) directly to the Building Inspection Section. From a zoning perspective at that point, if the plans complied with the newly adopted R-3/S-1 Zoning District and other zoning regulations applicable to that parcel (i.e., Parking), the County's review would be ministerial and not subject to any further public review.

Project Plans Compliance with R-3 Zoning and Parking Regulations. That said, leading up and including the workshop that is the subject of this letter, the applicant did submit for review the cited plans for the apartment building as described. Preliminarily, Planning has reviewed those plans against the R-3/S-1 Zoning Regulations (the most likely rezoning the applicant would likely apply for, relative to required setbacks, lot coverage and building height), and found them compliant with both those regulations and the County Parking Regulations, except for two of the spaces being slightly substandard in size. Specifically, the parking regulations require 16 covered spaces and 2 on-site visitor parking spaces, calculated as follows:

One (1 bedroom) unit (accessible unit located on ground floor): $1 \times 1.2 = 1.2$ spaces

Ten (2 bedroom) units: $10 \times 1.5 = 15$ spaces

TOTAL: 16 spaces required (all covered) plus 2 uncovered visitor spaces.

The project plans included 18 covered spaces (all located on the ground floor, although three of those are compact spaces, thus requiring an Off-Street Parking Exception) and 1 uncovered space (considered an additional visitor parking).

Affordable Housing Requirement. The project development (assuming apartments) would be subject to Inclusionary Ordinance for affordable housing. At 11 units, 20% will have to be reserved as affordable (2 units), one of which will be reserved for "very low" and the second for "low" income.

County Building Inspection Section

While Building's comments were directed at that point where the project building permit was submitted, they are still provided for preview as follows:

This is a preliminary review only. When this design is submitted for a building permit, there may be more requirements according to the actual design being submitted for a building permit. This review is neither permission nor approval for final plan check for a permit. For a building permit, please provide the following:

1. Prior to pouring any concrete for foundations, written verification from a licensed surveyor must be submitted which will confirm that the required setbacks as shown on the approved plans have been maintained.
2. An automatic fire sprinkler system will be required. The fire sprinkler permit must be issued prior to or in conjunction with the building permit.
3. If a water main extension, upgrade or hydrant is required, this work must be completed prior to the issuance of the building permit, or the applicant must submit a copy of an agreement and contract with the water purveyor which will confirm that the work will be completed prior to finalization of the building permit.
4. A site drainage plan will be required. This plan must demonstrate how roof drainage and site runoff will be directed to an approved disposal area.
5. Sediment and erosion control measures must be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of the permit. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until the corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time.
6. This project must comply with the Green Building Ordinance.
7. All drawings must be drawn to scale and clearly define the whole project.
8. Please call out the right codes on the code summary:

The design and/or drawings shall be done according to the 2010 Editions of the California Building Standards Code, the 2010 California Plumbing Code, the 2010 California Mechanical Code, and the 2010 California Electrical Code.

9. This project shall meet all the accessible requirements in the most current California Building Code(s), accessible parking, number of accessible units, accessible path from the right-of-way to the accessible parking, and an accessible route to any accessible units. Provide details of all accessible units and the accessible requirements within these units on the plans when you apply for a building permit.

County Geotechnical Engineer

This project will require a geotechnical study before either grading or building permits can be issued. A general site conditions report will be required at the time of the cited Planning application.

County Department of Public Works

While the Department of Public Works' comments were directed at that point where the project building permit was submitted (if project plans are not included with the Rezoning/GP Amendment, these requirements would not be applicable until such time as building plans are submitted), they are still provided for preview as follows:

1. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, the applicant will be required to provide payment of "roadway mitigation fees" based on the square footage (assessable space) of the proposed building per Ordinance #3277.
2. No proposed construction work within the Cal Trans right-of-way shall begin until Cal Trans requirements for the issuance of an encroachment permit, including review of the plans, have been met and an encroachment permit issued.
3. The applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan in compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and NPDES requirements for review and approval by the Department of Public Works.
4. The applicant shall have prepared, by a registered civil engineer, a drainage analysis of the proposed project and submit it to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. The drainage analysis shall consist of a written narrative and a plan. The flow of the stormwater onto, over, and off of the property shall be detailed on the plan and shall include adjacent lands as appropriate to clearly depict the pattern of flow. The analysis shall detail the measures necessary to certify adequate drainage. Post-development flows and velocities shall not exceed those that existed in the pre-developed state. Recommended measures shall be

designed and included in the improvement plans and submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval.

