

County of San Mateo  
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** McGregor Residence and Driveway
2. **County File Number:** PLN 2014-00490
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo, Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Camille Leung, Project Planner, 650/363-1826, [cleung@smcgov.org](mailto:cleung@smcgov.org) (only email checked during Shelter-In-Place)
5. **Project Location:** Vacant parcel (consisting of Lots 39 and 40) located at 15th Street and East Avenue, unincorporated Montara area of San Mateo County. A proposed driveway would be located within the 14th Street and East Avenue (between 14th and 15th Streets) unpaved, public rights-of-way.
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** APN 037-015-090; 6,000 sq. ft.
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Paul McGregor, 168 West Point, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
8. **Owner:** AARPAUL, LLC, 168 West Point, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
9. **General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential; Urban
10. **Zoning:** One-Family Residential/Combining District (Minimum Lot Size 5,000 sq. ft.)/Design Review/Coastal Development District (R-1/S-17/DR/CD)
11. **Description of the Project:** The project requires a Design Review Permit for the construction of a new 3-story, 3,152 sq. ft. residence (includes a 625 sq. ft. attached garage and a 60 sq. ft. covered porch) on a 6,000 sq. ft. legal parcel (Certificate of Compliance (Type A) was recorded on December 12, 2017). The property is at the corner of unimproved 15th Street and East Avenue which are both paper streets and would be accessed via a new, 290-foot long driveway, which would extend from the end of 14th Street. The project includes the removal of 18 significant trees (including 3 dead trees) and involves only minor grading. As the property involves the development of a single-family residence in the Single-Family Residence Categorical Exclusion Area, the project qualifies for a Coastal Development Permit Exemption (CDX).
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The property is located within an existing residential neighborhood and adjoins developed parcels on the north and west sides. Access is proposed from 14th Street, as 15th Street has not been constructed. A perennial blue-line stream referred to as Montara Creek is located south of the property, approximately parallel to the southern property line. A second, unvegetated drainage, runs parallel to the East Avenue

street right-of-way boundary and terminates in the riparian habitat along Montara Creek. The property slopes downward toward 15th Street with an average slope of approximately 19%.

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

14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?** No, consultation has not begun. Planning staff has consulted with the following tribes, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC): Amah Mutsun Tribal Band, Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan, Bautisnoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe, Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan, Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area, and the Ohlone Indian Tribe. On December 6, 2018, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment by January 6, 2019. No comments were received to date.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

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

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

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

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

<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
	<i><b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b></i>	<i><b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b></i>	<i><b>Less Than Significant Impact</b></i>	<i><b>No Impact</b></i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?			X	
<b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located in a scenic vista and is not visible from public lands, or the Pacific Ocean. The site is visible from adjoining areas within the residential area it is located. The proposed house and driveway would be directly visible from 14th Street, albeit located behind houses which front directly on 14th Street. As the new residence and driveway				

<p>would abut developed residential property and blend in with other houses and driveways in the area, the project would not have a significant adverse effect on views from existing residential areas.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Site visit; County GIS Maps</p>				
1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is not located within a designated scenic corridor, nor would it impact areas within a state scenic highway.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
1.c. In non-urbanized areas, significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The site is moderately sloped and densely vegetated. While the project would result in the removal of 18 significant trees (including 3 dead trees), the applicant proposes to plant five (5), 15-gallon Monterey Cypress trees, as well as other plants, as shown in the Landscape Plan. Also, due to the retention of 10 significant trees, the applicant's proposal to replace the removed trees with 5 Monterey Cypress trees is appropriate to the surrounding environment. Therefore, the project would not significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project only involves minor grading and would not result in a significant change in topography or ground surface relief features. The project site is not located on or near a ridgeline.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Site visit; County GIS Maps</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><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not involve the introduction of significant light sources that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, as the project involves the construction of a residence within an existing residential area. Proposed exterior lights are located only at doorways and at the garage door. Additionally, design review standards of the Design Review (DR) District require downward-directed exterior light fixtures.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				

1.e. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The parcel is not located within a State or County Scenic Corridor and is not adjacent to a State Highway (site is over 450 feet from Cabrillo Highway). The proposed improvements on the subject parcel would not be visible from Cabrillo Highway, due to the distance of the property and proposed structures from Cabrillo Highway.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
1.f. If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The site is located in a Design Review District. The project will require a Design Review Permit and is required to comply with applicable design standards. The project will be reviewed by the Coastside Design Review Committee for compliance with applicable design review standards. Planning staff has reviewed the proposal and found it to be in substantial compliance with the design review standards.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps; County Zoning Regulations</p>				
1.g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see Section 1.c for discussion.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Site visit; County GIS Maps</p>				

<p><b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES.</b> 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>				
	<b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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				X

Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves an urban, residential property located within a Single-Family Residential Zoning District in the Coastal Zone, which does not contain agricultural lands and is not farmed. There is no project impact to farmland, forestland or timberland.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Site visit; County GIS Maps</p>				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under Section 2.a.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</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><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under Section 2.a.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; County GIS Maps</p>				
2.d. For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under Section 2.a.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
2.e. Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under Section 2.a.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
2.f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				X

Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.

**Discussion:** See discussion under Section 2.a.

**Source:** County GIS Maps

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

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

**Discussion:** The project involves tree removal, grading, and construction activities associated with driveway and house construction.

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As described in the BAAQMD’s 2017 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all control measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures, *All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures*, and other criteria, that, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure 1.a- 1.h requires the applicant to comply with BAAQMD’s *All Basic Construction Mitigation Measures*. Other applicable BAAQMD criteria requires that construction-related activities exclude the below listed activities (followed by staff’s evaluation of project compliance):

- a. Demolition - The project is undeveloped and would not require demolition of any existing buildings.
- b. Simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously): Staff has added this as Mitigation Measure 1.i to require compliance with this criteria.
- c. Simultaneous construction of more than one land use type (e.g., project would develop residential and commercial uses on the same site) (not applicable to high density infill development): The project only involves the construction of a single-family residential use.
- d. Extensive site preparation (i.e., greater than default assumptions used by the Urban Land Use Emissions Model [URBEMIS] for grading, cut/fill, or earth movement): The project will not require extensive site preparation, and would disturb approximately 20,000 sq. ft. (including the 6,000 sq. ft. of the subject parcel and 14,000 sq. ft. of the public right-of-way for the construction of the driveway to the proposed house).

- e. Extensive material transport (e.g., greater than 10,000 cubic yards of soil import/export) requiring a considerable amount of haul truck activity: The project will not extensive material transport requiring off haul of approximately 200 c.y.

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

**Mitigation Measure 1:** Upon the start of excavation activities and through to the completion of the project, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that the following dust control guidelines are implemented:

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

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

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

**Discussion:** As of December 2012, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attains the 24-hour PM-2.5 national standard. However, the Bay Area will continue to be designated as “non-attainment” for the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard until the BAAQMD submits a “re-designation request” and a “maintenance plan” to EPA and the proposed re-designation is approved by the EPA. A temporary increase in the project area is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations



reduce the potential effects to a less than significant impact. Mitigation Measure 1 in Section 3.b. will minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level.

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

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

**Discussion:** See discussion in Section 3.a.

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

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

**Discussion:** The project involves construction and operation of a single-family residence. While the project may result in dust and odors associated with the construction process, these odors would be temporary and would not affect a significant number of people due to intervening trees and the distance of the project site from other development.

