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INITIAL STUDY 
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST

1. **Project Title:** Complete the Gap Trail Project

2. **County File Number:** PLN 12072017

3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Parks Department, 455 County Center – Fourth Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063

4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Cecily Harris, Senior Management Analyst  
(650) 363-4027, charris@smcgov.org

5. **Project Location:** The approximately 0.3-acre Project corridor is located in unincorporated San Mateo County near the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. The Project would be located on the western shoulder of Skyline Boulevard (State Route 35 [SR 35]), a two-lane highway which runs along the eastern shore of the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. Figure 1 shows the location of the Project corridor in the region and Figure 2 shows the Project corridor’s immediate location and nearby land uses.

6. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**  
County of San Mateo Parks Department, 455 County Center – Fourth Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063. Contact: Cecily Harris, Senior Management Analyst, (650) 363-4027, charris@smcgov.org

7. **General Plan Designation:** General Open Space

8. **Zoning:** Resource Management/Coastal Zone (RM-CZ/CD)

9. **Description of the Project:**

   The Project would involve construction of an 800-foot-long paved trail segment up to 10 feet wide on the western shoulder of Skyline Boulevard. The trail segment would be bordered by a 54-inch metal safety fence barrier on the east side, separating the trail from the roadway’s travel lanes for motor vehicles, and a gravel shoulder and six-foot chain-link fence with barbed wire on top on the west side. The northern section of the trail segment would have a 250-foot long, two- to five-foot high retaining wall. Figures 3 through 6 show the proposed site plans and trail sections.

   The proposed Project is intended to eliminate a trail gap and connect the existing Crystal Springs Dam Trail segment to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail segment. These segments are a part of the 17.5-mile Crystal Springs Regional Trail (CSRT) system that connects the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the eastern side of the San Francisco Watershed reservoirs. The CSRT serves a variety of users including hikers, joggers, equestrians, and cyclists.
Figure 1 – Regional Location
Figure 2 – Project Location
Figure 3 – Proposed Site Plans: Northern Segment

Source: Bellecci & Associates, Inc. March 2017
Figure 4 – Proposed Site Plans: Central Segment

Source: Bellecoul & Associates, Inc. March 2017
Figure 5 – Proposed Site Plans: Southern Segment

Source: Bellecci & Associates, Inc. March 2017
Figure 6 – Typical Trail Sections

Source: Bellecci & Associates, Inc. March 2017
It is estimated that construction of the proposed trail would begin in the spring of 2018 and conclude at the end of 2018. Based on this timeline, the IS-MND assumes that the overall construction period would take six months. Approximately 0.30 acres would be disturbed. The total volume of graded material is estimated at approximately 1,500 cubic yards, with a maximum excavation depth of 12 feet.

10. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting**:

   **Project corridor.** The approximately 0.3-acre Project corridor is located in unincorporated San Mateo County near the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. The site consists of Skyline Boulevard, adjacent coast live oak woodland, and a Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) tower to the northwest. The site is bordered by the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir to the west, Lower Crystal Springs Dam to the north, the intersection of Skyline Blvd and a service access road to the south, and a thickly vegetated open space area to the east. Beyond this open space area lies Interstate 280 (I-280), approximately 450 feet east of Skyline Boulevard. The Project corridor is currently closed off from public access due to construction activities on the Lower Crystal Springs Dam, and is being used to house construction equipment, vehicles, and debris.

   **Surrounding Area.** Lands immediately surrounding the Project corridor are largely undeveloped with vegetated open space. Single-family homes can be found within a quarter-mile radius of Skyline Boulevard, to the east and northeast. Approximately 450 feet east of Skyline Boulevard is I-280. West of the Project corridor is the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. South of the Project corridor is open space comprised of unincorporated San Mateo County land along the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. **Figure 7 and Figure 8** show photographs of the existing conditions at the Project corridor and its surroundings, respectively.

11. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required**:

   - San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
     - Approval of construction staging and fencing
Figure 7 – Site Photos

**Photo 1:** Northward view of the Project corridor on Skyline Boulevard.

**Photo 2:** Westward view of the Project corridor where planned trail would be located.
Figure 8 – Surrounding Area Photos

Photo 3: Southward view of Skyline Boulevard from Project corridor.

Photo 4: Westward view of Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir from Project corridor.
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.

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

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

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

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

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

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

---

### 1. AESTHETICS.

**Environmental Setting:** The Project corridor is located on Skyline Boulevard, south of the Lower Crystal Springs Dam. Skyline Boulevard is cut into a hillside and bordered on both the east and west by heavily vegetated areas of coast live oak woodland. The eastern border has a steep, vegetated slope that abuts Skyline Boulevard. The western border of the Project has a thin strip of gradually downward-sloping, vegetated shoreline which separates the site from the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. The Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir is partially visible from the Project corridor through several clearings through the trees that line the western portion of Skyline Boulevard, as shown in **Figure 8**. The Project corridor is not visible from the closest residences, which are within a quarter-mile radius of Skyline Boulevard, to the east and northeast.

Goals and policies in the San Mateo County General Plan (1986) to protect visual quality would apply to the majority of the Project corridor which consists of unincorporated County land. Goal 4.1 would protect and enhance the natural visual quality of the County. Policy 4.29 is to preserve natural vegetation, replace vegetation and trees removed during construction, use native plant materials compatible with the surrounding vegetation, climate, soil, and ecological characteristics, and provide special protection to large and native trees.

Would the Project:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.a.</th>
<th>Have a significant adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** As discussed above, the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir is partially visible from the Project corridor through several small clearings through vegetation that line the western portion of Skyline Boulevard. The proposed 54-inch metal safety fence barrier on the east side of the trail, separating the trail from the roadway’s travel lanes for motor vehicles, and a six-foot chain-link fence with barbed wire on top on the west side would partially obstruct existing views of the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir from the Project corridor through the clearings. However, there are no existing sensitive viewers at the Project corridor as the sole users of the site are motorists driving at moderate speeds along Skyline Boulevard and are unlikely to be able to view the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir through the clearings. Additionally, views of the Project corridor from the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir are generally blocked by existing vegetation and would be minimally affected by the proposed Project.

**Conclusion:** The inclusion of two fences on the Project corridor would have a less than significant impact on scenic views.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.b.</th>
<th>Significantly damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Construction of the proposed trail would involve the removal of six coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) trees up to 24 inches in diameter within the Project corridor, which serve as scenic resources to motorists on Skyline Boulevard. However, as the 800-foot long corridor is densely forested, the removal of six trees would have a less than substantial adverse effect on scenic trees. Furthermore, the Project would have no effect on rock outcroppings or historic buildings, as these resources are not present on-site.

The Project corridor is located within an area of scenic undeveloped open space approximately 450 feet east of I-280, a State designated scenic route also known as the Junipero Serra Freeway (Caltrans 2013). However, the Project corridor is not visible from the scenic route due to a raised, heavily vegetated area between the Project corridor and I-280. Additionally, the segment of Skyline Boulevard in which the Project corridor is located is not classified as a State scenic highway. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact on scenic resources.

**Conclusion:** The Project would have a less than significant impact on scenic resources.

1.c. Significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline?

|   |   | X |

**Discussion:** Skyline Boulevard through the Project corridor is bordered by coast live oak woodland. This road corridor currently has high visual quality because of the surrounding natural open space. The proposed removal of six coast live oak trees west of the existing paved roadway, adjacent to the service access road, would incrementally degrade the existing visual quality of the site. The Project also would involve the construction of an 800-foot long paved trail segment up to 10 feet wide, bordered by a 54-inch metal safety fence barrier on the east side, separating the trail from the roadway’s travel lanes for motor vehicles, and a six-foot chain-link fence with barbed wire on top on the west side. The introduction of a safety fence and chain-link fence in a largely natural setting would also incrementally degrade the existing visual quality of the site. However, as the Project corridor is not visible to existing sensitive viewers, changes to the Project corridor would not substantially alter or visually intrude on the site’s visual character. The Project also would not significantly change topography or ground surface relief features, and would not involve development on a ridgeline.

**Conclusion:** Aesthetic impacts associated with the removal of coast live oak trees and the construction of two fences would have a less than significant impact on the visual character and quality of the site.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

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

|   |   | X |

**Discussion:** The Project would not create any sources of light or glare as no exterior lighting or nighttime construction is proposed.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

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

|   |   | X |

**Discussion:** As discussed in Item 1.b, the Project corridor is not located on a State-designated scenic route. However, the corridor is part of a section of Skyline Boulevard from San Francisco to Half Moon Bay Road that is classified as a County Designated Route in the San Mateo County General Plan, Section 4.46 (San Mateo County 1986). Construction of the proposed trail would involve the removal of six coast live oak trees within the Project corridor, which serve as scenic resources to motorists on Skyline Boulevard. However, as the 800-foot long corridor is densely wooded, the removal of six trees would have minimal adverse effect on scenic trees. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact on designated Scenic Highways or County Scenic Corridors.

**Conclusion:** The Project would have a less than significant impact on scenic roadway corridors.
**Sources:** San Mateo County, General Plan, 1986. Caltrans, Scenic Highway Program - San Mateo County, 2011.

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

**Discussion:** San Mateo County has design review districts for the areas of Bayside, Emerald Lake, and the coast communities of Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Miramar, and Princeton. The Project corridor is not located within any of these design review districts. Implementation of the Project would not conflict with Zoning Ordinance provisions.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** San Mateo County, Design Review website, 2017.

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

**Discussion:** See the discussion under Item 1.c. The Project would not result in a substantial visual intrusion into an area having natural scenic qualities.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

---

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

**Environmental Setting:** The Project corridor is zoned Resource Management/Coastal Zone (RM-CZ/CD). The corridor and adjacent land are not used for farming, grazing, forest land, or timberland. The site is not under a Williamson Act contract, and no Williamson Act land is located in the vicinity of the Project corridor.

Would the Project:

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

The California Department of Conservation (DOC), Office of Land Conservation, maintains a statewide inventory of farmlands. These lands are mapped by the Division of Land Resource Protection as part of the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The maps are updated every two years with the use of aerial photographs, a computer mapping system, public review, and field reconnaissance. Important farmlands are divided into the following five categories based on their suitability for agriculture:

- **Prime Farmland** is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for crop production. It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed.
- **Farmland of Statewide Importance** is land other than Prime Farmland that has a good combination of physical and chemical characteristics for crop production.
- **Unique Farmland** is land that does not meet the criteria for Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance, but has been used for the production of specific crops with high economic value.
- **Farmland of Local Importance** is either currently producing crops or has the capability of production, but does not meet the criteria of the categories above.
- **Grazing Land** is land on which the vegetation is suited to grazing livestock.

The Project corridor and vicinity are designated as Other Land under the FMMP, indicating that they do not have value for agricultural production or grazing (Department of Conservation [DOC] 2016).

**Conclusion:** The Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance outside the Coastal Zone to a non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur.


| 2.b. | Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract? | X |

**Discussion:** The Project corridor is zoned Resource Management/Coastal Zone (RM-CZ/CD) and is not intended for agricultural use. The Project corridor is not located within an existing Open Space Easement or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, Open Space Easements, or Williamson Act contracts.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.


| 2.c. | Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use? | X |

**Discussion:** The Project would involve the removal of six trees from oak woodlands adjacent to Skyline Boulevard. However, this loss of trees would not result in the loss of timber or forestry...
resources. Furthermore, the Project would not involve construction on land currently used for agricultural resources. Therefore, the Project would not result in conversion of such uses.

**Conclusion:** No impact from other changes in the existing environment would occur.

**Source:** San Mateo County, Find My Zoning District, 2017.

| 2.d. | For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts? | X |

**Discussion:** The Project is not located within the Coastal Zone in San Mateo County.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur because the Project corridor is outside the Coastal Zone.

**Source:** San Mateo County, Find My Zoning District, 2017.

| 2.e. | Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land? | X |

**Discussion:** While the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Web Soil Survey does not have available data on the Capability Class of soils at a usable resolution for the Project corridor (USDA 2016), the site is a natural open space area with steep topography that is not suitable for agricultural cultivation. Therefore, the Project would not result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** USDA, Web Soil Survey, 2016.

| 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:** The Project is zoned Resource Management/Coastal Zone (RM-CZ/CD) and is not zoned for forestland or timberland. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause the rezoning of, forest or timberland.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** San Mateo County, Find My Zoning District, 2017.
3. AIR QUALITY.