5. The applicant shall submit a driveway "Plan and Profile," to the Department of Public Works, showing the driveway access to the parcel (garage slab) complying with County Standards for driveway slopes (not to exceed 20%) and to County Standards for driveways (at the property line) being the same elevation as the center of the access roadway. When appropriate, this plan and profile shall be prepared from elevations and alignment shown on the roadway improvement plans. The driveway plan shall also include and show specific provisions and details for both the existing and the proposed drainage patterns and drainage facilities.

County Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District

Mark Chow (of this District) responded that, while plans would be required and the proposed connection would be allowed assuming all associated fees are paid, they would state that "project could result in an increase of sewage flow which could be of considerable impact to the private sewer line and the Sewer District's facilities downstream of the project site, thus, the applicant shall perform a capacity analysis of the additional sewage anticipated by the apartment building and delivered into sewer facilities to determine whether the private sewer line and the Sewer District facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate the increased flow." This would have to occur prior to the Department of Public Works' approval of the associated building plans.

California Water Service Company

Marty Roberts (of this District) responded back with: "Backflow devices on all services - Domestic and Fire."

Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)

Given that the parcel is adjacent to the City of Redwood City on one side and the roadway fronting is Redwood City, it is recommended that the applicant exhaust the possibility of annexation to the City of Redwood City. This is consistent with LAFCo law & policy and with the County's General Plan. It is high density housing that the City is better suited to serve as a full service city. Annexation would require detachment from the County governed districts and Menlo Park Fire District. Annexation would be consistent with the LAFCo adopted sphere & LAFCo and County policies supporting annexation of areas requiring a full level of municipal service.

To this issue, staff has referred the project to the City of Redwood City's Planning Manager, since it is dependent upon the City to both express interest in and to initiate the process for annexation. However, as of the date of this letter, the County has received no comments from the City.

Other Agency Review

Referrals for this Pre-Application were also sent to The Committee for Green Foothills, the Menlo Park Fire Protection District and the City of Redwood City. While no comments were received, these entities will be notified in the future upon such time when the formal application is submitted; such notice will also occur upon circulation of the subsequent environmental document as well as for all public hearing agendas.

Before submittal of the formal application, including all plans and materials cited earlier in this letter, please consider the comments discussed above. If you have any questions regarding this summary or need assistance with application requirements, please feel free to contact me at 650/363-1837.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Holbrook', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David Holbrook, Senior Planner

DJH:jlh – DJHX0694_WJN.DOCX

cc: Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission
Jim Eggemeyer, Community Development Director
Steve Monowitz, Deputy Community Development Director
Planning Manager, City of Redwood City

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et seq.), that the following project: Rezoning, when adopted and implemented, will not have a significant impact on the environment.

FILE NO.: PLN 2013-00482

OWNER: James and Diane Chesler

APPLICANT: James Chesler

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 069-261-440

LOCATION: 1811/1813 Woodside Road, Unincorporated Redwood City (Sequoia Tract)

FILED ENDORSED
IN THE OFFICE OF THE
COUNTY CLERK RECORDER OF
SAN MATEO COUNTY CALIF

JUN 25 2014

By MARK CHURCH, County Clerk
VERONICA MADRID
DEPUTY CLERK

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Rezone the subject parcel from single-family residential (R-1) to multiple-family residential (R-3) zoning and amend the General Plan designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential to allow for the future construction of a new apartment complex.

While the project does not include a development proposal, the applicant tentatively intends to demolish the existing development and construct an apartment complex. The proposed zoning and density changes would allow for an 11-unit apartment complex.

FINDINGS AND BASIS FOR A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Current Planning Section has reviewed the initial study for the project and, based upon substantial evidence in the record, finds that:

1. The project will not adversely affect water or air quality or increase noise levels substantially.
2. The project will not have adverse impacts on the flora or fauna of the area.
3. The project will not degrade the aesthetic quality of the area.
4. The project will not have adverse impacts on traffic or land use.
5. In addition, the project will not:
 - a. Create impacts which have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.
 - b. Create impacts which achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

- c. Create impacts for a project which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- d. Create environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The County of San Mateo has, therefore, determined that the environmental impact of the project is insignificant.

MITIGATION MEASURES included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects:

Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities:

- a. Water all active construction and grading areas at least twice daily.
- b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- c. ~~Apply water two times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at the project site.~~
- d. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets/roads.
- e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to commencement of the project, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

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

- d. Within five days of clearing or inactivity, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative best management practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two weeks of seeding/planting.
- e. Project site entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and control dust.
- f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 feet from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- ~~i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.~~
- j. Install storm drain inlet protection that traps sediment before it enters any adjacent storm sewer systems. This barrier shall consist of filter fabric, straw bales, gravel, or sand bags.
- k. Install sediment traps/basins at outlets of diversions, channels, slope drains, or other runoff conveyances that discharge sediment-laden water. Sediment traps/basins shall be cleaned out when 50% full (by volume).
- l. Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acre or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.
- m. Utilize coir fabric/netting on sloped graded areas to provide a reduction in water velocity, erosive areas, habitat protection, and topsoil stabilization.
- n. Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved Erosion Control Plan.