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

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

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

**Discussion:** A Riparian Habitat Areas Assessment was prepared on April 17, 2015 for the project site by WRA, Inc. (2015 WRA Report; Attachment E1). A Biological Resources Assessment report was prepared on August 7, 2015 by WRA, Inc. for the project site (Attachment E2).

Dana Riggs of Sol Ecology, Inc. (Project Biologist) prepared an Updated Biological Resources Addendum Letter (2017 Sol Ecology, Inc. Report), dated December 13, 2017, included as Attachment F2. The 2017 Sol Ecology, Inc. Report references the prior reports and addresses comments from consulting biologist Daniel Edelstein contained in his letter dated March 17, 2015

(Attachment F1). The analysis contained in this IS/MND primarily cites analysis from the 2015 WRA Report and the 2017 Sol Ecology, Inc. Addendum Letter.

In a letter dated October 25, 2018, Ms. Riggs reports that the site was examined on October 16, 2018 and conditions remain unchanged since the previous biological assessment on December 13, 2017 and no new potential impacts to biological resources are anticipated (Attachment F4).

Recently, in a letter dated June 23, 2020, Ms. Riggs describes that the site was examined on May 14, 2020 and conditions remain unchanged since the previous biological assessment on October 16, 2018 and no new potential impacts to biological resources are anticipated (Attachment F5).

The subject property in its entirety is located outside of any stream or riparian corridors and their associated prescribed setbacks.

According to Local Coastal Program (LCP) ESHA maps (County of San Mateo 2013) and the most recent U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 minute quadrangle topographic map (USGS 2015), a perennial blue-line stream referred to as Montara Creek is located south of the Study Area of the 2017 Sol Ecology, Inc. Report (Study Area), parallel to the southern property line. This stream is identified as *primary riparian corridor* along the drainage. Riparian vegetation composed of arroyo willow was identified along the drainage and the edge of riparian vegetation was mapped using aerial photographs and a handheld geographic positioning system (GPS) with sub-meter accuracy. This habitat is located outside of the Study Area; however, it is subject to a 50-foot riparian buffer measured from the limit of riparian vegetation. Figure 1 of the 2015 WRA Report shows the mapped edge of riparian vegetation and associated setback in relation to the Study Area.

A second, largely unvegetated drainage was identified outside of the Study Area, running parallel to the West Avenue right of way boundary and terminating in the riparian habitat along Montara Creek. This drainage was largely unvegetated and surrounded by Monterey cypress, and contains veldtgrass, common rush, and pampasgrass (*Cortaderia sp.*). As this drainage was located on private property, the edge of top of bank and center point of the drainage were photographed and GPS points taken outside of the existing fence line to best approximate the extent of the drainage. This drainage is likely to be considered an intermittent stream under the LCP which will require a 30-foot buffer measured from the drainage midpoint. The non-riparian drainage centerline and associated setback are shown in Figure 1 of the 2015 WRA Report.

Special-status species include those plants and wildlife species that have been formally listed, are proposed as endangered or threatened, or are candidates for such listing under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). These Acts afford protection to both listed species and those that are formal candidates for listing. Plant species on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare and Endangered Plant Inventory (Inventory) with California Rare Plant Ranks (Rank) of 1 and 2 are also considered special-status plant species and must be considered under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern, CDFW California Fully Protected species, United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Birds of Conservation Concern, and CDFW Special-status Invertebrates are all considered special-status species. Furthermore, CDFG Fish and Game Code prohibits the take of actively nesting birds as well as common bats and their roosts. Lastly, special status species in the 2017 Sol Ecology, Inc. report include all rare or unique species listed in the Mid-Coast LCP.

Twenty-one special status plants and ten special status wildlife species have been documented within five miles of the Project Site (Attachment F2, Figures 3 and 4 of the 2017 Sol Ecology, Inc. report). A discussion of the potential for these species to occur is described below.

## *Plants*

None of the twenty-one special status plants has potential to occur on the project site. These species occur in chaparral, coastal scrub, and open grassland habitats or along streams. As such, no additional measures are prescribed. However, Rose Leptosiphon was identified near but not on the project site.

In an email dated November 29, 2018 (Attachment F3), the Project Biologist addressed the occurrence of Rose Leptosiphon in response to staff's request: The occurrence in question is located on Moss Beach approximately 1000 feet downslope and west of the Project Area and is based on two collections from 1903 and 1950. According to the CNDDDB, this occurrence is considered possibly extirpated (CDFW 2018). Rose leptosiphon is associated with open, grassy slopes on coastal bluff scrub habitats according to the Jepson Herbarium; no open bluff scrub habitat is present on the Project Area. The majority of the site is heavily shaded by Monterey Cypress and does not provide suitable growing conditions. A small opening in the tree canopy is present near the proposed driveway, but shows evidence of past site disturbance likely associated with development of the adjacent residence. Furthermore, of the 40 records of commonly associated species only two species were observed, poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*) and Douglas iris (*Iris douglasiana*). Based on the lack of suitable habitat and associated species in the Project Area and the assumption that this species is likely extirpated from Moss Beach, it was determined by both the WRA and Sol Ecology botanists that this species is not likely to be present on the Project Area.

## *Wildlife*

Of the ten species with potential to occur within five miles, two species have potential to occur on-site: California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake. These two species and their potential to occur on the project site are discussed below. The remaining species are not likely to ever be present due to the absence of suitable habitat (e.g., aquatic habitat, such as ponds or streams, grassland, coastal scrub, coastal bluff, or chaparral habitats).

Numerous migratory birds and raptors, including the two special status species described in the 2015 WRA report also have potential to occur; however, many of the species documented in the area (including special status and common species) are not likely to be present due to the absence of tree cavities and brokentop or platform trees. Lastly, Figure 4 of the 2017 Sol Ecology, Inc. report depicts an occurrence of the obscure bumble bee overlapping with the project site. Information provided in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) on this occurrence notes mapping was based on an approximate location near Moss Beach. This species inhabits open grassy coastal prairies and Coast Range meadows, which are not present on the subject property and therefore, this species is likely absent.

### California Red-legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*), Federal Threatened Species, CDFW Species of Special Concern

The California red-legged frog (CRLF) is dependent on suitable aquatic, estivation, and upland habitat. During periods of wet weather, starting with the first rainfall in late fall, red-legged frogs disperse away from their estivation sites to seek suitable breeding habitat. Aquatic and breeding habitat is characterized by dense, shrubby, riparian vegetation and deep, still or slow-moving water. Breeding occurs between late November and late April. Following breeding during the wet season, adult frogs may disperse into upland habitats which include areas up to 300 feet from aquatic and riparian habitat and are comprised of grasslands, woodlands, and/or vegetation that provide shelter, forage, and predator avoidance. At the end of the wet season, CRLF may disperse up to one-mile overland from upland or breeding habitats (often via riparian corridors) to aquatic non-breeding habitats.

Since the 2015 report, CRLF has been documented in Montara Creek in a pool located approximately 0.75 mile east (upstream) of the project site; both adults and juveniles were observed indicating Montara Creek provides suitable breeding habitat for CRLF. Given the project site is within the known dispersal distance from this occurrence and Montara Creek, there is potential for CRLF to disperse on to the site. However, no suitable aquatic or upland habitat (breeding or non-breeding habitat) is present.