Environmental Setting: The Project corridor is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin (SFBAAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). As the local air quality management agency, the BAAQMD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that state and federal air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards.

Depending on whether or not the standards are met or exceeded, SFBAAB is classified as being in “attainment” or “nonattainment.” Under state law, air districts are required to prepare a plan for air quality improvement for pollutants for which the district is in non-compliance. The BAAQMD is in non-attainment for the state and federal ozone standards, the state and federal PM$_{2.5}$ (particulate matter up to 2.5 microns in size) standards, and the state PM$_{10}$ (particulate matter up to 10 microns in size) standards and is required to prepare a plan for improvement (BAAQMD 2017a).

This analysis uses the BAAQMD’s May 2017 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines to evaluate air quality. The May 2017 Guidelines include revisions made to the 2010 Guidelines, addressing the California Supreme Court’s 2015 opinion in the Cal. Bldg. Indus. Ass’n vs. Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. Dist., 62 Cal. 4th 369 (BAAQMD 2017b). Therefore, the numeric thresholds in the May 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Thresholds were used for this analysis to determine whether the impacts of the Project exceed the thresholds identified in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines.

The BAAQMD has developed screening criteria to provide lead agencies and project applicants with a conservative indication of whether a project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. If all of the screening criteria are met by a project, then the lead agency or applicant would not need to perform a detailed air quality assessment of their project’s air pollutant emissions. These screening levels are generally representative of new development on greenfield sites without any form of mitigation measures taken into consideration. For city parks, the BAAQMD’s operational criteria pollutant screening size is 2,613-acres and the construction-related screening size is 67-acres. The proposed Project involves 0.30-acres and is well below the screening criteria. Nonetheless, this analysis quantifies emissions associated with the Project and compares them to BAAQMD’s numeric significance thresholds.

Table 1 presents the significance thresholds for construction and operational-related criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions being used for the purposes of this analysis. These represent the levels at which a project’s individual emissions of criteria air pollutants or precursors would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the SFBAAB’s existing air quality conditions. For the purposes of this analysis, the proposed Project would result in a significant impact if construction or operational emissions would exceed any of the thresholds shown in Table 1. ¹

¹ Note the thresholds for PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ apply to construction exhaust emissions only.
### Table 1

**Air Quality Thresholds of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant/Precursor</th>
<th>Construction (Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day))</th>
<th>Operational (Maximum Annual Emissions (tpy))</th>
<th>Construction (Average Daily Emissions (lbs/day))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOX</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 (exhaust)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 (exhaust)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 2-1, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2017.

Notes: tpy = tons per year; lbs/day = pounds per day; NOX = oxides of nitrogen; PM$_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less; PM$_{10}$ = respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 10 micrometers or less; ROG = reactive organic gases; tpy = tons per year.

In addition, a significant air quality impact would occur if the Project design or Project construction does not incorporate control measures recommended by the BAAQMD to control emissions during construction (as listed in Table 8-1 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines).

Emissions from construction activity were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.1. Construction was modeled to begin in April 2018 and end in November 2018. Site preparation would occur first, followed by grading and paving. Average daily emissions from Project construction were calculated including both on-site and off-site activities. On-site activities would consist of the operation of off-road construction equipment, as well as on-site truck travel (e.g., haul trucks, water trucks, dump trucks, and concrete trucks), whereas off-site sources would be emissions from construction vehicle trips.

Would the Project:

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

**Discussion:** The Project would result in temporary emissions during the anticipated period of six months when construction equipment would be in use. As discussed in Section 16, Transportation/Traffic, the Project would not contribute to urban growth or substantially increase the number of visitors and associated vehicle trips to the Crystal Springs Regional Trail. Therefore, the Project would not introduce new long-term sources of air pollutants into the SFBAAB. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality management plans due to the small size, short duration, and the temporary nature of construction.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** BAAQMD, 2017 Clean Air Plan.
3.b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation? X

Discussion: The Project would not introduce new permanent sources of air emissions into the SFBAAB: it would not contribute to urban growth or substantially increase visitor-ship to the Crystal Springs Regional Trail.

The Project would result in temporary emissions for the duration of the work that involves use of construction equipment. These impacts are associated with fugitive dust ($\text{PM}_{10}$ and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$) and exhaust emissions from the expected use of a backhoe and small excavator to grade areas and a drill rig to excavate holes for soldier piles.

The following significance thresholds for construction emissions within the SFBAAB are based on the 2017 BAAQMD proposed thresholds of significance:

- 54 pounds per day of ROG
- 54 pounds per day of NO$_x$
- 82 pounds per day of $\text{PM}_{10}$ (exhaust only)
- 54 pounds per day of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ (exhaust only)

The CalEEMod analysis of construction emissions assumes a six-month construction period, grading of approximately 0.30 acres, and excavation of approximately 1,500 cubic yards of soil. The CalEEMod calculations are available in Appendix A. **Table 2** summarizes the estimated maximum daily construction emissions of ROG, NO$_x$, CO, $\text{PM}_{10}$, and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ relative to the significance thresholds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NO$_x$</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>$\text{PM}_{10}$</th>
<th>$\text{PM}_{2.5}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum total lbs/day</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>82 (exhaust only)</th>
<th>54 (exhaust only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Exceeded?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** All calculations were made using CalEEMod. See Appendix A for calculations. Site Preparation, Grading, Construction totals include worker trips, construction vehicle emissions and fugitive dust.

As shown in **Table 2**, none of the BAAQMD thresholds would be exceeded. Nonetheless, for all proposed projects, BAAQMD recommends implementing all the Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed in Table 8-1 of the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, to meet the best management practices threshold for fugitive dust, whether or not construction-related emissions exceed applicable thresholds. Sources of fugitive dust would include disturbed soils in the Project corridor and trucks carrying uncovered loads of debris. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site could deposit mud on local streets, which could generate an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. Fugitive dust emissions would vary from day to day, depending on the nature and magnitude of construction activity and local weather conditions. Fugitive dust emissions would also depend on soil moisture, silt content of soil, wind speed, and the amount of equipment operating. Larger dust particles would settle near the source, while fine particles would disperse over greater...
distances from the site. The BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines consider these impacts to be less than significant if best management practices (BMPs) are employed to reduce emissions. While the Project would not generate emissions in excess of BAAQMD thresholds, implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would further reduce emissions, resulting in a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1:** Implementation of the measures recommended by BAAQMD and listed below would reduce the impacts on air quality from fugitive dust emissions during construction to less than significant. The contractor shall implement the following BMPs that are required of all projects:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day;
2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered;
3. 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;
4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph;
5. 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;
6. 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; and
7. 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.

**Conclusion:** Incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce the potential significant impact from violations of air quality standards to a less than significant level.

**Sources:** BAAQMD, 2017 Clean Air Plan. BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated April 2017. CalEEMod, version 2016.3.1.

| 3.c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | X |
BAAQMD's recommended dust control measures in Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would ensure that no significant construction-period emissions occur.

**Conclusion:** Incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce the potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.

**Sources:** BAAQMD, 2017 Clean Air Plan. BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, updated April 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.d.</th>
<th>Expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by BAAQMD?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The closest sensitive receptors to the Project corridor are single-family residences located within a quarter-mile radius of Skyline Boulevard, to the east and northeast. Only temporary emissions from construction equipment and dust would occur during the Project implementation period, and none of the sensitive receptors would be exposed to substantial concentrations of air pollutants because emissions would be well below BAAQMD thresholds. Construction would occur over an anticipated period of six months and would not result in substantial concentration of air pollutants. Additionally, the implementation of BMPs in Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would further reduce impacts from fugitive dust.

**Conclusion:** This impact would be less than significant, and incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

**Sources:** Project plans, 2017. Google Earth, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.e.</th>
<th>Create objectionable odors affecting a significant number of people?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Construction of the proposed bike path would generate odors from the use of heavy equipment and off-gassing of freshly laid asphalt. However, these odors would be temporary and would not affect a substantial number of people because of the remote location of the Project corridor. Existing motorists on Skyline Boulevard and recreational users in nearby open space areas would not be exposed to substantial objectionable odors. Therefore, odor impacts would be less than significant.

**Conclusion:** Impacts from objectionable odors would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

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

**Discussion:** See response to Item 3.b. The Project would temporarily generate pollutants during construction activities. As shown in Table 2, construction-period emissions would not exceed the BAAQMD thresholds. However, implementation of the BAAQMD’s recommended dust control measures in Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would ensure that the Project would not contribute to violations of air quality standards on-site or in the surrounding area.

**Conclusion:** Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce this impact to a less than
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

Environmental Setting: In January 2017, Rincon Consultants, Inc. completed a Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) for the Project, supported by a field reconnaissance survey of the Project corridor that was conducted on January 4, 2017 (Rincon 2017). The focus of the biological studies (as presented in the BRA) was to inform the impact analysis provided herein, and was sufficient to identify and map vegetation communities, assess the potential for special status species to occur on the site and to evaluate potential impacts to biological resources. Focused botanical surveys for special status plants and wildlife were not conducted. The BRA is provided as Appendix B. The Biological Study Area (BSA) refers to the area covered by the biological assessment, and here encompasses the “Project corridor” plus a 50-foot buffer, and the boundary of the BSA is shown in Figure 9 of this IS-MND.

Vegetation Communities. Vegetation communities and habitats were mapped in the field on January 4, 2017 (see Appendix B). One vegetation community and one other land cover type were detected in the BSA: coast live oak woodland (Quercus agrifolia Woodland Alliance) and disturbed/developed. These are described in detail below.

**Coast live oak woodland** (Quercus agrifolia Woodland Alliance). Coast live oak woodland is the only vegetation community in the BSA. This woodland in the BSA is characterized by an open to continuous canopy of coast live oak with California bay (Umbellularia californica) and Pacific madrone (Arbutus menziesii) throughout. Seventy coast live oak trees were recorded within the BSA, with diameter at breast height (dbh) ranging from 7 inches to 29.25 inches. Shrubs in the BSA were mostly toyon (Heteromeles arbutifolia) and western poison oak (Toxicodendron diversilobum). The herbaceous understory is comprised of various annual grasses and forb species that were unable to be identified due to the timing of the reconnaissance survey.

**Disturbed/developed.** Skyline Boulevard runs north-south through the center of the BSA. At the southern end of the BSA, a small segment of the existing CSRT connects to Skyline Boulevard. A single tubular steel pole is present in the BSA just south of the Lower Crystal Springs Dam to the west of Skyline Boulevard.

Special Status Species. Special status species include taxa that are afforded protection by the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), or those that are considered sensitive by state or local agencies such as state Species of Special Concern. In addition, California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) 1B and 2 species are typically regarded as rare, threatened, or endangered under CEQA by lead CEQA agencies and are considered as such in this document. CRPR 4 species have limited distribution globally but are fairly common within their range. CRPR 3 and 4 plant species are typically not considered for analysis under CEQA except where they are designated as rare or otherwise protected by local governments.

**Special Status Plants.** Six regionally occurring special status plant species have at least some potential to occur in the BSA (see Appendix B). These represent species known to occur within the region for which specific habitat requirements or known historical occurrences indicate the species may be present. Of these, four are considered to have moderate potential to occur in the BSA based on presence of suitable habitat and soils, and two have a low potential to occur in the BSA, based on the presence of suitable coast live oak woodland habitat but limited suitability of soils in the BSA (see Appendix B).

The following four special status plant species have a moderate potential to occur in coast live oak woodland in the BSA:
• Franciscan onion (*Allium pensilulare* var. *franciscanum*) – CRPR 1B.2
• San Mateo woolly sunflower (*Eriophyllum latilobum*) – federally and state Endangered; CRPR 1B.1
• Hillsborough chocolate lily (*Fritillaria biflora* var. *ineziana*) – CRPR 1B.1
• Crystal Springs lessingia (*Lessingia arachnoidea*) – CRPR 1B.2

The following two special status plant species have a low potential to occur in coast live oak woodland in the BSA:
• Bent-flowered fiddleneck (*Amsinckia lunaris*) – CRPR 1B.2
• White-rayed pentachaeta (*Pentachaeta bellidiflora*) – federally and state Endangered; CRPR 1B.1

Each of the above species has been recorded in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) within a one-mile radius of the BSA and could potentially be found in the coast live oak woodland on site. Targeted botanical surveys would need to be conducted during the appropriate blooming periods to definitively determine the presence or absence of these species.