Mitigation Measure 3: The applicant shall implement the following basic construction measures at all times:

- a. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxic Control Measure, Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

- b. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
- c. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person, or his/her designee, shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Mitigation Measure 4: All grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project shall be limited from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. Construction activities will be prohibited on Sunday and any nationally observed holiday. Noise levels produced by construction activities shall not exceed the 80-dBA level at any one moment.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY CONSULTATION

None.

INITIAL STUDY


The San Mateo County Current Planning Section has reviewed the Environmental Evaluation of this project and has found that the probable environmental impacts are insignificant. A copy of the initial study is attached.

REVIEW PERIOD: June 25, 2014 to July 15, 2014

All comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this Negative Declaration must be received by the County Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, no later than **5:00 p.m., July 15, 2014.**

CONTACT PERSON

Angela Chavez, Project Planner
Telephone 650/599-7217


Angela Chavez, Project Planner

ACC:fc – ACCY0529_WFH.DOCX
FRM00013(click).doc
(1/11/07)

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Rezoning
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2013-00482
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department
455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Angela Chavez, 650/599-7217
5. **Project Location:** 1811/1813 Woodside Road, Sequoia Tract (Redwood City)
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 069-261-440; 14,564 sq. ft.
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** James Chesler
626 Eastview Way, Redwood City, CA 94062
8. **General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential Urban
9. **Zoning:** R-1/S-74 (Single-Family Residential/Sequoia Tract)
10. **Description of the Project:** Rezone the subject parcel from single-family residential (R-1) to multiple-family residential (R-3) zoning and amend the General Plan designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential to allow for the future construction of a new apartment complex.

While the project does not include a development proposal, the applicant tentatively intends to demolish the existing development and construct an apartment complex. The proposed zoning and density changes would allow for an 11-unit apartment complex.
11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is accessed directly from Woodside Road (State Route 84), a 4-lane roadway. The property is located approximately 1.4 miles east from Interstate 280 and 1.7 miles west of the intersection of El Camino Real (Highway 82) and Woodside Road. The property is bordered by a commercial use to the east, multiple-family residential development to the west, and single-family residential development to the north and south. The project parcel is currently developed with a single-family residence, a second dwelling unit, and a detached garage.
12. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

- b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
 7. Supporting Information Sources. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1.a. Have a significant adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within an area that has a scenic vista. The area in and around the parcel is highly urbanized and developed with varying levels of density. Given this, the development of this site poses no adverse impacts on a scenic vista or views from residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
1.b. Significantly damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within a state scenic highway. In addition, there are no buildings of historical significance or rock outcroppings located on the property.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.</p>				
1.c. Significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline?				X

<p>Discussion: The project and eventual construction on the subject parcel do not include any significant change to the topography, ground surface relief features, or result in development on a ridge.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
1.d.	Create a new source of significant light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X
<p>Discussion: Given the urbanized nature of the surrounding area, the project and future development of the subject parcel are not expected to create a new source of significant light and/or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
1.e.	Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?			X
<p>Discussion: The subject parcel is not located in either a Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
1.f.	If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?			X
<p>Discussion: Project parcel is not located within a Design Review District.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, San Mateo County General Plan.</p>				
1.g.	Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?			X
<p>Discussion: Please refer to the discussion under 1.a, 1.b, and 1.c, above.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.</p>				

2.	<p>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:</p>			
----	--	--	--	--

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a. For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. A review of the State of California Department of Conservation California Important Farmland Finder classifies the subject parcel as Other Land. The parcel is currently utilized for residential uses and the proposed project does not introduce any new or converted uses.</p> <p>Source: United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service, California Department of Conservation.</p>				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not zoned for agriculture, protected by an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, San Mateo County General Plan, San Mateo County Williamson Act Contracts.</p>				
2.c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in an area identified as Farmland or is necessarily suitable for agricultural activities. Further, the project site is not considered forestland given the urbanized nature of the area.</p> <p>Source: United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service Forest Inventory Analysis 2005, Project Proposal.</p>				
2.d. For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X

Discussion: The project parcel is not located within the Coastal Zone. Source: Project Location.				
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			X
Discussion: The project parcel has not been identified as containing agricultural lands. The project site is classified as urban land. Given the size of the parcel and the urbanized nature of the area, there is no damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land associated with this project. Source: United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service.				
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))?			X
<i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>				
Discussion: The project will result in an increase in the allowable density of development but will continue the designated use of the property as residential. In addition, the project parcel is not located in an area identified as forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned for timberland production. Source: Project Proposal, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.				