San Francisco Garter Snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*), Federal Endangered, State Endangered. CDFW Fully Protected Species

The preferred habitat of the San Francisco garter snake (SFGS) is a densely vegetated pond near an open hillside where they can sun themselves, feed, and find cover in rodent burrows; however, considerably less ideal habitats can be successfully occupied. According to the 5-year review by USFWS, there are two significant components to SFGS habitat: ponds that support California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*, CRLF), American bullfrog (*Lithobates catesbeiana*), or the Sierran treefrog (*Pseudacris sierra*); and surrounding upland that supports Botta's pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*) and the California meadow vole (*Microtus californicus*). Recent studies at Año Nuevo State Reserve continue to confirm SFGS are regularly within 300 and 650 feet of foraging (pond) habitats and upland sites. If dispersal occurs in pursuit of prey, and during periods of heavy rain or shortly after, SFGS may make long-distance movements of up to 1.25 miles along drainages within the dense riparian cover; however, SFGS have not been documented to travel over open terrain.

SFGS has a very low potential to occur on the project site. Suitable habitat is present in Montara Creek and its associated riparian habitat located more than 200 feet to the south of the project site; there is no pond habitat however, within 650 feet. SFGS may disperse in pursuit of prey or during or after periods of heavy rain up the unnamed tributary, but is not likely to remain in this area due to deeply incised banks and lack of riparian cover. As such, it is highly unlikely this species would occur on-site.

CRLF may be impacted by construction activities associated with site development, if present. The development of the site would not result in any permanent barriers however. To avoid any impacts to CRLF, the recommended measures have been incorporated as Mitigation Measures 2 through 7, below. Avoidance measures designed to protect CRLF from being impacted will also protect SFGS from potential impacts associated with the proposed project.

There are no additional special status species or habitats subject to potential impacts from the proposed project. In response to a comment from consulting biologist Daniel Edelstein, it was noted that the 2015 WRA report failed to address potential impacts to migratory birds and raptors that may nest outside the proposed development area. As such, we recommend that avoidance measures include pre-construction migratory bird nesting surveys performed both in and within 250 feet of the proposed development area prior to any proposed construction-related activities during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31).

**Mitigation Measure 2:** An environmental training shall be provided to all workers prior to the start of any activities regarding any sensitive biological resources (including CRLF, SFGS, or migratory bird nesting birds). The training shall include steps to identify and respond to a sighting, the laws and regulations protecting those resources, and consequences of non-compliance. Date and time of each training shall be reported to the County within one week of completion.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** At least 14 days prior to the onset of any construction-related activity, exclusion fencing (designed for CRLF and SFGS) with exit funnels shall be installed between the project site and both Montara Creek and the unnamed tributary. Exit funnels shall be installed approximately every 100 meters to allow trapped individuals to leave the area on their own. Following installation, the fence shall be inspected by a qualified biologist periodically throughout

the duration of any ground-disturbing activities. Should a durable exclusion fence material such as Ertec be used, fence inspections after initial inspection are only necessary following high wind or heavy rain events.

**Mitigation Measure 4:** A pre-construction survey for CRLF and SFGS shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities within 48 hours of the start of ground disturbance activities. Surveys are to be conducted by approved qualified biologist with experience surveying for each species. If CRLF or SFGS is found on the project site it shall be allowed to leave the area on its own. If the animal does not leave the area on its own, work shall remain halted and USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted.

**Mitigation Measure 5:** No work shall be performed within 30 minutes of sunrise or sunset or during or within 24 hours of any rain event (greater than 0.5 inches) between February 1 and April 31 when frogs are most likely to utilize upland habitats.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting), rolled erosion control products, or similar material shall not be used.

**Mitigation Measure 7:** A pre-construction, migratory bird nesting survey shall be conducted prior to any proposed construction-related activities during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31). The survey shall be performed both in and within 250 feet of the proposed development area and the results reported to the County. If for any reason construction activities do not commence within 10 days of completion of the survey, the survey shall be repeated and results reported to the County. If active nests are discovered, no construction-related activities are allowed until birds have fledged from nests, as confirmed by a biologist.

**Source:** Biological Resources Addendum Letter for APN 037-015-090, Montara, California – Current Conditions as of May 14, 2020, dated June 23, 2020; Updated Biological Resources Addendum Letter, dated December 13, 2017, prepared by Dana Riggs of Sol Ecology, Inc.; Riparian Habitat Areas Assessment, dated April 17, 2015, prepared by WRA, Inc.; Letter from Consulting biologist Daniel Edelstein, dated March 17, 2015

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

**Discussion:** Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above.

**Sources:** Biological Resources Addendum Letter for APN 037-015-090, Montara, California – Current Conditions as of May 14, 2020, dated June 23, 2020; Updated Biological Resources Addendum Letter, dated December 13, 2017, prepared by Dana Riggs of Sol Ecology, Inc.; Riparian Habitat Areas Assessment, dated April 17, 2015, prepared by WRA, Inc.; Letter from Consulting biologist Daniel Edelstein, dated March 17, 2015

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

**Discussion:** The Project Site was evaluated to determine if any coastal wetland (one-parameter rule) is present. Coastal wetlands are defined in the LCP as an area where the water table is at, near, or above the land surface long enough to bring about the formation of hydric soils or to support the growth of plants which normally are found to grow in water or wet ground (also known as hydrophytic); in either case, hydrology must be present also. Hydrophytic plants commonly found in wetlands in San Mateo County include: cordgrass, pickleweed, jaumea, frankenia, marsh mint, tule, bullrush, narrow-leaf cattail, broadleaf cattail, pacific silverweed, salt rush, and bog rush. To qualify, a wetland must contain at least a 50% cover of some combination of these plants, unless it is a mudflat.

A Sol Ecology biologist trained in wetland delineation evaluated coastal wetland criteria including presence of hydrology in combination with the presence of either hydric soils or hydrophytic vegetation as described in the 2017 Sol Ecology, Inc. report, dated December 13, 2017. No evidence of hydric soils was observed. Areas on or within 100 feet of the project site did not contain both hydrology and 50 percent or more dominant hydrophytes indicating coastal wetland habitat.

The site was re-examined on May 14, 2020 (letter included as Attachment F5) to determine whether any new indicators of wetland habitat are present at the site comprising 50 percent or more cover in any location per LCP criteria for wetlands. No new wetland plants (per the new 2018 list) or increase in density of hydrophytic plants previously found was observed, despite a very wet rainfall year in 2019, and recent rainfall the week prior. Two facultative wetland plant species were also observed on the property; however, both species comprised less than 50 percent cover.

In a letter dated June 28, 2016, California Coastal Commission staff inquired as to whether the topography of the site excludes the possibility of a wetland (Attachment J). In an email dated November 29, 2018 (Attachment F3), Sol Ecology, Inc., staff states that the Project Area is located on a hillslope and is more than 40 feet above (or upslope) of the floodplain of Montara Creek and its tributaries. The 2008 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0) contains 16 primary hydrology indicators and 10 secondary hydrology indicators. Only one primary indicator is required to meet the wetland hydrology criterion; however, if secondary indicators are used, at least two secondary indicators must be present to conclude that an area has wetland hydrology. These indicators include observation of surface water or saturated soils, evidence of recent inundation (e.g. soil cracks, salt crust, water marks), evidence of current or recent soil saturation, and evidence from other site conditions or data (such as presence of a shallow aquitard). A mild convergence of topographical contours was observed during the 2017 site assessment by Sol Ecology. Such convergences are typical of topography on hillslopes, but are not considered a primary or secondary indicator of hydrology alone without the presence of other hydrological indicators such as wrack lines or sediment deposits. None of the 16 primary or 10 secondary hydrology indicators were observed during the 2017 assessment. There is also no evidence that any sheet flow drains directly or by way of any channel into Montara Creek or its tributaries. Given the proximity of the site to the nearby floodplain habitat and absence of any hydrological indicators - combined with the absence of hydrophytic vegetation, indicates there is no evidence to suggest wetlands are present on the

site. Topography of the site (a hillslope without any terraces where water may pool) further excludes the possibility of wetland habitats.