**Special Status Wildlife.** Seven regionally occurring special status animal species have at least some potential to occur in the BSA (see Appendix B). These represent wildlife species know to occur within the region and for which the site has the necessary habitat or microhabitat conditions to support these species.

Three special status animal species were determined to have a low potential to occur in the BSA: western pond turtle (*Emys marmorata*); San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*); saltmarsh common yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas sinuosa*). Three special status animal species were determined to have a moderate potential to occur in the BSA: California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*); pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*); and California giant salamander (*Dicamptodon ensatus*). One special status animal species was present in the BSA: San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (*Neotoma fuscipes annectens*).

These species are discussed in more detail below.

**San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat:** This species is a state Species of Special Concern (SSC). Twenty-nine woodrat middens are present in the BSA (*Figure 9*). The coast live oak woodland in the BSA provides moderate canopy and understory habitat that woodrats prefer.

**California red-legged frog:** This species is a federally threatened and state SSC that has a moderate potential to occur in the BSA. The entire BSA is within United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) designated Critical Habitat for California red-legged frog (CRLF) (USFWS 2017). The BSA lacks suitable aquatic/breeding habitat for CRLF, but it potentially provides suitable non-breeding habitat within the coast live oak woodland and is within dispersal distance of a perennial water body. This habitat type within the project area is marginally suitable for frog movement since the proposed trail alignment is not located between the reservoir and other suitable aquatic habitat and is therefore not within a primary movement corridor for the CRLF. All life history stages of the CRLF are most likely to be encountered in and around breeding sites, which include coastal lagoons, marshes, springs, permanent and semi-permanent natural ponds, and ponded and backwater portions of streams, as well as artificial impoundments such as stock ponds, irrigation ponds, and siltation ponds. Eggs are typically deposited in permanent pools, attached to emergent vegetation. The CNDDB record in close proximity to the BSA was recorded in 2007. Observations of adults, tadpoles, and egg masses were made in 2001, 2006, and 2007 (CDFW 2017a). The observation includes the Lower Crystal Springs Dam, just north of the...
Figure 9 – Sensitive Resources within the Biological Study Area
BSA. There are multiple other CNDDB records of CRLF within the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir and within one mile of the BSA. The BSA lacks suitable breeding habitat for CRLF; however, the coast live oak woodland in the BSA could provide suitable upland habitat for dispersal and to shelter, forage, and avoid predators.

*Pallid bat:* This species is a state SSC that has a moderate potential to roost, and is likely to forage in the BSA. Pallid bats have been documented within the nine-quad search area surrounding the BSA. This species’ preferred roosting habitat includes cliff and rocky outcrops, which are not found in the BSA; however, pallid bats could also potentially roost in hollow trees in the BSA. The BSA occurs adjacent to the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir, and the surrounding vegetation provides foraging habitat for pallid bat.

*California giant salamander:* This species is a state SSC that has a moderate potential to occur in the BSA. California giant salamanders have been documented regionally. This species inhabits wet coastal forests surrounding various water sources. The coast live oak woodland in the BSA would potentially provide suitable habitat. This species was documented more than one mile from the BSA in the vicinity of San Mateo Creek in 1997.

*Western pond turtle:* This species is a state SSC that has a low potential to occur in the BSA. Western pond turtles have been documented within one mile of the BSA. The BSA is immediately adjacent to the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir, which provides suitable aquatic habitat. The BSA does not have beaches or grassy open fields for basking, however it may provide suitable upland habitat for dispersal or overwintering. Several CNDDB records of adult western pond turtles exist in the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir from 2006.

*San Francisco garter snake:* This species is federally and state endangered and a state fully protected species that has a low potential to occur in the BSA. San Francisco garter snake was included in the USFWS Information, Planning, and Conservation System (IPaC) (USFWS, 2016) list of species, and has been documented regionally, reportedly occurring within marshes surrounding Crystal Springs Reservoir (USFWS 2006). The BSA does not provide suitable aquatic habitat for this species; however, this species requires upland habitat adjacent to marshlands, typically within 100 to 200 meters of aquatic habitat (USFWS 2006). Preferred upland habitats include open grassy areas and brush, though it may use the coast live oak woodland on site where suitable mammal burrows are present to overwinter. An occurrence of San Francisco garter snake was documented in within one mile of the BSA.

*Saltmarsh common yellowthroat:* This species is a state SSC that has a low potential to occur in the BSA. Saltmarsh common yellowthroat has been documented regionally in marshes near the BSA. This species is found in freshwater and saltwater marshes with emergent vegetation and willows for nesting. The BSA does not provide suitable marsh habitat; however, this species could forage in the coast live oak woodland in the BSA. There are no CNDDB records of saltmarsh common yellowthroat within one mile of the BSA.

Sensitive Communities. No sensitive plant communities are present in the BSA. One sensitive plant community, serpentine bunchgrass, occurs within one mile of the BSA. This community is listed as a sensitive natural community in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) List of Vegetation Alliances and Associations (CDFW 2010). According to the CDFW’s Vegetation Program (CDFW 2010), vegetation alliances with State ranks of S1-S3 are considered to be imperiled, and thus, potentially of special concern. Serpentine bunchgrass is listed as S2.2.

Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands. There are no areas present in the BSA that would qualify as waters of the United States and/or State of California or fall under the jurisdictions of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control
Wildlife Movement. Wildlife movement corridors, or habitat linkages, are generally defined as connections between habitat patches that allow for physical and genetic exchange between otherwise isolated animal populations. Such linkages may serve a local purpose, such as providing a linkage between foraging and denning areas, or they may be regional in nature providing genetic linkages among populations. Some habitat linkages may serve as migration corridors, wherein animals periodically move to and from seasonal ranges. Others may be important as dispersal corridors for young animals. Multiple habitat linkages may form a wildlife corridor network, and may link a variety of different habitats.

Habitat linkages may differ significantly in composition from the habitats being linked, and often simply provide suitable cover for wildlife to move unobstructed between patches of suitable habitat. Typically habitat linkages are contiguous strips of natural areas within a larger landscape of disturbed or developed lands; however, dense plantings of landscape vegetation can be used by certain disturbance-tolerant species on local scales. Depending upon the species using a corridor, specific physical resources (such as rock outcroppings, vernal pools, or oak trees) dispersed at certain minimal intervals may be necessary for the linkage to function for many species. For highly mobile or aerial species, habitat linkages may be discontinuous patches of suitable resources spaced close enough together to permit travel along a route in a short period of time. Wildlife movement corridors can be both large and small scale.

The BSA is not located between or among well-defined habitat regions and as such is unlikely to serve as an important wildlife corridor. The site is located in a comparatively undeveloped area of natural habitat in San Mateo County that runs along the eastern border of the Upper and Lower Crystal Springs Reservoirs. However the BSA is already partially developed, with an existing paved road, Skyline Boulevard that parallels the proposed trail alignment. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) owns and manages the lands surrounding the Crystal Springs Reservoirs, and maintains a chain link fence that is located just west of Skyline Boulevard, to limit public access to the reservoirs. This chain link fence is an existing and established barrier to wildlife movement in the area. I-280 occurs approximately 450 feet east of the proposed trail alignment and represents another major wildlife movement barrier.

Resources Protected by Local Policies and Ordinances. Biological resources in the BSA are protected by policies and ordinances set forth by the County of San Mateo, including the San Mateo County General Plan (1986), which outlines policies to protect biological resources, as well as the San Mateo County Heritage Tree Ordinance, which protects heritage trees from removal. The Heritage Tree Ordinance (Regulations for the Preservation, Protection, Removal and Trimming of Heritage Trees on Public and Private Property [Ordinance 2427, April 5, 1977]) requires a tree permit from the San Mateo County Planning Department for the removal of a heritage tree. The County, as the applicant for the proposed Project, has the legal authority to either apply its Heritage Tree Ordinance or to not subject itself to this ordinance. The County’s Significant Tree Ordinance pertains to private properties and would not apply to the BSA.

Would the Project:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.a. Have a significant adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

**Special Status Plants.** There are six special status plant species that have at least some potential to occur in the BSA: Franciscan onion, San Mateo woolly sunflower, Hillsborough chocolate lily, Crystal Springs lessingia, bent-flowered fiddleneck, and white-rayed pentachaeta.

The Project could potentially directly impact special status plants, if they are present on-site, by removing or damaging them. The construction of a new trail segment on the western shoulder of Skyline Boulevard could result in temporary and permanent impacts to special status plants if present.

Indirect impacts to special status plants could occur due to the spread of invasive, non-native species from vegetation removal and from the spread of seeds on construction equipment. Excavation and fill activities have the potential to propagate invasive species throughout the site. Invasive, non-native plant species can out-compete native species and/or alter the quality of habitat so that it is unsuitable for special status species.

**Special Status Animals.** San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat is the only documented special status animal species in the BSA based upon the presence of woodrat middens in the area (Figure 9). Six additional special status animal species have potential to occur in the BSA based upon known ranges, habitat preferences for the species, species occurrence records from the CNDDB, and previous reports for areas in the vicinity of the site. These six species are: California red-legged frog, pallid bat, California giant salamander, western pond turtle, San Francisco garter snake, and saltmarsh common yellowthroat.

The Project could potentially directly impact special status animals through a direct take or injury. Additionally, the Project activities could reduce habitat for special status species. The Project would result in the permanent change of approximately 6,400 square feet (0.15-acre) of ground condition within critical habitat for CRLF, where the ground would be altered from soil and duff to trail base. However, the impacted area is non-breeding, upland dispersal habitat, and after the completion of construction, all of the non-hardscape areas of the project would again be accessible to CRLF as potential dispersal habitat. Additionally, hardscaped areas would not preclude movement post-construction.

Suitable nesting habitat for birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFGC), as well as for special status birds, occurs in or near the BSA. Direct impacts to nesting birds may occur due to removal of trees and shrubs. Construction on-site may result in indirect impacts to nesting bird species, such as nest abandonment, should they be present near areas of disturbance at the time of construction.

Impacts to special status plants and animals due to construction of the Project are potentially significant and would be reduced to a less than significant level with the following mitigation
Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Botanical Special Status Plant Surveys. The following measures are required:

- Prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activities, surveys for special status plants shall be conducted in all areas of the Project corridor that would be potentially impacted and within a 25-foot buffer or to the extent feasible. The surveys shall be conducted in general accordance with CDFW (CDFG 2009), California Native Plant Society (CNPS 2001), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS 2000) protocols for conducting special status plant surveys. The surveys shall be seasonally timed to coincide with the blooming periods for the six species that have potential to occur on-site. All plant surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist before initial ground disturbance so that sufficient time is allotted to develop a restoration plan and complete agency consultations, if necessary. Any special status plant species identified on-site shall be mapped onto a site-specific aerial photograph and their location shall be recorded with a Global Positioning System (GPS). Field data shall be recorded and submitted to the CNDDB to document the population size, cover, and associated species.

- If feasible, measures shall be implemented to avoid special status plants within the limits of disturbance. If special status plants cannot be avoided, each species shall be restored on-site at a minimum of a 2:1 (number of acres or individuals restored to number of acres or individuals impacted) ratio. A mitigation and monitoring plan shall be prepared and submitted to the jurisdiction overseeing the Project for approval. If a State-listed plant species would be impacted, the restoration plan shall be submitted to CDFW for review. If a federally listed plant species would be impacted, the restoration plan shall be submitted to USFWS for review. The plan shall be in place for no less than three years. The restoration plan shall include specific descriptions of the mitigation site, rationale for expecting successful restoration, site preparation, planting plan, maintenance activities during the monitoring period, success criteria based on the goals and measurable objectives, adaptive management plan, and notification of completion of compensatory mitigation and agency confirmation.

- Prior to ground disturbance, special status plant occurrences that are not within the immediate disturbance footprint, but are located within 50 feet of the disturbance limits shall have brightly colored protective fencing installed at least 30 feet beyond their extent, or other distance as approved by a qualified biologist, to protect them from damage during construction.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Invasive Weed Management. The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive weeds in the Project corridor that could potentially degrade native habitats, including habitat for special status species.

- The removal or disturbance of non-native plant species that are listed by the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC 2007) as having a high invasiveness shall be conducted in a manner that does not increase the risk of spreading these species within the Project corridor or adjacent areas.