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 rezoning of the property will not conflict or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan. Emissions occurring during and after construction and for the life of the development are minimal. Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District.					
3.b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X

Discussion: There are ten sites within one mile of the project site that have been identified as stationary sources which present risks and hazards to the surrounding area. The rezoning itself will not violate any air quality standard or contribute significantly to the existing or projected air quality issues.

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

3.c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

X

Discussion: As of December 2012, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. However, the project does not contribute to an increase in emissions. Given that PM-2.5 is a typical vehicle emission (i.e., construction trucks/diesel equipment), a temporary PM increase in the project area would be anticipated during any future construction. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations reduce the potential effects to a less than a significant impact.

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

3.d. Expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by BAAQMD?

X

Discussion: The project is not expected to result in significant pollutant concentrations. While future construction may result in temporary emissions, the best management practices required through the issuance of a building permit would ensure that impacts are minimized to a less than significant impact. While there are identified sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of the project area (e.g., nursing homes), the temporary nature of construction is not expected to significantly increase pollutant concentrations. Further, there are no identified species of special concern located within the project area.

Source: Project Proposal, Google Maps, California Natural Diversity Database.

3.e. Create objectionable odors affecting a significant number of people?

X

Discussion: There are no aspects included as part of the project that are expected to emit odors nor would the parcel's future development be expected to create objectionable odors.

Source: Project Proposal.

3.f. Generate pollutants (hydrocarbon, thermal odor, dust or smoke particulates, radiation, etc.) that will violate existing standards of air quality on-site or in the surrounding area?

X

Discussion: While the project in and of itself will not generate pollutants, the future development of the site is expected to generate a temporary increase in dust, motor vehicle and diesel particulate matter in the area. This temporary increase is not expected to violate existing standards of on-site air quality given required vehicle emission standards required by the State of California for vehicle operations. To mitigate for the temporary increase in dust, Mitigation Measure 1, below, is recommended. Mitigation Measure 3 under Section 7.a, below, is further recommended to minimize particulate matter and greenhouse gasses.

Source: Project Proposal, Bay Area Air Quality Management, California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board.

Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities:

- a. Water all active construction and grading areas at least twice daily.
- b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- c. Apply water two times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at the project site.
- d. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets/roads.
- e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

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 significant adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X

Discussion: There are no State or Federal mapped protected species located within the project area.

Source: Project Proposal, California Natural Diversity Database.

4.b.	Have a significant adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities located within the project area.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, San Mateo County General Plan.</p>					
4.c.	Have a significant adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no wetlands located within the project area.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.</p>					
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
<p>Discussion: There are no known migratory wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites in the project area. Given the urbanized nature of the project area, there is no expectation that the project, as proposed, poses any significant threat to native or migratory wildlife species.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.</p>					
4.e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?				X
<p>Discussion: The project itself does not involve conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The future development of the parcel will likely involve the removal of at least one significant tree; however, that removal will be subject to the issuance of a separate significant tree removal permit in accordance with applicable policies. The subject parcel does not contain any heritage trees. Therefore, the project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Zoning Regulations, County Ordinance Code Sections 11,000 and 12,000.</p>					

4.f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
Discussion: There are no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans that cover the project parcel. Source: San Mateo County General Plan.					
4.g.	Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
Discussion: The project parcel is not located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve. The project site is not located in an area mapped for sensitive habitats or as an area known to possess a protected species of plant or animal. Source: Project Location, California Natural Diversity Database.					
4.h.	Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
Discussion: The project parcel is not located in an area defined as such. Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.					

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
		Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5.a.	Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?				X
Discussion: There are no known archaeological resources in the project area. Source: Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan, California State Parks Office of Historic Preservation.					
5.b.	Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?				X
Discussion: There are no known archaeological resources in the disturbed/developed area. Source: Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan, California State Parks Office of Historic Preservation.					