In a letter dated October 25, 2018, Ms. Riggs describes that the site was examined on October 16, 2018 and conditions remain unchanged since the previous biological assessment on December 13, 2017.

Recently, in a letter dated June 23, 2020 (Attachment F5), Ms. Riggs describes that the site was examined on May 14, 2020 and conditions remain unchanged since the previous biological assessment on October 16, 2018. The 2020 letter states that there is still no evidence of 1-parameter coastal wetlands or waters on the site.

**Sources:** Biological Resources Addendum Letter for APN 037-015-090, Montara, California – Current Conditions as of May 14, 2020, dated June 23, 2020; Updated Biological Resources Addendum Letter, dated December 13, 2017, prepared by Dana Riggs of Sol Ecology, Inc.; Riparian Habitat Areas Assessment, dated April 17, 2015, prepared by WRA, Inc.; Letter from Consulting biologist Daniel Edelstein, dated March 17, 2015

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

**Discussion:** Please see the discussion in Section 4.a, above.

**Sources:** Biological Resources Addendum Letter for APN 037-015-090, Montara, California – Current Conditions as of May 14, 2020, dated June 23, 2020; Updated Biological Resources Addendum Letter, dated December 13, 2017, prepared by Dana Riggs of Sol Ecology, Inc.; Riparian Habitat Areas Assessment, dated April 17, 2015, prepared by WRA, Inc.; Letter from Consulting biologist Daniel Edelstein, dated March 17, 2015

4.e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

**Discussion:** The applicant has submitted a report titled “Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan for 1900 East Avenue, Montara, Ca.” (Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan), prepared by Roy C. Leggit, III, dated January 11, 2019 (Attachment I1). The project would involve the removal of 18 significant trees as shown on the Tree Data Sheet of the Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan, including 1 Monterey Pine tree and 17 Monterey Cypress Trees.

The trees proposed removal include three dead trees and six trees in poor health, per the Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan. Per the arborist report, seven trees of the 18 trees to be removed are located in the footprint of the proposed building or driveway. The applicant proposes to retain 10 significant trees, including a large 40.9” diameter at breast height (dbh) Monterey Cypress (Tree #5) in good condition located adjacent to the proposed driveway at the corner of 14th Street and East Avenue. The report contains a Tree Protection Plan, including tree protection measures with Tree Protection Zones (TPZ) and warning signs, to be installed during various stages of construction. The County Arborist, Dan Krug, has reviewed the Arborist Report

and Tree Protection Plan and found it to be adequate in protecting the trees to remain. Regarding the proposed tree protection measures for the 40.9" Cypress tree, he has added the measure contained in Mitigation Measure 8 to further protect tree roots during grading activities for the new driveway. Mitigation Measure 9 has been added to require the trimming of low branches by a certified arborist to minimize damage to the 40" Cypress Tree during grading and construction. Mitigation Measure 10 has been added to require implementation of the tree protection measures of the Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan.

Section 6565.21 of the Design Review (DR) Zoning District regulations requires replacement of a significant indigenous tree with three (3) or more trees of the same species using at least five (5) gallon size stock. For each loss of a significant exotic tree, there shall be a replacement with three (3) or more trees from a list maintained by the Planning Director. Section 6565.20(f) encourages planting of native and drought-tolerant plant tree species.

As shown in the Landscape Plan, the applicant proposes to plant five (5), 15-gallon Monterey Cypress trees. Due to the removal of 17 Monterey Cypress trees and the retention of 10 significant trees, the applicant's proposal to replace the removed trees with 5 Monterey Cypress trees is appropriate to the surrounding environment. Planting of additional trees may result in tree overcrowding and reduction of daylight to the proposed residence, which would impede the effectiveness of required solar panels without further tree removal.

**Mitigation Measure 8:** In order to minimize tree root impacts during grading for the new driveway, a pneumatic air-tool shall be used to excavate the soil beneath the 40.9" dbh Cypress' (Tree #5) dripline. This would minimize unnecessary root cutting and allow the arborist to better qualify which roots could reasonably be cut to truly minimize impact to the tree. Furthermore, installation of geo-grid or other structural geotextile fabrics should be utilized to minimize excavation and preserve the trees roots. Plans submitted for an encroachment permit and a building permit for the new driveway shall be demonstrate compliance with this condition.

**Mitigation Measure 9:** To provide adequate clearance over the proposed driveway a low large lateral limb of the 40" Cypress (Tree 5) and potentially other low branches will need to be removed. Vertical clearance over the driveway necessary to provide truck access during construction will likely require a minimum vertical clearance of 15 feet. Tree limb removal shall be performed by a certified arborist. Documentation demonstrating compliance with this mitigation measure shall sent to the Project Planner prior to any land disturbance.

**Mitigation Measure 10:** Prior to any land disturbance and throughout the grading operation, the applicant shall implement the tree protection measures of the Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan for 1900 East Avenue, Montara, Ca. and said protections shall remain in place undisturbed throughout construction, as described in the Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan, dated January 11, 2019.

**Sources:** Project Plans; County Zoning Regulations; Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan for 1900 East Avenue, Montara, Ca, prepared by Roy C. Leggit, III, dated January 11, 2019

4.f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
---	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project site is not protected by an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.



The proposed area of work is located adjacent to existing residential homes in an area zoned for residential land use. <b>Source:</b> County General Plan; County GIS Maps				
4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve. <b>Source:</b> County General Plan; County GIS Maps				
4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The project would not involve the removal of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands. <b>Source:</b> Site visit; County GIS Maps				

<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves earth-moving and construction impacts that could adversely affect archaeological resources should any exist in areas impacted by this project. The project was referred to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). In a letter dated June 20, 2016, CHRIS staff stated that the office had no record of any previous cultural resource studies for the project area, the project area has the possibility of containing unrecorded archeological site(s) and recommended the preparation of a study prior to the commencement of project activities. The applicant submitted a report titled "Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15 Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California", prepared by Matthew R. Clark of Holman &amp; Associates (H&amp;A) Archeological Consultants, dated December 2017 (Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report), included as Attachment H.</p> <p>The Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report states that a historical resources records search and field survey was conducted of the subject parcel. H&amp;A first conducted an archaeological records search for the Project Area at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of CHRIS. The records search found two surface reconnaissances within the records search area, one of which was adjacent to the east of this Project Area, which did not record prehistoric archaeological or historical resources. The other surface reconnaissance was of an existing single-family residence on 14th Street northwest of the Project Area, and that structure was recorded as a potential historical resource as it originally dated to circa 1910. No other historical resources are recorded within the search perimeter, though slightly farther to the west the 1874</p>				

Point Montara Light Station is a recorded resource and elsewhere on that lighthouse property a prehistoric archaeological site has been informally reported. There are no recorded archaeological or historical resources within or adjacent to the Project Area, however the parcel is adjacent to Montara Creek (the local appellation; the stream is not named on the topographic maps), as is the aforementioned prehistoric site, so the vicinity has perhaps medium archaeological sensitivity, but is also rather steeply sloped and therefore would have been unsuitable for prehistoric habitation.