- All construction equipment shall be cleaned prior to entering the site so that it is free of soil, seeds, and vegetation that could translocate invasive species into the site from elsewhere. The Inspection & Cleaning checklist from the California Invasive Plant Council’s *Preventing the Spread of Invasive Plants: Best Management Practices for Land Managers*, 3rd Edition, (2012) shall be utilized to verify compliance with invasive species minimization measures.
**Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Pre-Construction Wildlife Survey.** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to avoid or reduce the project’s potentially significant impacts to nesting birds and special status wildlife.

- Not more than 14 days prior to commencement of construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey of the Project corridor to determine if special status wildlife species are present. The survey should be consistent with the standard industry methodology for conducting pre-construction surveys and can be conducted simultaneously with pre-construction nesting bird surveys.

- A pre-construction survey report shall be submitted to the County of San Mateo documenting the methods used and results of the pre-construction survey. The report shall be provided to the County within 30 days of completion of the survey.

- If special status species are determined to be present in the Project corridor at the time of the pre-construction survey, consultation with the relevant resource agency shall commence (e.g., USFWS for federally listed species, CDFW for State listed species) and measures shall be implemented to avoid impacts to the species, such as:
  - Halting construction until the species has left the Project corridor of its own volition.
  - Implementation of avoidance buffers as specified by agency guidelines for the special status species observed.
  - Altering the timing of construction to avoid a species active, migratory, or breeding season

- If non-listed special status wildlife species are present, wildlife species shall be relocated by a County-approved qualified biologist. Species shall be relocated to a County-approved off-site location with suitable habitat to support that species.

- If avoidance of federal or State listed wildlife species (i.e., Threatened or Endangered) is not possible, take permit(s) shall be obtained from USFWS (ESA Section 10(a)(1)(A) for federal listed species) and/or CDFW (CFGC Section 2081(b) for State listed species). Listed species cannot be relocated without the appropriate take permits/authorization from USFWS and/or CDFW, as appropriate.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4: General Wildlife Best Management Practices.** The following general wildlife BMPs shall be required:

- The number of access routes, number and size of staging areas, and the total area of the activity shall be limited to the minimum necessary to achieve the goals of the Project. All vehicles and equipment shall be parked and operated only within the designated access routes, staging areas, and work areas. All Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) that are marked by orange temporary fencing shall be avoided.

- All vehicles shall be in good working condition and free of leaks. All leaks shall be contained and cleaned up immediately to reduce the potential or soil/vegetation contamination.

- Drip pans shall be placed under all stationary vehicles and mechanical equipment.

- All trash that may attract predators must be properly contained and removed from the work site. All such debris and waste shall be picked up daily and properly disposed of at an appropriate site.

- All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur in designated areas. A plan must be in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills prior to the onset of work activities. All workers shall be informed of the appropriate measures to take should an accidental spill occur.
To control sedimentation during and after Project implementation, appropriate erosion control best management practices (i.e., use of coir rolls, jute netting, etc.) shall be implemented. Fiber rolls (straw wattles) and other erosion control materials that are proposed for the Project shall not have monofilament netting.

All trenches, pipes, culverts or similar structures shall be inspected for animals prior to burying, capping, moving, or filling. All excavations in excess of two feet deep shall be sloped, have escape ramps installed that are suitable for the escape of wildlife, or be thoroughly covered at the end of the day. All trenches and excavations shall be inspected for wildlife at the beginning of the work day and prior to backfilling. If a special status species is discovered in a trench or excavation, work in the area shall be redirected, and the special status species shall be allowed to leave the trench and the area of its own accord. In the event any special-status species is trapped in a trench or an excavation and unable to leave on its own accord, USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted to relocate the special-status species or an individual with appropriate permits (e.g., a CDFW collecting permit) shall relocate the special status species.

No exposed hollow open-ended posts or pipes in a vertical, skyward orientation shall be installed as part of the Project or stored/staged on-site. All pipes or posts in the Project corridor during construction which are exposed to the environment shall be capped, screened or filled with material.

Any post with exposed perforations installed in the Project corridor and exposed to the environment shall have the holes permanently filled within the top six inches of the post upon installation.

No pets shall be allowed in the Project corridor.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP).** The following steps to reduce the potential impacts to all special-status species are required:

Prior to initiation of construction activities (including staging and mobilization), all personnel associated with Project construction shall attend WEAP training, conducted by a qualified biologist, to aid workers in recognizing special status resources that may occur on-site. The specifics of this program shall include identification of the special status species and their habitats, a description of the regulatory status and general ecological characteristics of sensitive resources, and review of the limits of construction and mitigation measures required to reduce impacts to biological resources within the work area. The fenced boundaries for all ESAs shall be discussed, including ESAs for special status species and nesting birds. A fact sheet conveying this information shall also be prepared for distribution to all contractors, their employers, and other personnel involved with construction of the Project. All employees shall sign a form documenting that they have attended the WEAP and understand the information presented to them. The form(s) shall be submitted to the implementing agency to document compliance.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-6: California Red-legged Frog Avoidance and Minimization Measures.**

Because the BSA is suitable upland dispersal habitat for CRLF, the following steps to reduce the potential impacts to CRLF are required:

- If feasible, initial ground disturbing activities and any work associated with the Project corridor shall be conducted between May 1 and October 31 during dry weather conditions to minimize the potential for encountering CRLF. Work shall be restricted to daylight hours.
- Water shall not be impounded in a manner that may attract CRLF.
- To ensure that diseases are not conveyed between work sites by the qualified biologist, the
fieldwork code of practice developed by the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force shall be followed at all times.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-7: San Francisco Dusky-Footed Woodrat Avoidance and Minimization Measures.** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to avoid or reduce the project’s potentially significant impacts to San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat:

- If possible, woodrat nests (middens) shall be avoided by any construction activity by at least 25 feet or the largest feasible buffer that preserves the midden where 25 feet is not feasible. Flagging, orange construction fencing, or similar material shall be used to demarcate avoidance buffers, and buffers shall be left in place for the duration of construction activities.

- If woodrat nests cannot be avoided, woodrats shall be passively evicted from their nests prior to removal and relocation of the nests and prior to the onset of ground-disturbing activities to avoid injury or mortality of the woodrats. A qualified biologist shall disturb the woodrat nest to the degree that all woodrats leave the nest and seek refuge outside of the project activity area. Subsequently, the nest shall be removed from the site; if feasible, nest materials will be piled at the base of a nearby tree or shrub. Given the frequency of the use of poison oak for nest building material, it is recommended that a forklift with narrow forks be used to the remove and relocate nests. The spacing between relocated nests shall not be less than 100 feet, unless a qualified biologist has determined that the habitat can support higher densities of nests.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Nesting Birds Avoidance and Minimization Measures.** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to avoid or reduce the project’s potentially significant impacts to nesting birds:

- Initial site disturbance activities, including vegetation removal, shall not occur during the general avian nesting season (February 1 – August 30), if feasible. If breeding season avoidance is not feasible, the applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction nesting bird survey to determine the presence/absence, location, and status of nests in or adjacent to the Project corridor. The extent of the survey buffer area surrounding the site shall be established by the qualified biologist to ensure that direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds are avoided. To avoid the destruction of active nests and to protect the reproductive success of birds protected by the MBTA and CFGC, nesting bird surveys shall be performed not more than 14 days prior to scheduled vegetation clearance and structure demolition. In the event that active nests are discovered, a 300-foot radius avoidance buffer for raptors and a 150-foot radius avoidance buffers for all other birds shall be established around active nests and no construction shall be allowed within the buffer areas until a qualified biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active (e.g., the nestlings have fledged and are no longer reliant on the nest). In locations where topography and/or visual screening limits a direct line of sight between the nest location and Project activities, a qualified biologist may determine that a reduction in the avoidance buffer is warranted and may reduce these distances for individual nest locations if the qualified biologist determines that the reduction in the avoidance buffer will not cause nest failure or abandonment. No ground disturbing activities shall occur within this buffer until the qualified biologist has confirmed that breeding/nesting is completed and the young have fledged the nest. Nesting bird surveys are not required for construction activities occurring between August 30 and February 1.

**Conclusion:** Incorporation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-8 would reduce the potentially significant impact on special status species to a less than significant level.

| Section | Question                                                                 | Impact | Discussion                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Conclusion                                                                                           | Source |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4.b.    | Have a significant adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | X      | Discussion: No sensitive plant communities or riparian habitat are present in the BSA.                                                                                                                     | No impact to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS would occur. | Appendix B |
| 4.c.    | Have a significant adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | X      | Discussion: No jurisdictional wetlands or waters have been identified on-site that would qualify as waters of the United States and/or State of California under the jurisdictions of the USACE, RWQCB, or CDFW. Incorporation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would require general BMPs to avoid leaks, spills, and construction site runoff to the nearby Crystal Springs Reservoir, preventing adverse effects on offsite jurisdictional wetlands or waters. | The impact to jurisdictional waters would be less than significant after mitigation. | Appendix B |
| 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: The BSA lacks perennial channels that could support fish on-site, and fish passage is therefore not affected. However, terrestrial wildlife may use the existing road shoulders of Skyline Boulevard. The Project would involve the relocation of an existing SFPUC chain link fence to align with the western border of the trail segment. This existing fence currently runs in a north-south | |
direction between Skyline Boulevard and Crystal Springs Reservoirs. The Project would involve the addition of a 54-inch metal safety fence between the proposed trail and the existing Skyline Boulevard. This safety fence would consist of three widely spaced horizontal bars that would not impede wildlife passage. The northern section of the Project would have a retaining wall while the southern section would not. The existing SFPUC chain link fence already impedes wildlife movement for animals too big to fit through the chain link openings, and I-280, approximately 450 feet east of the trail alignment also creates a barrier to wildlife movement in the area. The proposed project would not significantly alter wildlife movement through the area, given the extent of existing linear barriers to movement in the region, and would therefore not change the movement patterns that currently exist.

**Conclusion:** The Project would not add significant barriers to wildlife or fish movement that don’t already exist, and therefore the Project would have a less than significant impact on the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species.

**Sources:** Appendix B. Project plans, 2017.

| 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 Project would require the removal of six coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) trees, all within the County of San Mateo, and none larger than 24 inches at breast height. The County regulates tree trimming and removal within its jurisdiction under its Heritage Tree Ordinance. However, the County has discretion on whether to apply its own ordinances to the proposed Project and would not apply the Heritage Tree Ordinance in this case.

**Conclusion:** Because the County’s Heritage Tree Ordinance would not apply to the proposed Project, the Project would have no impacts from conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

**Sources:** San Mateo County, General Plan, 1986. San Mateo County, Regulation of the Removal and Trimming of Heritage Trees on Public and Private Property (Ordinance 2427, April 5, 1977).

| 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 BSA is not located within any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

**Conclusion:** No impact on such plans would occur.

**Source:** California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Regional Conservation Plans Map, July 2017.

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

**Discussion:** No marine or wildlife reserves occur within 200 feet of the site.
Conclusion: No impact on marine or wildlife reserves would occur.

Source: CDFW, San Francisco Bay Marine Protected Areas, March 2016.

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

Discussion: The Project would require the removal of up to six coast live oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*), all within the County of San Mateo but would not substantially alter the extent of oak woodlands regionally. All trees proposed for removal are 24 inches at breast height or smaller.

Conclusion: Because of the small number of oak trees that would be impacted by the Project, and the extent of existing oak woodlands in the region, the Project would have a less than significant impact from loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands.

Source: Project plans, 2017.

5. **CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

Environmental Setting: A Cultural Resources Study was prepared for an approximately 5.4-acre area centered on the Project corridor by Rincon Consultants on January 30, 2017 (see Appendix C). As discussed in this study, a records search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) did not identify any previously recorded cultural resources in the Project corridor. Several recorded resources associated with the Lower Crystal Springs Dam were identified within 0.5-mile of the site. Constructed between 1886 and 1890, this dam was an architecturally innovative engineering prototype for future large water storage dams. The Lower Crystal Springs Dam has been previously determined eligible, with concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) under Criteria A/1 (associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage) and C/3 (embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method or construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values). The Cultural Resources Study also notes that a potential historic district associated with the dam was evaluated in 2008. This district was determined ineligible for the NRHP and CRHR.