5.c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no mapped unique paleontological resources or geological features in this area. The project location consists of KJfs (Franciscan complex sedimentary rocks) which are commonly found within the County.</p> <p>Source: U.S. Geological Survey Geologic Map of the San Francisco Bay Region, 2006.</p>				
5.d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no known human remains on the project area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6.a. Expose people or structures to potential significant adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other significant evidence of a known fault? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>			X	
<p>Discussion: The San Francisco Bay Area generally experiences a high level of seismic activity due to its tectonic setting. Surface rupture occurs when the ground surface is broken due to fault movement during earthquakes. Such hazards are generally assumed to occur in the vicinity of an active fault trace. Active fault lines in San Mateo County include the San Andreas and the Seal Cove-San Gregorio faults. The former occurs within 2.5 miles of the project area (County of San Mateo, 1986). Ground shaking could result from an earthquake along one of these faults, causing potentially serious hazards throughout the County, depending upon the location of the earthquake, magnitude, and area geology. Risks of loss, injury, or death resulting from surface rupture or ground shaking are greatest in densely developed, high-population areas. If the project is approved, it is understood that eventual construction will take place at a higher density of development. Any future</p>				

construction will be subject to the California Building Code in effect at that time. The required methods of construction take into consideration the proximity of development to the fault and/or fault traces to maximize structural integrity and to minimize loss of life or property in the event of an earthquake. For these reasons, the project's impact with respect to surface fault rupture and ground shaking would be less than significant.

Source: State of California Department of Conservation.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

X

Discussion: The project parcel is located within an area designated as susceptibility very strong to violent for earthquake shaking. At the time that construction is proposed, the applicant will be required to submit a soils report and geotechnical investigation as part of the standard requirements for issuance of a building permit. Any future construction will be reviewed by the County's Geotechnical Section and all work shall be completed in accordance with the California Building Code and recommendations made by the applicant's engineer to ensure the health and safety of any occupants. If the project is approved, it is understood that eventual construction will take place at a higher density of development. Any future construction will be subject to the California Building Code in effect at that time. The required methods of construction take into consideration the proximity of development to the fault and/or fault traces to maximize structural integrity and to minimize loss of life or property in the event of an earthquake. For these reasons, the project's impact with respect to surface fault rupture and ground shaking would be less than significant.

Source: San Mateo County Earthquake Shaking Fault Maps (San Andreas Fault, Hayward Fault).

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

X

Discussion: The project parcel is located in an area identified as having very low to moderate probability for earthquake liquefaction. As stated previously, the project will be completed in accordance with the California Building Code and per the recommendations of the applicant's engineer.

Source: U.S. Geological Survey Susceptibility Map of the San Francisco Bay Area (Map Compiled from Knudsen and Others, 2000, and Witter and Others, 2005).

iv. Landslides?

X

Discussion: The project area consists of areas identified as "Few Landslides." As discussed previously, a soils report and geotechnical investigation will be required at the time that construction is proposed. The project will be subject to the issuance of a building permit and all work shall be completed in accordance with the California Building Code and recommendations made by the applicant's engineer to ensure the health and safety of any occupants.

Source: U.S. Geological Survey Summary Distribution of Slides and Earth Flows in San Mateo County, California, 1997.

v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?

X

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

Discussion: The project parcel is not located in such an area.

Source: Project Location.

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

X

Discussion: The project itself will not result in significant soil erosion. Given the relatively flat nature of the site, any proposed construction is not expected to result in significant soil erosion or loss of top soil. In addition, any proposed construction is not expected to result in significant amounts of earthwork. However, to ensure that there are no impacts to surrounding properties, staff has included the following mitigation measure to be required for future construction.

Source: Project Proposal.

Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to commencement of the project, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

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

j.	Install storm drain inlet protection that traps sediment before it enters any adjacent storm sewer systems. This barrier shall consist of filter fabric, straw bales, gravel, or sand bags.				
k.	Install sediment traps/basins at outlets of diversions, channels, slope drains, or other runoff conveyances that discharge sediment-laden water. Sediment traps/basins shall be cleaned out when 50% full (by volume).				
l.	Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acre or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.				
m.	Utilize coir fabric/netting on sloped graded areas to provide a reduction in water velocity, erosive areas, habitat protection, and topsoil stabilization.				
n.	Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved Erosion Control Plan.				
6.c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?				X
<p>Discussion: There project site is not identified as containing a geological unit or soil that is presently unstable. However, compliance with Mitigation Measure 2 will ensure that the proposed site disturbance does not result in soil instability.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>					
6.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as noted in the 2010 California Building Code, creating significant risks to life or property?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no known expansive soils. The site is currently developed and given a lack of previous failures, there is no expectation of encountering expansive soils which could result in a risk to life and/or property.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>					
6.e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Discussion: The project site is currently serviced by a municipal wastewater provider. A preliminary approval has been provided by the Fair Oaks Sewer District to allow for a higher density of residential development on the site. The district has adequate capacity to serve future development.

Source: Project Proposal.

7. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:

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

Discussion: Vehicle emissions are a known source of GHG emissions. While the increased density of development is likely to result in additional car trips, the additional trips created by this project are minimal. Considering 11 units, an average of 22 additional trips would be expected. Given the limitations set by the State regarding vehicle emission, a significant increase in emissions is not expected. However, a minor temporary increase in greenhouse gasses during the construction phase may occur. Vehicles are subject to California Air Resources Board emission standards. Although the project scope is not likely to significantly generate greenhouse gases, the following mitigation measure is recommended.