A pedestrian general surface reconnaissance of the Project Area was completed by H&A on November 8, 2017, finding no archaeological or historical resources within any impact zones. Surface reconnaissance conditions were poor as the Project Area is covered by trees and duff, with significant understory growth and downed trees and broken branches also present. No evidence of prehistoric or historical archaeological resources was found during the surface survey.

The 15th Street Project Area was surface surveyed; poor field conditions often hampered the survey over most of the property. Conditions were not quite adequate for an initial general surface survey, and intensive survey was not possible. Based on the field survey and results of the nearest previous surveys, wherein no prehistoric cultural materials were found, no additional cultural resources research is recommended for the residential Project, which should be able to proceed without encountering significant historic resources. The following measures have been incorporated below:

**Mitigation Measure 11:** Although no archaeological resources were found on the Project Area, it is possible that subsurface deposits may yet exist or that evidence of such resources has been obscured by more recent natural or cultural factors such as downslope aggradation and alluviation and the presence of non-native trees and vegetation. Archaeological and historical resources and human remains are protected from unauthorized disturbance by State law, and supervisory and construction personnel therefore must notify the County and proper authorities if any possible archaeological or historic resources or human remains are encountered during construction activities and halt construction to allow qualified Archaeologists to identify, record, and evaluate such resources and recommend an appropriate course of action.

**Mitigation Measure 12:** In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archeologist and any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

**Sources:** Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15 Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California, prepared by Matthew R. Clark, dated December 2017

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

**Discussion:** Please see Section 5.a for discussion.

**Sources:** Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15th Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California, prepared by Matthew R. Clark, dated December 2017

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

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

**Mitigation Measure 13:** The applicants and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains, whether historic or prehistoric, during grading and construction. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.

**Sources:** Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15th Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California, prepared by Matthew R. Clark, dated December 2017

**6. ENERGY.** Would the project:

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

**Discussion:** Energy conservation standards for new residential and nonresidential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission) in June 1977 and are updated every 3 years (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations). Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.

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

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

Construction

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

Operation

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

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

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

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

**Source:** Project Plans

7. <b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?  <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The applicant has submitted a Geotechnical Investigation (Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., dated May 9, 2014 (Attachment G) and a Preliminary Geologic Hazard Evaluation by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated May 14, 2019. The Geotechnical Investigation states that the site is located near a contact between unconsolidated sediments of the marine terrace and Montara Mountain granitic rocks (Pampeyan, 1994). The basement rocks are described as consisting of medium- to coarsely crystalline, foliated granitic rock, which is highly fractured and deeply weathered. An unnamed, inactive fault passes close to the building site.</p> <p>The nearest active faults include the San Gregorio/Seal Cove Fault, approximately 0.6 miles southwest of the site and the San Andreas Fault, about 6.4 miles to the northeast and the Hayward Fault, mapped on the western margin of the East Bay Hills. These faults have been sources for several strong earthquakes in the historic past. In addition, the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (2008) predicted that there is a 63 percent chance of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake on one or more of the major Bay Area faults within the next 30 years. Since no mapped active faults pass through the site, it is the opinion of Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., that the probability of fault rupture affecting the site is low.</p> <p>In the opinion of Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., the site is suitable for the proposed improvements provided the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Investigation are followed. The soils encountered in the borings provide good foundation support for the proposed structures. The primary geotechnical considerations are strong seismic shaking during a future earthquake and control of site drainage. Mitigation Measure 14 requires the implementation of the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation:</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 14:</b> During the building permit application stage and prior to issuance of a building permit for the project, the applicant shall demonstrate project design compliance with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc.</p>				

<b>Source:</b> Geotechnical Investigation (Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., dated May 9, 2014; Preliminary Geologic Hazard Evaluation, dated May 14, 2019				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The Geotechnical Investigation states that, on the basis of the historical seismic record in the Bay Area, it is reasonable to assume that the proposed building will be subject to moderate to severe earthquake shaking during the lifetime of the proposed structure. The earthquake-shaking hazard can be mitigated with implementation of compliant seismic design and construction, as required at the building permit stage by County Building Regulations and adherence to the recommendations in the geotechnical report.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Geotechnical Investigation (Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., dated May 9, 2014; Preliminary Geologic Hazard Evaluation, dated May 14, 2019</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project geotechnical reports state that, since dense terrace deposits and weathered granitic rock underlie the site and due to shallow bedrock and the lack of shallow groundwater, the probability that liquefaction will affect the building during earthquakes is low.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Geotechnical Investigation (Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., dated May 9, 2014; Preliminary Geologic Hazard Evaluation, dated May 14, 2019</p>				
iv. Landslides?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The Geotechnical Investigation states that, because of the site's moderate topography and strong soil, the probability of landslides affecting the project is low.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Geotechnical Investigation (Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., dated May 9, 2014; Preliminary Geologic Hazard Evaluation, dated May 14, 2019</p>				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?  <i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i>			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located on or adjacent to a coastal cliff or bluff.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is moderately sloped at 19.9% and is bordered by a perennial blue-line stream referred to as Montara Creek located south of the project site, parallel to the southern property line. A second, unvegetated drainage was identified in the project vicinity running parallel</p>				

to the West Avenue street right-of-way boundary and terminating in the riparian habitat along Montara Creek.

While the proposed area of development is separated from Montara Creek and the drainage by approximately 60-feet of intervening vegetation, there is the potential for sedimentation in areas downslope from the project area should there be any precipitation during project grading or construction, including run-off to these water bodies.

The project involves a minor amount of grading, involving 195 cubic yards (c.y.) of excavation and 5 c.y. of fill. The project involves an estimated maximum area of land disturbance of approximately 20,000 sq. ft., including the 6,000 sq. ft. of the subject parcel and 14,000 sq. ft. of the public right-of-way for the construction of the driveway to the proposed house.

The applicant proposes an Erosion Control Plan, included on page L-1 of Attachment D, which includes measures that would contain and slow run-off, while allowing for natural infiltration. Due to the potential for erosion and sedimentation during land disturbing and earth-moving activities, the following mitigation measures have been included. Mitigation Measures 15 and 16 require revision of the Erosion Control and Staging Plan to include additional stormwater pollution prevention measures and to require compliance with the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines." Mitigation Measures 17 and 18 require implementation and monitoring of erosion control measures throughout the term of the grading permit and building permit.

**Mitigation Measure 15:** Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residence, the applicant shall revise the Erosion Control Plan to include the driveway area and proposed measures and additional measures as follows, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director:

- a. Protect Surface Water Locations: Montara Creek and the drainage are located within close proximity of proposed disturbed areas and access ways on your property. Please provide primary control measures (e.g., 2 rows of staked fiber rolls) along both sides of the driveway in the immediate project area.
- b. Show location of utility trenches, indicate utility types, and identify timing of installation.
- c. Construction Access Routes: Over access points at the end of the paved portion of 14th Street, construct a stabilized designated entrance(s), using 3" - 4" fractured aggregate over geo-textile fabric.

**Mitigation Measure 16:** The applicant shall adhere to the San Mateo County-wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Delineation with field markers clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.
- b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.
- c. Performing clearing and earth moving activities only during dry weather.
- d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30. Stabilization shall include both proactive measures, such as the placement of hay bales or coir netting, and passive measures, such as re-vegetating disturbed areas with plants propagated from seed collected in the immediate area.