To identify cultural resources in the Project corridor, Rincon Consultants conducted an intensive field survey on January 4, 2017 (see Appendix C). No evidence of prehistoric or historic archaeological materials was identified during this pedestrian survey. Based on field observations, the segment of Skyline Boulevard on-site was recorded as a built environment resource on California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms and evaluated for listing in the NRHP and CRHR. This road segment appears to have been initially developed by the Spring Valley Water Company in the late 19th century as a private service road for the Lower Crystal Springs Dam. The service road was most likely realigned as part of constructing a concrete bridge atop the dam in 1924 and incorporating the segment into the larger Skyline Boulevard. Other alterations of the original road segment include its paving with asphalt, partial widening, the addition of adjacent modern roadway signage, and most recently its disconnection from the 1923/1924 bridge, which is currently being replaced.

Although the road segment may have been developed to support construction of the Lower Crystal Springs Dam, it has been substantially altered since this time through its realignment and resurfacing, and by demolition of the original, adjacent wood bridge (see Appendix C). The road segment therefore does not possess sufficient integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association to convey any potentially significant...
associations with the Lower Crystal Springs Dam’s early development. Due to a lack of integrity, the road segment does not appear eligible for NRHP or CRHR listing for any potentially significant associations with events (Criterion A/1) or embodiment of distinctive architectural or engineering characteristics (Criterion C/3). Similarly, the road segment cannot convey an association with 1920s-era highway design in California because of a lack of integrity. In addition, archival research does not indicate that the segment is associated with any significant individuals (Criterion B/2) or that it has potential to yield important information (Criterion D/4).

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Less Than</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Unless</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.a. Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?

**Discussion**: The Cultural Resources Study did not identify any potential historic resources in the Project corridor. Because the on-site segment of Skyline Boulevard lacks integrity from its original period of construction, it is not considered eligible for listing in NRHP or CRHR. The northern end of the proposed trail would be visible from an adjacent historical resource, the Lower Crystal Springs Dam. The proposed addition of a separated trail to Skyline Boulevard would minimally alter the roadway’s visual character. This physical change would neither adversely affect the character-defining features of the adjacent dam nor materially impair this resource. Therefore, the Project would have no significant direct or indirect adverse effects on historical resources within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project corridor.

**Conclusion**: No impact on historical resources would occur.

**Source**: Appendix C.

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

**Discussion**: Construction of the Project would disturb approximately 0.30-acre and require excavation of approximately 1,500 cubic yards of graded material to a maximum depth of 12 feet. While grading activity would disturb the soil on-site, the Cultural Resources Study found no indication of any archaeological resources in the Project area. However, it is possible that unanticipated (previously unrecorded) archaeological resources would be unearthed in the process of construction. In the case of an unanticipated discovery of archaeological resources, the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Resources.** If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work within a 50-foot (15 meters) radius shall be halted and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology shall be contacted immediately to assess the nature, extent, and potential significance of the cultural resources. If necessary, the evaluation may require preparation of a treatment plan and archaeological testing for CRHR eligibility. If the discovered cultural resources are determined to be significant under CEQA, appropriate actions to mitigate impacts to the remains shall be identified in consultation with the qualified archaeologist. Depending
upon the nature of the find, such mitigation may include, but would not be limited to: avoidance, documentation, or other appropriate actions to be determined by the qualified archaeologist. For example, if significant archaeological resources cannot be avoided, impacts may be reduced by filling on top of the sites rather than cutting into the cultural deposits. Alternatively and/or in addition, a data collection program may be warranted, including mapping the location of artifacts, surface collection of artifacts, or excavation of the cultural deposit to characterize the nature of the buried portions of sites. Curation of the excavated artifacts or samples would occur as specified by the archaeologist.

**Conclusion:** Incorporation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

**Source:** Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project corridor is located on the west-facing slope adjacent to the Crystal Springs Reservoir shoreline and is in a valley basin formed by the 1906 surface rupture of the San Andreas fault zone, which underlies the reservoir (Pampeyan 1994). Two geologic units are present in the Project corridor and immediate vicinity: sandstone and sheared rock of the Franciscan Assemblage (Pampeyan, 1994). The sandstone unit consists of a greywacke (dark, poorly sorted, hard sandstone) interbedded with volcanic layers (Pampeyan 1994). The sheared rocks consist of a mix of greywacke, greenstone, chert, glaucophane schist, and limestone in a sheared mudstone matrix created by deformation caused by motion along faults (Pampeyan 1994).

While the Franciscan Assemblage is known to contain a wide range of fossils, including radiolarians, mollusks, and large marine vertebrates such as ichthyosaurs and plesiosaurs (Bailey et al. 1964, Schlocker 1974, Elder 2015, Hilton 2003), the greywacke and sheared rocks mapped in the Project area are unlikely to preserve fossils due to their lithology (greywacke) and post-depositional history (sheared rocks). Therefore, based on the sensitivity rankings of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, sedimentary rocks in the Project area have low paleontological sensitivity. However, it is possible that unanticipated paleontological resources would be unearthed in the process of construction. In the case of an unanticipated discovery of paleontological resources, the following mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact to less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resources.** In the event a fossil is discovered during construction of the Project, excavations within 50 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted or delayed until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The County shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. If the find is determined to be significant, the paleontologist shall design and carry out a data recovery plan consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) standards (SVP 2010).

**Conclusion:** Incorporation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

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

**Discussion:** The Cultural Resources Study found no indication of any human remains in the Project area. However, it is possible that previously unknown buried human remains would be unearthed in the process of construction. In the case of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, **Mitigation Measure CUL-3** would require compliance with the applicable requirements of State law. Implementation of this measure would mitigate any potentially significant impact to interred human remains to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains.** The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

**Conclusion:** Incorporation of **Mitigation Measure CUL-3** would reduce the potentially significant impact on human remains to a less-than-significant level.

**Source:** Appendix C.

### 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

**Environmental Setting:** A geotechnical investigation was prepared by Fisher Geotechnical in August 2017 to evaluate potential geologic constraints for the Project. The geotechnical investigation is available in Appendix D. The Project corridor is located on the west-facing slope adjacent to the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir shoreline and is in a valley formed by the San Andreas fault, which underlies the reservoir.

The following analysis of impacts related to geology and soils is partly based on the Fisher Geotechnical report.

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.a.</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to potential significant adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion:
The project is located in the seismically active San Francisco Bay area, which is dominated by the active San Andreas fault and related active faults such as the San Gregorio-Seal Cove, Hayward, and Calaveras. The San Andreas fault is located about 1,000 feet southwest of the Project corridor. The site is about 200 feet outside of and not within the State of California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone designated for the San Andreas fault (DOC 1974). The Project does not include any proposed habitable structures nor would it expose people or structures to significant adverse effects associated with rupture of earthquake faults.

**Conclusion:** Given that the Project corridor is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, no impact would occur.


### Discussion:
The primary seismic hazard affecting the Project corridor is strong ground shaking during a large earthquake, most notably on the San Andreas fault located approximately 1,000 feet to the west. However, the Project does not include any proposed habitable structures nor would it expose people or structures to significant adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking.

**Conclusion:** No impact related to strong seismic ground shaking would occur.


### Discussion:
Liquefaction, which is primarily associated with loose, saturated materials, is most common in areas of sand and silt or on reclaimed lands. The Project corridor consists of sheared rock containing predominately greywacke, siltstone, and shale, among other rocks, with a layer of poorly lithified clayey sandstone of variable thickness above sheared rock (see Appendix D). The site has an extremely low potential for liquefaction to occur as groundwater is located within the weathered rock zone and as the cohesionless fill and colluvial soils onsite are unsaturated and have a low potential to become saturated. Additionally, the Project does not include any proposed habitable structures and would not expose people or structures to risks associated with liquefaction or differential settling.

**Conclusion:** No impact from seismic-related ground failure would occur.

**Source:** Geotechnical investigation prepared by Fisher Geotechnical (Appendix D).

### Discussion:
Landslides?

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Geotechnical investigation prepared by Fisher Geotechnical (Appendix D).
**Discussion:** Landslide potential is influenced by physical factors, such as slope, soil, vegetation, and precipitation. Landslides require a slope, and can occur naturally from seismic activity, excessive saturation, and wildfires, or from human-made conditions such as construction disturbance or vegetation removal. At the edge of the Skyline Boulevard’s shoulder in the Project corridor, an embankment slopes downhill to the west and has varying slope inclinations between about 1.3H:1V and 3.0H:1V (horizontal to vertical) (see Appendix D). The geotechnical investigation found that the slope may experience shallow surface failures during intense ground shaking; however, the analysis also indicates that the slope has an adequate degree of stability against deeper failures. In addition, with proper foundation design the proposed 250-foot long, two- to five-foot high retaining wall would isolate the bike trail from a landslide hazard. Furthermore, the Project does not include any habitable structures that could be susceptible to landslides.

**Conclusion:** Impacts from landslides would be less than significant.

**Sources:** Geotechnical investigation prepared by Fisher Geotechnical (Appendix D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion: The western border of the Project corridor has a thin strip of gradually downward-sloping, vegetated shoreline which separates the site from the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir, which is an inland body of water. The Project corridor is not located along a coastal cliff or bluff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Conclusion:** No impacts from slope instability would occur.

**Source:** Geotechnical investigation prepared by Fisher Geotechnical (Appendix D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.b. Result in significant soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project would ground disturbance during construction of the proposed bike path and the removal of six coast live oak trees within the southwestern portion of the Project corridor, adjacent to the service access road. The removal of vegetation would expose topsoil to water and wind erosion. As the Project would disturb approximately 0.30-acres of the Project corridor, the County would not be required to obtain coverage under the NPDES Construction General Permit. However the County would implement BMPs to control erosion and storm water discharge of sediment in compliance with Chapter 4.100 of the San Mateo County Code of Ordinances. Also, the County would elect to implement BMPs for erosion control similar to those required by the County’s Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, as described above. Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of voluntary storm water BMPs would ensure that disturbed soils are properly managed and that the potential for erosion or loss of topsoil is minimized.

**Conclusion:** Implementation of BMPs would minimize soil erosion and loss of topsoil, and the Project would have less than significant impacts from erosion and loss of topsoil during construction.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.
| 6.c. | Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse? | X |
| 6.d. | Be located on expansive soil, as noted in the 2010 California Building Code, creating significant risks to life or property? | X |
| 6.e. | Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | X |

**Discussion:** The Project would not involve construction of any habitable structures that could expose people to hazardous conditions from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. In addition, the installation of erosion control measures and a retaining wall would ensure the stability of the proposed trail segment.

**Conclusion:** Impacts from unstable geologic units or soils would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

**Discussion:** Expansive soils tend swell with increases in soil moisture and shrink as the soil moisture decreases. The volume changes that the soils undergo in this cyclical pattern can stress and damage slabs and foundations if precautionary measures are not incorporated into construction. However, the Project does not involve construction of any habitable structures that could expose people to hazards from instability caused by expansive soil. In addition, the geotechnical investigation did not identify unstable soils subject to shrinking and swelling in the Project corridor (see Appendix D).

**Conclusion:** No impact from expansive soils would occur.

**Source:** Geotechnical investigation prepared by Fisher Geotechnical (Appendix D)

**Discussion:** The Project would not require use of septic tanks or any other wastewater disposal systems.

**Conclusion:** No impact from septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.
7. CLIMATE CHANGE.

Environmental Setting: Climate change is the observed increase in the average temperature of the Earth’s atmosphere and oceans along with other substantial changes in climate (such as wind patterns, precipitation, and storms) over an extended period of time. Climate change is the result of numerous, cumulative sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs), gases that trap heat in the atmosphere, analogous to the way in which a greenhouse retains heat. Common GHGs include water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxides (N₂O), fluorinated gases, and ozone. GHGs are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. Of these gases, CO₂ and CH₄ are emitted in the greatest quantities from human activities. Emissions of CO₂ are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas CH₄ results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Man-made GHGs, many of which have greater heat-absorption potential than CO₂, include fluorinated gases, such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFC), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) (Cal EPA 2015).

The accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the earth’s temperature. Without the natural heat trapping effect of GHGs, Earth’s surface would be about 34° C cooler (Cal EPA 2015). However, it is believed that emissions from human activities, particularly the consumption of fossil fuels for electricity production and transportation, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere beyond the level of naturally occurring concentrations.