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

Mitigation Measure 3: The applicant shall implement the following basic construction measures at all times:

- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxic Control Measure, 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 visible emissions evaluator.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person, or his/her designee, shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

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

<p>Discussion: The project does not conflict with the San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan provided that the mitigation measure outlined in Section 7.a, above, is implemented.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.</p>				
7.c.	Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?			X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in an area defined as forestland.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
7.d.	Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?			X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
7.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?			X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located approximately 4.45 miles from San Francisco Bay and 11.69 miles from the nearest coastal bluff. Given the distance from the ocean and terrain between the project site and the ocean, sea level rise is not expected to impact the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
7.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in such an area. The project site is located within a Flood Zone X (areas with minimal risk outside the 1-percent and 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplains. No base flood elevations or base flood depths are shown within these zones.); Community Panel No. 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p> <p>Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency.</p>				
7.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?			X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency.</p>				

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: No transport of hazardous materials is associated with this project. Source: Project Proposal.				
8.b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
Discussion: The project would not involve the use or release of hazardous materials. Source: Project Proposal.				
8.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
Discussion: The emission of hazardous materials, substances, or waste is not proposed as part of the project. Source: Project Proposal.				
8.d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located in an area identified as a hazardous materials site. Source: California Department of Toxic Substances Control.				

8.e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>					
8.f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>					
8.g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project is located completely on a privately owned parcel. All future site improvements would be located within the parcel's boundaries, and there is no expected impact to any such emergency response or evacuation plan.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services.</p>					
8.h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located in an area mapped for susceptibility or risk involving wildland fires. The project site is urbanized with no adjacent wildland areas.</p> <p>Source: Cal-Fire Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps.</p>					
8.i.	Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in such an area.</p> <p>Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, Effective October 16, 2012.</p>					

8.j.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: The project parcel is not located in such an area. Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, Effective October 16, 2012.					
8.k.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
Discussion: The project parcel is not located in a dam failure area. Source: San Mateo County General Plan Hazards Map.					
8.l.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
Discussion: The project parcel is not located in such an area. Source: San Mateo County General Plan Hazards Map.					

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:					
		Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9.a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?				X
Discussion: No wastewater discharge is associated with the proposed project. Future development would be connected to the municipal sewer provider for this area, Fair Oaks Sewer District. The district has preliminarily reviewed the project and has provided a conditional approval. Therefore, discharge from future development would be directed to and controlled by the sanitary district standards. Source: Project Proposal.					
9.b.	Significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere significantly with groundwater recharge such that there				X

would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
Discussion: The project site will be served by the Fair Oaks Sewer District, a municipal water service company. There is no expected impact to local groundwater supplies or that the project would include activities that would interfere with groundwater recharge. Source: Project Proposal.				
9.c. Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in significant erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
Discussion: The project site is flat and does not contain a stream or river. Future construction of the site, per County requirements, will need to incorporate permanent on-site stormwater treatment measures to capture runoff displaced by any new development. Compliance with these standard requirements ensures that there are no significant impacts to surrounding properties. Source: Project Proposal.				
9.d. Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
Discussion: While the rezoning of the property does not include any construction-related activities, future construction of multiple units will be required to include measures to ensure that post-development runoff (peak flow) and velocity is less than or equal to pre-development levels in accordance with the San Mateo County Drainage Policy. These measures will be required at the time that construction is proposed. The proposed rezoning poses no impact to existing drainage. Source: Project Plans.				
9.e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide significant additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
Discussion: See discussion under 9.d, above. Source: Project Proposal.				

9.f.	Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?				X
Discussion: No degradation of surface or groundwater water quality is expected with the proposed project. Source: Project Proposal.					
9.g.	Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?			X	
Discussion: See discussion under 9.d, above. Source: Project Proposal.					

10. 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>
10.a.	Physically divide an established community?				X
Discussion: The proposed rezoning would result in development that is consistent with the surrounding area and does not result in development that would result in the division of an established community. Source: Project Proposal.					
10.b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
Discussion: The proposed rezoning is consistent with the type and density of development in the surrounding area. The surrounding community contains both single-family and multiple-family residential development. The areas directly fronting Woodside Road largely consist of multiple-family development and the areas to the north and south of Woodside Road largely consist of single-family residential development. However, the property's current zoning and general plan designation would not allow the density of development consistent with the development along Woodside Road. The change in zoning and general plan designation would not result in any adverse impact to plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. Source: Project Proposal, San Mateo County General Plan, and Zoning Regulations.					