- e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.
- f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.
- g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.
- h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.
- i. Limiting and timing applications of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.
- j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.
- k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.
- l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.
- m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.

**Mitigation Measure 17:** Once approved, erosion and sediment control measures of the revised Erosion Control Plan shall be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of grading and construction, until all disturbed areas are stabilized. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time. Revisions to the approved erosion control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer and submitted to the Building Inspection Section.

**Mitigation Measure 18:** It shall be the responsibility of the engineer of record to regularly inspect the erosion control measures for the duration of all grading remediation activities, especially after major storm events, and determine that they are functioning as designed and that proper maintenance is being performed. Deficiencies shall be immediately corrected, as determined by and implemented under the observation of the engineer of record.

**Source:** Project C3C6 form, Project Site Plan and Drainage Plan (Pages A-1 and C-1)

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

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

**Source:** Geotechnical Investigation (Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., dated May 9, 2014



7.d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located in an area with an identified risk for expansive soil.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Geotechnical Investigation (Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., dated May 9, 2014</p>				
7.e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project proposes to connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD). MWSD has reviewed the project plans and the project will be subject to MWSD permitting requirements.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
7.f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Mitigation Measure 12 requires that, in the event that cultural, paleontological, or archeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery, County staff shall be notified, and the applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. As mitigated, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to the direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15th Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California, prepared by Matthew R. Clark, dated December 2017</p>				

<b>8. CLIMATE CHANGE.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO2) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. Grading involves GHG</p>				

emissions mainly from exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal cars of construction workers, and operation of grading equipment). Due to the site's coastal location and assuming construction vehicles and workers are based largely in city or larger urban areas, potential project GHG emission levels from construction would be increased from general levels.

The project involves a minor amount of grading, including 195 cubic yards (c.y.) of excavation and 5 c.y. of fill (involving approximately twenty truckloads). The project would also require importation of drain rock and aggregate rock; however, the volume of imported rock is also anticipated to be small. The project would be required to comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). Therefore, the project's generation of GHG emissions is anticipated to be low.

**Source:** Project Plans

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

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

**Source:** Bay Area Air Quality Management District

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

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

**Sources:** County GIS Maps; Project Plans

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

**Discussion:** The project is not located on or adjacent to a coastal cliff or bluff.

**Source:** County GIS Maps

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

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

**Source:** County GIS Maps

8.f. Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0117F, effective August 2, 2017.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
8.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion in Section 8.f.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				

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

materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> No use involving the emission or handling of hazardous materials or waste is proposed. The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; County GIS Maps</p>				
9.d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not a listed hazardous materials site.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
9.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Upon review of the provisions of the Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (HAF ALUCP) for the environs of Half Moon Bay Airport, as adopted by the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) on October 9, 2014, staff has determined that the project site is located in Zone 7 – Airport Influence Area (AIA) where the airport accident risk level is considered low. Within the AIA Zone, Airport Land Use Commission review is required for any proposed structure taller than 100 feet AGL. The proposed structure is approximately 32 feet in height.</p> <p>Residential uses are considered conditionally compatible in areas exposed to noise levels between 60-64 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) only if the proposed use is on a lot of record zoned exclusively for residential use as of the effective date of the ALUCP. Residential uses are not considered compatible above 65 CNEL. The project would be exposed to noise levels of less than 60 dB CNEL based on ALUC adopted craft noise exposure contours.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; County GIS Maps</p>				
9.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located within a residential area and, based on a review of aerial satellite imagery, is not within the immediate vicinity of a private airstrip.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				

9.g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence only and would not permanently or significantly impede access on existing public roads.</p> <p><b>Sources:</b> Project Plans, County GIS Maps</p>				
9.h. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located within a designated State Responsibility Area (SRA) or Local Responsibility Area (LRA) fire hazard zone or Wildland Urban Interface Zone.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
9.i. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0117F, effective August 2, 2017.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
9.j. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion in Section 9.i.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				
9.k. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion in Section 9.i.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Maps</p>				

<b>10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10.a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Regarding the potential impact of construction-related erosion and sedimentation to water quality, please see discussion in Section 7.b, above. Regarding post-construction, the project involves the construction and operation of a new single-family residence and would not result in the violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>					
10.b.	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, as the applicant proposes to connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) for domestic water service.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>					
10.c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:		X		
	i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project would result in 4,648 sq. ft. of new impervious surface and proposes energy dissipaters at the end of the new driveway in the public right-of-way, as well as a swale and a rock retention pit to handle drainage from house construction. The project could potentially</p>					

alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Mitigation Measure 19, below, requires that post-construction project run-off comply with standard requirements of the Municipal Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy. Project compliance with these regulations would prevent the substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns of the site and area. The project does not involve alteration of the course of a stream or river.

**Mitigation Measure 19:** At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan to the Building Inspection Section for review for compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy.

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

- a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.
- b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas.
- c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas.

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

**Source:** Project C3C6 form, Project Site Plan and Drainage Plan (Pages A-1 and C-1)

ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see Section 10.c for discussion. The project would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see Section 10.c, above, for discussion.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
10.d. Significantly degrade surface or ground water water quality?		X		

<p><b>Discussion:</b> With the implementation of mitigation measures as discussed in Section 7.b, potential project impacts to surface water quality related to sedimentation would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
10.e.	Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?		X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see Section 10.c for discussion.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
	iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?			X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project would not impede or redirect flood flows There is no work proposed within an existing drainage channel or creek.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
10.f.	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, create or contribute runoff water which would risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The site is located approximately 1,200 feet from the boundary of the tsunami inundation zone. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is not identified as potential concerns by the Geotechnical Investigation.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
10.g.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?		X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project includes proposes to connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) for domestic water services. Also, please see Section 10.c for discussion regarding potential impact to stormwater quality.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				

<b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a.	Physically divide an established community?				X



**Discussion:** The project proposes a new residential to be located within an existing residential neighborhood. Development of the property with a residential use would not result in the physical division of an established community.

**Source:** County GIS Maps

11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
---	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project complies with the R-1/S-17 Zoning District, the County’s Local Coastal Program, and the County’s General Plan.

**Source:** County GIS Maps

11.c. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The site is a vacant parcel located that the intersection of 2 paper streets, East Avenue and 15th Street. The project site involves the extension of a 20-foot wide driveway from the end of the paved portion of 14th Street in Montara, along a paper/undeveloped portion of East Avenue, to a parcel on 15th Street. 15th Street is a paper/undeveloped street located north of and parallel to Montara Creek. The subject parcel, along with 3 other undeveloped parcels, are located along 15th Street and are not currently accessible via 15th Street. While the proposed driveway from 14th Street provides vehicle access to the subject parcel, it does not provide access to other undeveloped parcels along 15th Street. Also, as the proposed driveway only allows for private access to the subject parcel, it is not a formal road extension of 14th Avenue or East Avenue and would not directly encourage development of East Avenue or 15th Street or undeveloped parcels located along those paper streets. The project would connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District for domestic water services, which provides service to this area.