Thresholds

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 97, the Resources Agency adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions and analysis of the effects of GHG emissions. The adopted CEQA Guidelines provide regulatory guidance on the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions in CEQA documents, while giving lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHGs and climate change impacts.

The vast majority of individual projects do not generate sufficient GHG emissions to directly influence climate change. However, physical changes caused by a project can contribute incrementally to cumulative effects that are significant, even if individual changes resulting from a project are limited. The issue of climate change typically involves an analysis of whether a project’s contribution towards an impact would be cumulatively considerable. “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064[h][1]).

According to the CEQA Guidelines, projects can tier off of a qualified GHG reduction plan, which allows for project-level evaluation of GHG emissions through the comparison of the project’s consistency with the GHG reduction policies included in a qualified GHG reduction plan. This approach is considered by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) in their white paper, Beyond 2020 and Newhall, to be the most defensible approach presently available under CEQA to determine the significance of a project’s GHG emissions (AEP 2016). San Mateo County does not currently have a qualified GHG reduction plan and thus this approach is not currently feasible.

To evaluate whether a project may generate a quantity of GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, a number of operational bright-line significance thresholds have been developed by state agencies. Significance thresholds are numeric...
mass emissions thresholds which identify the level at which additional analysis of project GHG emissions is necessary. Projects that attain the significance target, with or without mitigation, would result in less than significant GHG emissions. In the 2017 BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, the BAAQMD outlines an approach to determine the significance of projects. For residential, commercial, industrial, and public land use development projects, the thresholds of significance for operational-related GHG emissions are:

- Compliance with a qualified GHG Reduction Strategy
- Annual emissions less than 1,100 metric tons per year (MT/yr) of CO$_2$e
- Service person threshold of 4.6 MT CO$_2$e/SP/yr (residents + employees)

The annual emissions threshold of 1,100 MT of CO$_2$e per year applies best to the proposed Project as San Mateo County does not have a qualified GHG reduction plan and the Project is not a high-density project whose impacts would be more appropriately quantified by a service population threshold to reflect the per-person emission efficiency. The BAAQMD annual emissions threshold was designed to capture 90 percent of all emissions associated with projects in the SFBAAB and require implementation of mitigation so that a considerable reduction in emissions from new projects would be achieved. Additionally, the AEP white paper, Beyond 2020 and Newhall, recommends that for projects with a horizon of 2020 or earlier, a threshold based on meeting AB 32 targets should be used (AEP 2016). Thus, projects with horizon years of 2020 or earlier, and emissions below the BAAQMD threshold are not expected to require GHG mitigation for state mandates to be achieved. The Project would be fully operational in 2019; therefore, its horizon year is 2020.

Would the Project:

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

**Discussion:** The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.1 was used to estimate total Project emissions, which include construction and operational emissions. This methodology is recommended by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) CEQA and Climate Change white paper (CAPCOA 2008). The analysis focuses on CO$_2$, N$_2$O, and CH$_4$ as these are the GHG emissions that onsite development would generate in the largest quantities. The project would not generate GHG emissions from fluorinated gases, such as HFCs, PFCs, and SF$_6$, which are primarily associated with industrial processes. Calculations were based on the methodologies discussed in the CAPCOA white paper and included the use of the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) General Reporting Protocol (CCAR 2009).

This analysis converts all GHGs into their equivalent weight in CO$_2$ (CO$_2$e) because it is the GHG that the Project would emit in the largest quantities during construction. It is assumed that the Project would not generate operational emissions. The proposed closure of a gap in the Crystal Springs Regional Trail could incrementally increase use of the trail by bicyclists and pedestrians, resulting in a more vehicle trips to reach trailheads. However, the Project would not result in a substantial increase in trail use. Furthermore, trail use could substitute for motor vehicle trips, decreasing operational emissions. As discussed in Section 3, Air Quality, the CalEEMod analysis assumes a six-month construction period, grading of approximately 0.30 acres, and excavation of
approximately 1,500 cubic yards of soil. The CalEEMod calculations are available in Appendix A. Based on the CalEEMod results, construction of the Project would generate an estimated 96.8 metric tons of CO$_2$e. This is approximately 8.8% of the BAAQMD’s adopted significance threshold, which considers operational emissions of over 1,100 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent CO$_2$e per year to be significant.

**Conclusion:** Impacts from GHG emissions would be less than significant.

**Sources:** CalEEMod, version 2016.3.1. CAPCOA, CEQA and Climate Change, 2008. Cal EPA, website, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.b.</th>
<th>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?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project would not contribute to urban growth or introduce new long-term sources of air pollutants or greenhouse gas emissions in the SFBAAB. The proposed trail section would facilitate bicyclist and pedestrian trips, which could substitute for motor vehicle trips, reducing mobile GHG emissions. In addition, construction activities that generate GHGs would be temporary and small in scale. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the BAAQMD Clean Air Plan (CAP).

**Conclusion:** Impacts from conflicts with applicable plans to reduce GHG emissions would be less than significant.

**Sources:** CalEEMod, version 2016.3.1. BAAQMD, 2017 Clean Air Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.c.</th>
<th>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?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Although the Project would involve the removal of six coast live oak trees, it would not result in a substantial loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use (refer to Section 2.f, Agricultural and Forest Resources, and Section 4.h, Biological Resources).

**Conclusion:** Impacts from the loss of forestland or conversion of such land would be less than significant.

**Source:** Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.d.</th>
<th>Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The western border of the Project has a thin strip of gradually downward-sloping, vegetated shoreline which separates the site from the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir, an inland body of water. The Project corridor is not located along a coast cliff or bluff.

**Conclusion:** No impacts from coastal cliff/bluff erosion would occur.

**Source:** Geotechnical investigation prepared by Fisher Geotechnical (Appendix D)
### 7.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?

**Discussion:** It is projected that climate change may cause mean sea level on the California coastline to rise by 10 feet by the year 2100 (Working Group of the California Ocean Protection Council Science Advisory Team [OPC-SAT] 2017). The Project corridor is approximately 4.5 miles southwest from the nearest body of water impacted by sea level rise (the San Francisco Bay) and at an elevation of approximately 300 feet above sea level. An increase in sea level by 10 feet would not impact the Project. The Project corridor is also not listed in the sea level rise inundation zone (Figure 3A.1) in the San Mateo County *Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment* (San Mateo County 2017).

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.


### 7.f. Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

**Discussion:** The Project corridor is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, and the Project would not involve construction of structures that could be subject to flooding.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Sources:** FEMA, Flood Risk Map: San Mateo County, California, September 2015. Project Plans, 2017.

### 7.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

**Discussion:** The Project corridor is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, and the Project would not involve placement of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that could impede or redirect flood flows.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Sources:** FEMA, Flood Risk Map: San Mateo County, California, September 2015. Project Plans, 2017.

---

### 8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

**Environmental Setting:** Hazardous materials include all flammable, reactive, corrosive, or toxic substances which, because of these properties, pose potential harm to the public or environment. The California Department of Environmental Protection (CALEPA) has the responsibility for compiling (pursuant to Government Code §65962.5) information on hazardous material sites in California that together are known as the “Cortese” list. The following databases compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 were checked (August 30, 2017) for known hazardous materials contamination in the Project corridor:

- *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information*
A review of these databases found there are no known hazardous sites on or within 1,000 feet of the Project corridor. The Project corridor also is not within an airport land use plan; it is located approximately 5.9 miles northwest of San Carlos Airport, a local public-use airport, and 5.4 miles southeast of San Francisco International Airport. The site is located in a moderate to very high fire hazard severity zone as determined by CAL FIRE (2007). The nearest school, Highlands Elementary School, is approximately 0.55 miles southeast from the Project corridor.

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The proposed trail segment on the western shoulder of Skyline Boulevard would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials other than routine temporary use of fuel and engine fluids for grading and construction equipment.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project Plans, 2017.

| 8.b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | X |

**Discussion:** The Project would not involve the transport or use of hazardous materials that could be subject to upset and accident conditions. Users of the proposed trail segment would be subject to a de minimus risk of such conditions from an accident on Skyline Boulevard. However, this segment of Skyline Boulevard does not carry a substantial volume of truck traffic and would not pose a significant hazard to trail users from upset and accident conditions.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project Plans, 2017.
8.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

**Discussion:** The nearest school, Highlands Elementary School, is approximately 0.55 miles southeast from the Project corridor. As the Project corridor is located more than one-quarter mile away from the nearest school and the Project would not involve hazardous emissions or handing of hazardous materials beyond the routine temporary use of fuel and engine fluids for grading and construction equipment, the Project would not adversely affect nearby schools.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Sources:** Project Plans, 2017. Google Earth, 2017.

8.d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

**Discussion:** Based on a review of databases of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the Project corridor does not contain any known hazardous materials. The nearest known incidence of hazardous materials to the Project corridor was a small release of lead into the environment during a retrofit of the I-280 bridge to the northeast, according to the Lower Crystal Springs Dam Improvement Project EIR (City and County of San Francisco 2010). However, based on records indicating that more than 45 tons of soil contaminated with lead was transported off site for disposal, the Lower Crystal Springs Dam Improvement Project EIR found that release was likely cleaned up at the time it occurred and would have a low potential to affect soil quality at the dam site. Because the Project corridor is located no closer than the dam to the I-280 bridge (approximately 450 feet from the northern site boundary), it there is also a low potential for construction on-site to encounter hazardous lead in the soil and groundwater.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Sources:** California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), EnviroStor Database, 2017. State Water Resources Control Board, GeoTracker Database, 2017. California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA), Cortese List, 2017.

8.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**Discussion:** Airport-related hazards include aircraft accidents, particularly during takeoffs and landings, incompatible land uses, power transmission lines, wildlife hazards (e.g., bird strikes), and tall structures that penetrate the airspace surrounding an airport. The Project corridor is not susceptible to these hazards because of its distance from the nearest public airports: approximately 5.9 miles northwest of San Carlos Airport, a local public-use airport, and 5.4 miles southeast of San
Francisco International Airport. In addition, the Project corridor is not located within the area covered by an airport land use plan.

**Conclusion:** No safety hazards from proximity to public airports would occur.

**Source:** Google Earth, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.f.</th>
<th>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Conclusion:** No safety hazards from proximity to private airstrips would occur.

**Source:** Google Earth, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.g.</th>
<th>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The proposed trail segment on the western shoulder of Skyline Boulevard would not involve the development of structures that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The site would still remain accessible to emergency vehicles from Skyline Boulevard. During construction of the trail, access to the segment of Skyline Boulevard and the south entrance to Crystal Spring Dam would be potentially restricted or blocked. However, nearby roads, including I-280, Crystal Springs Road, and the north entrance to Crystal Spring Dam from Skyline Boulevard would be available for emergency vehicles.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project Plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.h.</th>
<th>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** Although the Project corridor is located in a moderate to very high fire hazard severity zone as determined by CAL FIRE, the Project would not involve construction of new habitable structures that would be susceptible to wildfires. In the event of a fire near the Project corridor, trail users would be able to quickly evacuate the site via Skyline Boulevard.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** CAL FIRE, Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA – San Mateo County, 2007.
|   | Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? |   |   | X |

**Discussion:** The Project would not involve construction of housing.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project Plans, 2017.

|   | Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? |   |   | X |

**Discussion:** The Project would not involve construction of structures within a 100-year flood hazard area.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** County of San Mateo, FEMA Flood Zone Map, 2012.

|   | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? |   |   | X |

**Discussion:** The Lower Crystal Springs Dam is adjacent to the north of the Project corridor. However, the Project would not be impacted by flooding during a dam failure as the site is approximately 22 feet above the water level of the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. Additionally, the Project corridor is not located within an inundation area for dam failure, as mapped for San Mateo County.

**Conclusion:** Less impact would occur.

**Source:** San Mateo County, Dam Failure Inundation Areas – San Mateo County, 2005.

|   | Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? |   |   | X |

**Discussion:** A seiche is an earthquake induced water wave in a confined body of water, such as the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. The Project corridor is near the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir to the west, an inland body or water that may be subject to a seiche. However, the Project corridor is elevated approximately 22 feet above the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir at its lowest point. Even in large bodies of water, seiches typically are less than one foot high (San Mateo, City of, 2010). Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed trail segment would be vulnerable to inundation by seiche. Additionally, the Project corridor is not located in a tsunami inundation area, according to the California Department of Conservation CGS Information Warehouse: Tsunami map (2015). As discussed in Section 6.a, Geology and Soils, at the western shoulder of Skyline Boulevard, the Project corridor has an embankment slope downhill to the west and has varying slope inclinations between about 1.3H:1V and 3.0H:1V (horizontal to vertical) (see Appendix D). The geotechnical investigation found that the slope may experience shallow surface failures during intense ground shaking; however, the analysis also indicates that the slope has an adequate degree of stability against deeper failures. In addition, with proper foundation design the proposed 250-foot long, two-
to five-foot high retaining wall would isolate the bike trail from a landslide hazard. Therefore, the Project would not be impacted from potential landslides or mudflows.