10.c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: There is no known conservation plan that covers the project parcel.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan.</p>					
10.d.	Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not propose a use that would result in the congregation of more than 50 people on a regular basis.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>					
10.e.	Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposal does not introduce any new type of use on to the property. The property is currently zoned for residential use and will remain so albeit with a higher density than that which currently exists. Both single-family and multiple-family residential uses are found throughout the surrounding community.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>					
10.f.	Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposes alterations to the zoning and general plan designation of the property, which will result in increased density of development on the project site only. Future construction would be completely within the parcel's boundaries of the subject property and does not serve to encourage off-site development of undeveloped areas or increase the development intensity of surrounding developed areas.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>					
10.g.	Create a significant new demand for housing?				X
<p>Discussion: No. The project itself will provide new housing but does not involve improvements that will create a significant new demand for housing.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>					

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
Discussion: None proposed. Source: Project Proposal.				
11.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
Discussion: None proposed. Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.				

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12.a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
Discussion: While the project will not generate noise, future project construction may do so. Therefore, during future project construction, excessive noise could be generated, particularly during grading and/or excavation activities. Mitigation Measure 4, as described below, is proposed to reduce the construction noise impact to a less than significant level. Once construction is complete, the project is not expected to generate significant amounts of noise. Source: Project Proposal, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance. Mitigation Measure 4: All grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project shall be limited from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. Construction activities will be prohibited on Sunday and any nationally observed holiday. Noise levels produced by construction activities shall not exceed the 80-dBA level at any one moment.				

12.b.	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				X
Discussion: None proposed. Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.					
12.c.	A significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
Discussion: None proposed. Source: Project Plans.					
12.d.	A significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
Discussion: A temporary increase in ambient noise levels at the time of future construction is expected. However, due to the project scope, this is expected to be limited. Post-construction, the site should not result in any additional ambient noise. Source: Project Proposal, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.					
12.e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located in such an area. Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.					
12.f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Source: Project Location.					

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13.a. Induce significant population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
<p>Discussion: While the project will eventually result in the provision of additional housing units, the maximum number of units allowed would be eleven. The addition of eleven units to this already highly urbanized area would not significantly induce population growth. Any improvements necessary to serve the site will occur within the subject parcel's boundaries and are sufficient only to serve it.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
13.b. Displace existing housing (including low- or moderate-income housing), in an area that is substantially deficient in housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will result in additional housing units than are currently present. The project site is not located in an area that is deficient in housing. As discussed previously, the project site is surrounded by both single-family and multiple-family residential developments.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				

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

14.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X
Discussion: The project would not trigger the need for any new or altered government facilities. Source: Project Proposal.				

15. RECREATION. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that significant physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
Discussion: All of the proposed improvements are to occur completely on the subject parcel. Given that the project site is already developed, there may be a slight increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities, but at a maximum of eleven units, there is not a significant increase in population that would result in physical deterioration of any such facility as a result of the project. Source: Project Proposal.				
15.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
Discussion: No recreational facilities are proposed as part of this project. Source: Project Proposal.				

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16.a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and				X

relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
<p>Discussion: As discussed previously, the project site is located within a highly urbanized area. Woodside Road is part of State Route 84 which is part of the California Freeway and Expressway System and consists of two lanes in both directions. The project would result in an increased density for a maximum of eleven units. There is no expectation that given the current level of traffic that Woodside Road carries, the addition of this small number of units would result in or significantly impact the roadway. Given the urbanized nature of the area, all the necessary utilities are existing so that when construction is proposed all of the site improvements are to occur completely on the subject parcel. The project does not involve a level of development that would adversely impact any plan, ordinance or policy which establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
16.b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
<p>Discussion: No. See discussion under 16.a, above.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
16.c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in significant safety risks?				X
<p>Discussion: None proposed.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.</p>				
16.d. Significantly increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
<p>Discussion: None proposed.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
16.e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
<p>Discussion: Given the urbanized nature of the parcel and the existing direct access from an improved roadway, there is no reason to believe that future development on the parcel would result</p>				

in inadequate emergency access. Should future construction be proposed, the plans will be reviewed by the fire department and will be required to meet current fire code for ingress/egress. Source: Project Proposal.				
16.f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
Discussion: No impacts. See discussion under 16.a, above. Source: Project Location.				
16.g. Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?				X
Discussion: The proposed project does not introduce a new use or result in changes outside of the parcel's boundaries. There is no expectation of significant increase or change to pedestrian patterns in the area. Source: Project Proposal.				
16.h. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
Discussion: No impact. At the time construction is proposed, it will be required to comply with the County's parking requirements. Source: Project Proposal, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.				