**Source:** Project Plans; County GIS Maps

<b>12. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not involve any mining or extraction of minerals.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
12.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project would not affect any nearby mineral resource recovery site, if such a site should exist nearby.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; County GIS Maps</p>				

<b>13. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project will generate additional non-substantial, temporary noise associated with grading and construction. However, such noises will be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (<i>Exemptions</i>) of the County Ordinance Code.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see discussion in Section 13.a.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				

12.e. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Please see discussion in Section 9.e, above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans; Half Moon Bay Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan</p>				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see discussion in Section 11.c, above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is an undeveloped, residential parcel and proposed improvements support this use. The project would provide one additional single-family residential unit of housing and would not displace any existing housing.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				

<b>15. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?			X	
15.b. Police protection?			X	
15.c. Schools?			X	
15.d. Parks?			X	
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the construction of one single-family residence on a legal parcel within an existing residential neighborhood in unincorporated Montara, California. The project has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Coastside Fire Protection District. The project site is located in an established residential subdivision, where police, school and park services presently exist in this area.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				

<b>16. RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the construction of one single-family residence on a legal parcel and would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The parcel is legal, with a Certificate of Compliance Type A recorded on December 12, 2017.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of				X

recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not involve the construction of any recreational facilities. The project involves the construction of one single-family residence on a residential parcel and would not require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				

<b>17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
	<b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The County LCP (Policy 2.52) exempts the development of singular single-family dwellings from the development and implementation of a traffic impact analysis and mitigation plan. The project involves the construction of one single-family residence and an associated driveway and would result in a temporary increase in traffic levels during construction and a negligible permanent increase in traffic levels after construction. The proposed use is a private single-family residential use and provides adequate on-site parking. Therefore, the project does not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Local Coastal Program (LCP)</p>				
17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts?</i>  <i>Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.</i>			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts</i>, describes specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. It states that, generally, vehicle miles traveled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. "Vehicle miles traveled" refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. The project involves the construction of one single-family residence within an existing residential neighborhood. The project will result in a temporary increase in traffic levels during construction and a negligible permanent increase in traffic levels</p>				

after construction. Therefore, the project does not conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans				
17.c. Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The project site involves the extension of a 20-foot wide driveway from the end of the paved portion of 14th Street in Montara, along a paper/undeveloped portion of East Avenue, to a parcel on 15th Street. The proposed driveway from 14th Street provides vehicle access to only the subject parcel and would not significantly increase hazards to the public through a design feature. The driveway design has been preliminarily approved by the County Department of Public Works. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The project has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by Cal-Fire and would not result in inadequate emergency access. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans				

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

**Discussion:** There are no structures on the property. The project site is not listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. Furthermore, the project is not listed in a local register of historical resources, pursuant to any local ordinance or resolution as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).

**Source:** Letter from California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), dated June 20, 2016; Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15 Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California”, prepared by Matthew R. Clark of Holman & Associates (H&A) Archeological Consultants, dated December 2017

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

**Discussion:** The applicant submitted a report titled “Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15 Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California”, prepared by Matthew R. Clark of Holman & Associates (H&A) Archeological Consultants, dated December 2017 (Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report), included as Attachment H. The Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report found no evidence of prehistoric archaeological resources on the 15th Street Project Area by archival search or field survey. It states that though most portions of the Project Area were obscured by surface conditions, significant resources on this sloped property are relatively unlikely. A larger but similar area adjacent to the Project Area had been surveyed previously with no resources found, and other nearby surveys have found or recorded no resources either historic or prehistoric, except on the west side of SR 1. The report determined this area would have been somewhat suitable for prehistoric cultural use but probably limited primarily to perhaps a trail along the creek bank, so the likelihood of encountering prehistoric sites is low.

The Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report concluded that the proposed residential development in the 15th Street Project Area can proceed without affecting known prehistoric or historic archaeological resources as defined under CEQA. However, due to the inability to adequately inspect much of the property, the normal conditions requiring appropriate investigations if potential archaeological resources are encountered should be in place for this development. The recommendation of the Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report has been included as Mitigation Measure 10 in Section 5.a.

Staff requested a Sacred Lands file search of the project vicinity, which was conducted by the Native American Heritage Council (NAHC), and resulted in no found records (Attachment H3). Planning staff has consulted with the following tribes, as identified by the NAHC:

- Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
- Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista
- Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
- Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan

- Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area
- The Ohlone Indian Tribe

On December 6, 2018, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comment by January 6, 2019. No comments were received to date.

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

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

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

**Source:** Letter from Native American Heritage Council, dated November 30, 2018; California Assembly Bill 52; Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15 Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California”, prepared by Matthew R. Clark of Holman & Associates (H&A) Archeological Consultants, dated December 2017

<b>19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project is required to demonstrate compliance with the County’s Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Permit, which require the construction of new site design measures to reduce stormwater runoff and associated negative environmental impacts. The project proposes to connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) for sewer services. MWSD has reviewed the project plans and the project will be subject to MWSD permitting requirements. Therefore, the project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or</p>				



<p>stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project includes proposes to connect to the Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) for domestic water services. MWSD has reviewed the project plans and the project will be subject to permitting requirements.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
19.c. Result in a determination by the waste-water treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see discussion in Section 19.a, above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the construction of one single-family residence and would result in a negligible increase in solid waste disposal needs.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				
19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the construction of one single-family residence and would result in a negligible increase in solid waste disposal needs.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans</p>				

<b>20. WILDFIRE.</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located within a designated State Responsibility Area (SRA) or Local Responsibility Area (LRA) fire hazard zone or Wildland Urban Interface Zone.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Map</p>				
20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The site is moderately sloped at 19.9%. Montara Creek is located south of the property and an unvegetated drainage is located to the east of the property, providing natural fuel breaks should a fire occur. Please see discussion in Section 20.a.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Map</p>				
20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see discussion in Sections 20.a and 20.b.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Map</p>				
20.d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The site is relatively moderately sloped at 19.9%. Please see discussion in Sections 20.a and 20.b.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> County GIS Map.</p>				

<b>21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Yes, as discussed in this document, the project has the potential to result in environmental impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures included in this document would adequately reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Subject Document</p>				
21.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the construction and operation of a single-family residence within an existing residential neighborhood on a previously undeveloped property, located at the intersection of two paper streets, as discussed in Section 11.c above. Due to the limited vehicle access provided by the project, the infill nature of the proposed residential construction, and existing water and sewer services in the area, the project is not likely to result in a cumulatively considerable impact when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Subject Document</p>				
21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> As discussed in this document, the project could result in environmental impacts that could both directly and indirectly cause impacts on human beings. However, implementation of</p>				

mitigation measures included in this document would adequately reduce project impacts to less than significant levels.

Source: Subject Document.

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

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
CalTrans		X	
City		X	
Coastal Commission		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
Other: None		X	
National Marine Fisheries Service		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
Sewer/Water District: MWSD		X	
State Department of Fish and Wildlife		X	
State Department of Public Health		X	
State Water Resources Control Board		X	

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	X	
Other mitigation measures are needed.		X
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 1:</b> Upon the start of excavation activities and through to the completion of the project, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that the following dust control guidelines are implemented:</p> <p>a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.</p>		

- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
- e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- g. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

**Mitigation Measure 2:** An environmental training shall be provided to all workers prior to the start of any activities regarding any sensitive biological resources (including CRLF, SFGS, or migratory bird nesting birds). The training shall include steps to identify and respond to a sighting, the laws and regulations protecting those resources, and consequences of non-compliance. Date and time of each training shall be reported to the County within one week of completion.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** At least 14 days prior to the onset of any construction-related activity, exclusion fencing (designed for CRLF and SFGS) with exit funnels shall be installed between the project site and both Montara Creek and the unnamed tributary. Exit funnels shall be installed approximately every 100 meters to allow trapped individuals to leave the area on their own. Following installation, the fence shall be inspected by a qualified biologist periodically throughout the duration of any ground-disturbing activities. Should a durable exclusion fence material such as Ertec be used, fence inspections after initial inspection are only necessary following high wind or heavy rain events.