**Conclusion:** Impacts from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would be less than significant.

**Sources:** San Mateo, City of, 2030 General Plan, 2010. California Department of Conservation, CGS Information Warehouse: Tsunami, 2015. Appendix D.

9. **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.**

**Environmental Setting:** The drainage pattern in the Project corridor is characterized by culverts beneath Skyline Boulevard to convey runoff from areas upslope of the embankment to areas downslope of the embankment. The culverts have concrete headwalls at the upstream ends.

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Storm water runoff during grading activity could cause erosion and sedimentation. As the Project would involve disturbance of soil on less than one acre, the County would not be required to obtain coverage under the NPDES Construction General Permit. However, the County would implement BMPs to prevent water pollutants such as sediment, trash, and waste products from entering the storm sewer system, in compliance with Chapter 4.100 of the San Mateo County Code of Ordinances.

Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of voluntary storm water BMPs would ensure that disturbed soils are properly managed and that the potential for erosion or loss of topsoil is minimized.

Therefore, the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

9.b. Significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere significantly with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.c.</td>
<td>Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in significant erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Ground disturbance during construction would temporarily alter drainage patterns. However, as discussed in Item 9.a, the use of BMPs would minimize erosion and siltation, and the proposed erosion control measures would reduce these impacts during construction of the Project. Furthermore, the Project would not alter the course of any streams on-site.

**Conclusion:** Impacts from alteration of existing drainage patterns would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

| 9.d. | Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site? | X |

**Discussion:** Ground disturbance of the Project corridor during construction would temporarily alter drainage patterns, but the required implementation of BMPs would minimize these impacts. Furthermore, the Project would only incrementally add impervious surfaces to the site, which would slightly increase surface runoff.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

| 9.e. | Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide significant additional sources of polluted runoff? | X |

**Discussion:** As discussed in Item 9.a, the use of BMPs would minimize erosion in the Project.
corridor, reducing discharge of storm water runoff during construction. Furthermore, no new water-intensive activities are proposed that would contribute substantial additional runoff that could exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems near the Project corridor.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9.f. Significantly degrade surface or groundwater water quality?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** As discussed in Item 9.a, the Project would include standard measures to control erosion and runoff during construction. Additionally, the County would implement BMPs to control erosion and storm water discharge of sediment in compliance with Chapter 4.100 of the San Mateo County Code of Ordinances. Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of voluntary storm water BMPs would ensure that no substantial degradation of surface or groundwater quality would occur.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project would increase impervious surfaces in the Project corridor with the construction of an 800-foot long paved trail segment up to 10 feet wide. However, the decrease in pervious surfaces would only incrementally increase runoff from Skyline Boulevard.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

10. **LAND USE AND PLANNING.**

The Project corridor is located in unincorporated San Mateo County and zoned Resource Management/Coastal Zone (RM-CZ/CD). The surrounding areas are largely undeveloped with vegetated open space with the exception of some single-family homes within a quarter-mile radius of Skyline Boulevard, to the east and northeast.

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.a</td>
<td>Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project is intended to eliminate a trail gap and connect the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail. The Project would be part of the 17.5-mile CSRT system that connects the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the eastern side of the San Francisco Watershed reservoirs. It would not physically divide any established communities.
### Conclusion:
No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project Plans, 2017.

### 10.b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The proposed trail improvement would occur on unincorporated San Mateo County land. The Project would close a gap in the existing recreational CSRT system and would not introduce a new land use in San Mateo County. Trail use is permitted in the RM-CZ/CD zone under the Public Recreation designation in the County of San Mateo Zoning Regulations (2016). Therefore, it would not result in conflicts with existing zoning. The proposed trail would also not conflict with applicable land use policies. Consistent with Policy 12.9 (Transportation Policies) in the San Mateo County General Plan (1986), the Project would “provide for a balanced and integrated transportation system in the County which allows for travel by various modes and easy transfer between modes.” Additionally, consistent with Policy 6.4 (Environmental Compatibility), the Project would “protect and enhance the environmental quality of San Mateo County when developing park and recreation facilities,” as the Project would only require the removal of six trees in a densely forested area, resulting in minimal adverse effect on the environmental quality of the area. Consistency with County zoning and policies would guarantee that the Project is in compliance with applicable regulations that protect the environment.

**Conclusion:** The Project would have a less than significant impact from conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations.

**Sources:** San Mateo County, General Plan, 1986. San Mateo County, Zoning Regulations, 2016.

### 10.c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** San Bruno Mountain, located more than 10 miles northwest of the Project corridor, is the nearest area covered by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The Project corridor is not located within the boundaries of the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan or any other adopted or approved plan.

**Conclusion:** No conflict with an adopted or approved plan would occur.

**Sources:** California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Regional Conservation Plans Map, July 2017. San Mateo County Parks Department, *San Bruno Mountain Habitat Management Plan*, revised March 2016.

### 10.d. Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The proposed Project is intended to eliminate a trail gap and connect the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail. The Project would be part of the 17.5-mile CSRT system that connects the City of San Bruno to the Town of Woodside along the
The Project could result in an increased number of bicyclists and pedestrians traveling in the Project corridor. However, these users would quickly pass through rather than congregate in the Project corridor. Therefore, the Project would not result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.e.</th>
<th>Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project would connect the Crystal Springs Dam Trail to the Crystal Springs Regional South of Dam Trail. The Project would not introduce new activities not currently found within San Mateo County.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.f.</th>
<th>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)?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The proposed trail segment would close a gap between existing trails and would not provide off-site access to open space areas near Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir. Therefore, it would not encourage off-site development.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.g.</th>
<th>Create a significant new demand for housing?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project would not generate a long-term increase in employment or otherwise create significant new demand for housing.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.
11. **MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** No regionally significant mineral resources have been identified in the Project corridor according to the San Mateo County General Plan, Section 3.5. Furthermore, the area is set aside for open space, a land use which is incompatible with the extraction of mineral resources.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** San Mateo County, General Plan, 1986.

| 11.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | | | | X |

**Discussion:** The Project would not involve the removal of known or locally important mineral resources.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project Plans, 2017.

12. **NOISE.**

**Environmental Setting:** Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Noise level measurements include intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence. Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA).

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project corridor include outdoor recreation areas and trails associated with the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir and single-family residences. These residences are located a quarter-mile east and southeast of the Project corridor in the Highlands-Baywood Park neighborhood of unincorporated San Mateo County.

Because the nearest recognized sensitive receptors are located in unincorporated San Mateo County, the County would apply its noise ordinances to the proposed Project. Chapter 4.88 (Noise Control) of the San Mateo County Code of Ordinances is intended to protect noise-sensitive receptors from annoying or disturbing noise generated at nearby properties. Section 4.88.330 sets maximum exterior noise levels for activities on properties in the
unincorporated County, as measured at noise-sensitive receptors in either incorporated or
unincorporated areas. Table 3 shows these exterior noise standards. Higher noise levels are
permitted for shorter amounts of time in any one-hour time period. The exterior noise
standards are more stringent during nighttime hours from 10 P.M. to 7 A.M.

Table 3
Exterior Noise Standards, dBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cumulative Number of Minutes in Any One Hour Time Period</th>
<th>Daytime 7 A.M.—10 P.M.</th>
<th>Nighttime 10 P.M.—7 A.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Vibration is a unique form of noise because its energy is carried through buildings,
structures, and the ground, whereas noise is simply carried through the air. Thus, vibration is
generally felt rather than heard. Some vibration effects can be caused by noise; e.g., the
rattling of windows from passing trucks. This phenomenon is caused by the coupling of the
acoustic energy at frequencies that are close to the resonant frequency of the material being
vibrated. Typically, groundborne vibration generated by manmade activities attenuates
rapidly as distance from the source of the vibration increases. The ground motion caused by
vibration is measured as particle velocity in inches per second and is referenced as vibration
decibels (VdB) in the U.S.

The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A
vibration velocity of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and
distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by
sources within buildings such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people,
or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are
construction equipment, steel wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads.

Vibration impacts would be significant if they exceed the following Federal Railroad
Administration (FRA) thresholds:
- 65 VdB where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operations, such as
  hospitals and recording studios
- 72 VdB for residences and buildings where people normally sleep, including hotels
- 75 VdB for institutional land uses with primary daytime use, such as churches and
  schools
- 95 VdB for physical damage to extremely fragile historic buildings
- 100 VdB for physical damage to buildings

Nearby sensitive receptors are currently exposed to noise from vehicular traffic on SR-35
and I-280. Any temporary or permanent noise generated by the proposed Project would be
considered in combination with present conditions. Furthermore, construction-related
vibration impacts would be less than significant for residential receptors if they are below the
threshold of physical damage to buildings and occur during the County’s normally permitted
hours of construction, as described above, because these construction hours are during the
daytime and would therefore not typically interfere with sleep.

Would the Project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion: Project construction would generate temporary noise during the estimated up-to-6-month process that could be audible to sensitive receptors near the Project corridor. A drill rig would be used to excavate holes for the soldier piles, and construction vehicles including haul trucks would access the site from Skyline Boulevard. Noise from point sources such as construction equipment generally decreases by about 6 dBA per doubling of distance. Table 4 shows estimated noise levels associated with the anticipated equipment used for the construction of the Project, including bulldozers, pavers, and trucks at a reference distance of 50 feet and 1,000 feet from the source (corresponding to the nearest recreational and residential receptors, respectively).

Table 4
Typical Construction Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>50 Feet</th>
<th>1,000 Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozers</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As indicated in Table 4, noise levels during the estimated six-month construction period would be up to 89 dBA Leq at the nearest recreational use and approximately 52 dBA Leq at the exterior of the nearest residences. Construction activity would primarily cause disturbance to recreational users as they approach the end of the existing CSRT trail that connects to the Project corridor. However, the short duration of exposure would not cause a substantial disturbance to the overall use of the CSRT and surrounding open space. Furthermore, construction noise would occur during normal waking hours (7 a.m. to 6 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturdays), consistent with the allowable hours of construction activity in Section 4.88.360 of the County Code of Ordinances. Therefore, the Project would not expose recreational or residential users to noise levels in excess of any standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance.

Conclusion: Impacts would be less than significant.

12.b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

**Discussion:** Construction activities that would occur in the Project corridor have the potential to generate groundborne vibration. **Table 5** identifies various vibration velocity levels for the types of vibration-producing construction equipment that would operate in the Project corridor during construction, including bulldozers, caisson drills, and loaded trucks. Vibration levels are estimated at a reference distance of 25 feet and 1,000 feet (corresponding to the reference distance and residential receptors, respectively).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisson drill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Federal Transit Administration, 2006. See Appendix E for vibration calculations.

As shown in **Table 5**, vibration levels would be up to 56 VdB at the nearest residences to construction activity in the Project corridor, located 0.2 miles (over 1,000 feet) to the east. However, construction activity would not occur during nighttime hours and thus would not generate noise levels exceeding the Federal Transit Administration’s criterion of 72 VdB for frequent vibration events at residences during recognized sleep hours. Furthermore, construction activity would not approach the Federal Transit Administration’s threshold of 75 VdB for frequent events at the nearest institutional land use with primary daytime use, a school located approximately 0.55-mile (over 2,500 feet) southeast of the Project corridor. In addition, the project would not exceed vibration levels that could potentially damage nearby buildings.