17. 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>
17.a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
Discussion: The property is currently served by a municipal wastewater service provider. A referral of the proposed project was sent to the Fair Oaks Sewer District and a conditional approval was provided to the project. Source: Project Proposal, Project Location, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.				

17.b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
<p>Discussion: The project has existing municipal water and wastewater service. Conditional approval has been granted by both agencies, as there is availability capacity to serve additional living units.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Fair Oaks Sewer District, California Water Service Company.</p>				
17.c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
<p>Discussion: Re-development of the site will require new on-site stormwater measures to address the site alterations. However, these measures are standard requirements for any development and would be relatively minor in nature. There are no significant environmental effects associated with these types of improvements.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
17.d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
<p>Discussion: As mentioned previously, the subject parcel is served by municipal water provider. The California Water Service Company was provided the opportunity to review and condition the proposed project and submitted only minor comments regarding the proposal. There is sufficient water to service the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, California Water Service Company.</p>				
17.e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
<p>Discussion: See discussion under 17.b, above. No impact.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, Project Location.</p>				
17.f. Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X

<p>Discussion: The property receives municipal trash pick service, and there is no indication at this time that the landfill utilized has insufficient capacity to continue to serve it.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
17.g. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<p>Discussion: Given that the site has been previously developed with residential uses and is served by a municipal solid waste management company, there is no expectation that the use would result in waste production that would trigger compliance with Federal, State, and/or local statutes and regulations.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
17.h. Be sited, oriented, and/or designed to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy; incorporate water conservation and solid waste reduction measures; and incorporate solar or other alternative energy sources?				X
<p>Discussion: While there is no development associated with this phase of the project given the project location, there is available opportunity to incorporate energy efficient design elements. Further, any future construction will be required to comply with all currently applicable efficiency standards (i.e., Title 24, CAL-Green, etc.) as part of compliance with the California Building Code.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal, California Building Code.</p>				
17.i. Generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?				X
<p>Discussion: No. See discussion of utility usage in 17.a-h, above.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				

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

endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
<p>Discussion: No sensitive habitats are mapped in the project area. The project does not involve construction at this time. However, future construction will be limited to the project site which is within a highly urbanized environment.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
18.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
<p>Discussion: The project would change the zoning and general plan designation to allow high density residential development on the site. While no construction is proposed at this time, the expected outcome would be the construction of an 11-unit multiple-family residential structure. The rezoning itself does not have significant impacts associated with its approval while future construction does have the potential to create impacts. However, the preceding analysis considered these short-term potential impacts and mitigation measures have been included to address them. These mitigation measures have been included in the project analysis in order to provide protections to ensure that future development on the subject property does not result in significant impacts to the surrounding community. With the implementation of these measures, there is no expectation that the project either contributes to or creates any cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				
18.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X
<p>Discussion: See discussion of 8.a and 8.b, above.</p> <p>Source: Project Proposal.</p>				

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

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)		X	
State Water Resources Control Board		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	

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

MITIGATION MEASURES

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

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

Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall implement the following dust control measures during grading and construction activities:

- Water all active construction and grading areas at least twice daily.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
- Apply water two times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at the project site.
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets/roads.
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).

Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to commencement of the project, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally

generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment-capturing devices. The plan shall also limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

- a. Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b. Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c. Clear only areas essential for project activities.
- d. Within five days of clearing or inactivity, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative best management practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two weeks of seeding/planting.
- e. Project site entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and control dust.
- f. Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g. Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 feet from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h. Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i. Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j. Install storm drain inlet protection that traps sediment before it enters any adjacent storm sewer systems. This barrier shall consist of filter fabric, straw bales, gravel, or sand bags.
- k. Install sediment traps/basins at outlets of diversions, channels, slope drains, or other runoff conveyances that discharge sediment-laden water. Sediment traps/basins shall be cleaned out when 50% full (by volume).
- l. Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow. The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acre or less per 100 feet of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 the fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion-resistant species.
- m. Utilize coir fabric/netting on sloped graded areas to provide a reduction in water velocity, erosive areas, habitat protection, and topsoil stabilization.
- n. Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved Erosion Control Plan.

Mitigation Measure 3: The applicant shall implement the following basic construction measures at all times:

- a. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxic Control Measure, Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- b. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.
- c. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person, or his/her designee, shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Mitigation Measure 4: All grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project shall be limited from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. Construction activities will be prohibited on Sunday and any nationally observed holiday. Noise levels produced by construction activities shall not exceed the 80-dBA level at any one moment.


DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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


(Signature)

June 25, 2014

Date

Planner III

(Title)

ACC:fc – ACCY0528_WFH.DOCX
Initial Study Checklist 10.17.2013.docx