**Mitigation Measure 4:** A pre-construction survey for CRLF and SFGS shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities within 48 hours of the start of ground disturbance activities. Surveys are to be conducted by approved qualified biologist with experience surveying for each species. If CRLF or SFGS is found on the project site it shall be allowed to leave the area on its own. If the animal does not leave the area on its own, work shall remain halted and USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted.

**Mitigation Measure 5:** No work shall be performed within 30 minutes of sunrise or sunset or during or within 24 hours of any rain event (greater than 0.5 inches) between February 1 and April 31 when frogs are most likely to utilize upland habitats.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic monofilament netting (erosion control matting), rolled erosion control products, or similar material shall not be used.

**Mitigation Measure 7:** A pre-construction, migratory bird nesting survey shall be conducted prior to any proposed construction-related activities during the nesting bird season (February 1 to August 31). The survey shall be performed both in and within 250 feet of the proposed development area and the results reported to the County. If for any reason construction activities do not commence within 10 days of completion of the survey, the survey shall be repeated and results reported to the County. If active nests are discovered, no construction-related activities are allowed until birds have fledged from nests, as confirmed by a biologist.

**Mitigation Measure 8:** In order to minimize tree root impacts during grading for the new driveway, a pneumatic air-tool shall be used to excavate the soil beneath the 40.9" dbh Cypress' (Tree #5) dripline. This would minimize unnecessary root cutting and allow the arborist to better qualify which roots could reasonably be cut to truly minimize impact to the tree. Furthermore, installation of geo-grid or other structural geotextile fabrics should be utilized to minimize excavation and preserve the trees roots. Plans submitted for an encroachment permit and a building permit for the new driveway shall demonstrate compliance with this condition.

**Mitigation Measure 9:** To provide adequate clearance over the proposed driveway a low large lateral limb of the 40" Cypress (Tree 5) and potentially other low branches will need to be removed. Vertical clearance over the driveway necessary to provide truck access during construction will likely require a minimum vertical clearance of 15 feet. Tree limb removal shall be performed by a certified arborist. Documentation demonstrating compliance with this mitigation measure shall be sent to the Project Planner prior to any land disturbance.

**Mitigation Measure 10:** Prior to any land disturbance and throughout the grading operation, the applicant shall implement the tree protection measures of the Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan for 1900 East Avenue, Montara, Ca. and said protections shall remain in place undisturbed throughout construction, as described in the Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan, dated January 11, 2019.

**Mitigation Measure 11:** Although no archaeological resources were found on the Project Area, it is possible that subsurface deposits may yet exist or that evidence of such resources has been obscured by more recent natural or cultural factors such as downslope aggradation and alluviation and the presence of non-native trees and vegetation. Archaeological and historical resources and human remains are protected from unauthorized disturbance by State law, and supervisory and construction personnel therefore must notify the County and proper authorities if any possible archaeological or historic resources or human remains are encountered during construction activities and halt construction to allow qualified Archaeologists to identify, record, and evaluate such resources and recommend an appropriate course of action.

**Mitigation Measure 12:** In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Community Development Director of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archeologist and any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archeologist shall be required to submit to the Community Development Director for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred. Disposition of Native American remains shall comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e).

**Mitigation Measure 13:** The applicants and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains, whether historic or prehistoric, during grading and construction. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the

County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.

**Mitigation Measure 14:** During the building permit application stage and prior to issuance of a building permit for the project, the applicant shall demonstrate project design compliance with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc.

**Mitigation Measure 15:** Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the residence, the applicant shall revise the Erosion Control Plan to include the driveway area and proposed measures and additional measures as follows, subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director:

- a. Protect Surface Water Locations: Montara Creek and the drainage are located within close proximity of proposed disturbed areas and access ways on your property. Please provide primary control measures (e.g., 2 rows of staked fiber rolls) along both sides of the driveway in the immediate project area.
- b. Show location of utility trenches, indicate utility types, and identify timing of installation.
- c. Construction Access Routes: Over access points at the end of the paved portion of 14th Street, construct a stabilized designated entrance(s), using 3" - 4" fractured aggregate over geo-textile fabric.

**Mitigation Measure 16:** The applicant shall adhere to the San Mateo County-wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Delineation with field markers clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.
- b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.
- c. Performing clearing and earth moving activities only during dry weather.
- d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30. Stabilization shall include both proactive measures, such as the placement of hay bales or coir netting, and passive measures, such as re-vegetating disturbed areas with plants propagated from seed collected in the immediate area.
- e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.
- f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.
- g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.
- h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.

- i. Limiting and timing applications of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.
- j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.
- k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.
- l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.
- m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.

**Mitigation Measure 17:** Once approved, erosion and sediment control measures of the revised Erosion Control Plan shall be installed prior to beginning any site work and maintained throughout the term of grading and construction, until all disturbed areas are stabilized. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time. Revisions to the approved erosion control plan shall be prepared and signed by the engineer and submitted to the Building Inspection Section.

**Mitigation Measure 18:** It shall be the responsibility of the engineer of record to regularly inspect the erosion control measures for the duration of all grading remediation activities, especially after major storm events, and determine that they are functioning as designed and that proper maintenance is being performed. Deficiencies shall be immediately corrected, as determined by and implemented under the observation of the engineer of record.

**Mitigation Measure 19:** At the time of application for a building permit, the applicant shall submit a permanent stormwater management plan to the Building Inspection Section for review for compliance with Municipal Stormwater Regional Permit Provision C.3.i and the County's Drainage Policy.

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

- a. Direct roof runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use.
- b. Direct roof runoff onto vegetated areas.
- c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios onto vegetated areas.

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

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



**DETERMINATION** (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

X

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

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



(Signature)

Camille Leung, Project Planner

August 17, 2020

Date

(Title)

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. Driveway and Utility Plans
- D. Erosion and Sediment Control Plan
- E. Previous Biological Reports:
  - 1. A Riparian Habitat Areas Assessment by WRA, Inc., dated April 17, 2015.
  - 2. A Biological Resources Assessment Report by WRA, Inc., dated August 7, 2015.
- F. Current Biological Reports:
  - 1. Letter from Consulting Biologist Daniel Edelstein, dated March 17, 2015
  - 2. Updated Biological Resources Addendum Letter by Sol Ecology, Inc., dated December 13, 2017.

3. Email from Sol Ecology, Inc. staff to Project Planner, dated November 29, 2018
  4. Biological Resources Addendum Letter by Sol Ecology, Inc., dated October 25, 2018.
  5. Biological Resources Addendum Letter by Sol Ecology, Inc., dated June 23, 2020.
- G. Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Buckley Engineering Associates, Inc., dated May 9, 2014
- H. Initial Cultural/Archeological Resources Reconnaissance Report for Parcel at 15 Street and East Avenue, (APN 037-015-090) in Montara, San Mateo County, California, prepared by Matthew R. Clark of Holman & Associates Archeological Consultants, dated December 2017.
- I. Arborist Reports and Correspondence with County Arborist:
1. Arborist Report and Tree Protection Plan for 1900 East Avenue, Montara, Ca, prepared by Roy C. Leggit, III, dated January 11, 2019.
  2. Correspondence with County Arborist, emails dated December 3, 2018 and January 3, 2019.
- J. Letter from California Coastal Commission, dated June 28, 2016

CL:pac – CMLEE0311\_WPH.DOCX