**Conclusion:** Vibration impacts would be less than significant.


12.c. A significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

**Discussion:** Because the Project would not generate a substantial increase in traffic or the number
of visitors to the Crystal Springs Regional Trail relative to existing public use of the site, it would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

| 12.d. | A significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | X |

**Discussion:** As discussed in Item 12.a, it is anticipated that construction of the proposed trail would involve the use of bulldozers for grading, loaded trucks, pavers, and caisson drills. As discussed above, noise levels during construction activities would be approximately 89 dBA Leq at the surrounding open space areas, up to 52 dBA Leq at the exterior of the nearest residences, and less than 52 dBA Leq at the exterior of the nearest school. Such noise levels during normal waking hours for a period of six months would not cause a substantial disturbance to nearby residents or students. Furthermore, construction would not involve the use of heavy equipment such as pile drivers, steam shovels, or pneumatic hammers. The Project would not cause a significant temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

| 12.e. | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | X |

**Discussion:** As discussed in Items 8.e and 8.f in Section 8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the Project corridor is not located within an area subject to an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or private airport.

**Conclusion:** No noise conflicts with aircraft would occur.

**Source:** Google Earth, 2017.

| 12.f. | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | X |

**Discussion:** See Item 12.e. No private airstrips occur nearby.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Google Earth, 2017.
### 13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Induce significant population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

**Discussion:** The Project would not involve construction of new homes and businesses, or the extension of roads or other infrastructure that would induce population growth.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Displace existing housing (including low-or moderate-income housing), in an area that is substantially deficient in housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**Discussion:** The Project would not displace any housing or people, as no residences are located on-site.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

### 14. PUBLIC SERVICES.

**Environmental Setting:** The Pedro Point Headlands is currently an open space area with a trail network open to the public. The Pedro Point Headlands is accessible by a trailhead to the California Coastal Trail on the north side of Highway 1. Parking is available at nearby pull-offs on Highway 1 and to the west at the northern terminus of the Devil’s Slide Trail.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fire protection?**

**Discussion:** Currently, the Project vicinity is served by San Mateo County Fire Department, contracting with CAL FIRE personnel. The closest fire station is the Belmont Station (#17) located at
320 Paul Scannell Drive, less than two miles from the Project corridor.

The Project would not result in an increase in population that would result in an increased demand for fire protection services. Additionally, the Project would not involve construction of structures that increase demand for fire protection services within the Project vicinity. Therefore, the Project would not result in any adverse impacts related to the construction of new fire protection facilities.

**Conclusion:** No impact related to fire protection would occur.

**Source:** San Mateo County Fire Department, 2017

|--------------------------|---|

**Discussion:** The San Mateo County Sheriff’s Department provides police protection to unincorporated San Mateo County. Because the existing segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail are currently open for public use, the Project would not generate additional users to an extent that would require additional police protection service. Therefore, the Project would not result in an adverse impact related to police protection services.

**Conclusion:** No impact related to police protection would occur.

**Source:** San Mateo County Sheriff’s Office website, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14.c. Schools?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project would not affect the number of students served by local schools, nor bring in any new residents requiring the construction of additional school facilities.

**Conclusion:** No impact related to school facilities would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

|--------------|---|

**Discussion:** The Project would close a gap in the Crystal Springs Regional Trail with a bikeway that connects two existing segments. Closure of the trail gap would increase its capacity for public use. To reduce any temporary or long-term impacts resulting from trail construction to a less than significant level, measures would be taken to mitigate impacts to air quality and biological and cultural resources. These measures are discussed in Section 3, *Air Quality*, Section 4, *Biological Resources*, and Section 5, *Cultural Resources*. With implementation of the mitigation measures discussed for air quality, biological and cultural resources, impacts to the Crystal Springs Regional Trail as a recreational facility would be less than significant. The Project would not induce any population growth resulting from increased use of parks and other recreational facilities in the area.

**Conclusion:** Impacts related to parks would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project would not affect other public facilities including hospitals or electrical/natural gas supply systems. Impacts to sewer systems, storm drains, and roadways are discussed in Section 16, *Transportation/Traffic*, and Section 18, *Utilities and Service Systems*, of this Initial Study.
**Conclusion:** No impact related to other public facilities or utilities would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

### 15. RECREATION. Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that significant physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project in itself would not substantially increase the use of existing recreational facilities. Completed segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail are currently open to public use by hikers, cyclists, and equestrians. Completion of the trail would increase its capacity for public use and would not generate a substantial increase in the number of visitors such that physical deterioration would occur.

**Conclusion:** There would be no adverse impact.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project includes the construction of a separated bikeway on Skyline Boulevard to connect existing segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail. As noted in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, construction of the Project has the potential to adversely affect special-status species, sensitive vegetation communities, and heritage trees. These potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-8 for surveys, best practices, worker training, and avoidance and compensatory mitigation of biological resources. As discussed in Section 5, *Cultural Resources*, potential adverse impacts on unanticipated cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-3. All other environmental impacts from construction of the trail segment would be less than significant without mitigation.

**Conclusion:** Overall environmental impacts from the construction of the proposed recreational facilities would be potentially significant but could be mitigated to a less than significant level.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.

**Environmental Setting:** The Project corridor is located west of Interstate 280 (I-280) and on the western shoulder of Skyline Boulevard (SR 35) south of Lower Crystal Springs Dam. Public parking is available north and south of the Project corridor at three access points along existing segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail.

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Some passenger vehicle trips associated with construction workers and the hauling of materials and equipment would occur over the anticipated construction period of up to 6 months. Vehicle trips would be minimal and limited to non-peak hours on SR-35/Skyline Boulevard. Thus, vehicular trips associated with construction would not adversely affect the circulation system near the Project corridor.

The operational phase of the Project would not substantially increase the number of visitors at the Crystal Springs Regional Trail or result in an increase in vehicle trips to and from the site. The Crystal Springs Regional Trail is currently open for public use, and the Project would involve the construction of bikeway that connects the existing segments. Although these improvements would increase capacity for public use, they would not drive a substantial increase in the number of visitors beyond existing public use after construction.

**Conclusion:** Impacts to any existing applicable plans, ordinances, or policies that establish a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system would be less than significant.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

| 16.b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | X |

**Discussion:** As discussed in Item 16.a, the Project would maintain the existing recreational use of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail without increasing vehicle trips substantially after construction.
Therefore, the Project would not generate traffic that could conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

**Conclusion:** No impacts related to a congestion management program would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

| 16.c. | Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in significant safety risks? | X |

**Discussion:** The Project corridor is located approximately 5.9 miles northwest of the San Carlos Airport, a public-use airport. The Project is not within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the Project would not affect airport operations, alter air traffic patterns or in any way conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones.

**Conclusion:** No impact related to air traffic patterns would occur.

**Source:** Google Earth, 2017.

| 16.d. | Significantly increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | X |

**Discussion:** The Project would not involve design features or incompatible uses that could increase traffic hazards. Eight access points along the existing segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail would remain. No permanent changes in roadway design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections would be introduced to the site. Furthermore, as the proposed Project is a trail segment that connects two existing trail segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail with a separated bike path on Skyline Boulevard, it is a proposed extension of an existing recreational use and would be compatible with the surrounding area. Although the addition of a separated bike path would physically alter the existing segment of Skyline Boulevard, it would increase the safety of pedestrians and cyclists by providing a barrier from vehicular traffic.

**Conclusion:** No impact from hazardous design features or incompatible uses would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

| 16.e. | Result in inadequate emergency access? | X |

**Discussion:** The Project involves the construction of a separated bike path along Skyline Boulevard to connect the existing trail segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail. The bike path would not obstruct or narrow the existing vehicular roadway and thus would not result in inadequate emergency access.

**Conclusion:** No impact on emergency access would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.
16.f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

**Discussion:** The Project would close an existing gap in the County’s circulation network for bicyclists and pedestrians. This improvement in connectivity would have a beneficial effect on the performance of bicyclist and pedestrian facilities. In addition, the proposed trail would provide a physical barrier that separates bicyclists and pedestrians from vehicular traffic, protecting the safety of trail users. These improvements would advance policies in the County’s General Plan to “support the development of bicycle trails in rural and coastal areas” (Policy 12.44) and “support, encourage, and participate in the development of a system of trails that link existing and proposed park and recreation facilities within this County and adjacent counties” (Policy 6.39).

**Conclusion:** No adverse impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

16.g. Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?

**Discussion:** Construction of a new Class 1 bikeway would generate pedestrian activity along the proposed 800-foot segment parallel to the roadway. However, the proposed bikeway would not cause a noticeable change in pedestrian patterns in the Project vicinity, as it would connect existing segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail that are already in use by pedestrians. Furthermore, the proposed Project would include a barrier between the bikeway and the existing roadway, and would not create additional trail access points. Thus, the proposed Project would not generate any pedestrian traffic across or on SR-35/Skyline Boulevard. Therefore, it would not cause a noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or change in pedestrian patterns.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

16.h. Result in inadequate parking capacity?

**Discussion:** Because the Project would not generate a substantial increase in use of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail, it would not result in a shortage of parking capacity. Public parking would remain available near three access points along the existing trail segments.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

17. **TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

**Environmental Setting:** AB 52 was enacted on July 1, 2015, and establishes that “a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (Public Resources Code Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3).
Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a)(1)(A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and meets either of the following criteria:

1. 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), or

2. 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 these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding tribal cultural resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in a Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.a. 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** According to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, an impact to tribal cultural resources from the Project would be significant if the Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that meets the criteria listed in Public Resources Code Section 21074.

The County prepared and mailed formal notification letters to interested tribes in accordance with the provisions of AB 52 on October 10, 2017. As of December 5, 2017, no responses have been received and no tribal cultural resources have been identified on-site. However, proposed excavation of the Project corridor could potentially result in adverse effects on unanticipated tribal cultural resources. Impacts from the unanticipated discovery of tribal cultural resources during construction would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources.** In the event that cultural resources of Native American origin are identified during construction, the County shall consult with a qualified archaeologist and begin or continue Native American consultation procedures. If the County determines that the resource is a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with State guidelines and in consultation with Native American groups. If the resource cannot be avoided,
additional measures to avoid or reduce impacts to the resource and to address tribal concerns may be required.

**Conclusion:** Incorporation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

**Source:** Appendix C. Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.b. 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 2024.1?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significant of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** As discussed in Item 17.a, on-site tribal cultural resources have not been identified as of December 5, 2017, and Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would apply should any resources be discovered during construction.

**Conclusion:** Incorporation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1 would reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant.

**Source:** Appendix C. Project plans, 2017.

### 18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

**Environmental Setting:** Currently, there are six public restrooms along the Crystal Springs Regional Trail. No utility or service systems exist in the Project corridor.

Would the Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the Project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The proposed 800-foot bikeway would not include new restroom facilities or substantially increase wastewater generation on the greater Crystal Springs Regional Trail. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to an exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements.

**Conclusion:** No impact related to wastewater treatment requirements would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18.b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 18.c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Discussion:** The proposed Project would involve the construction of a paved and graded bikeway parallel to an existing roadway (SR-35/Skyline Boulevard) and the Crystal Springs Reservoir. The project would add stormwater drainage improvements along the bikeway, including curb inlets and gutters. However, construction of these minor roadside facilities would not result in significant environmental effects. Construction and use of the bikeway also would not result in the need for any additional storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities offsite.

**Conclusion:** No impact related to storm water drainage facilities would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18.c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 18.d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

**Discussion:** Other than the existing restroom facilities, the Crystal Springs Regional Trail does not provide any potable water. While the Project could incrementally increase use of the CSRT, it would not substantially increase the use of water at existing restroom facilities on other trail segments, nor would it involve the construction of new facilities connected to the County’s water supply.

**Conclusion:** There would be no impact on water supply.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18.d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 18.e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

**Discussion:** The Project may incrementally increase trail use and therefore increase the use of existing restrooms along other segments of the Crystal Springs Regional Trail. However, the resulting increase in wastewater would be minimal and thus would not substantially impact the capacity of existing wastewater services.

**Conclusion:** Less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Project plans, 2017.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.f. Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The proposed bikeway would not lead to a permanent increase in solid waste coming from the site. Waste generated by the Project would be limited to removal of minimal excess materials during construction. No trash cans occur on-site and none are proposed, so the operational phase of the Project would not generate solid waste for disposal at a landfill. Any waste from construction would be taken to the Ox Mountain Landfill, approximately 15 miles southeast of the Project corridor. The Ox Mountain Landfill had a remaining permitted capacity of 22,030,078 as of December 2016 and is expected to close in 2034 (San Mateo County 2017). Temporary waste generated by the proposed Project would not exceed the permitted capacity of the Ox Mountain Landfill.

**Conclusion:** Impacts related to landfill capacity would be less than significant.

**Sources:** Project plans, 2017. San Mateo County Environmental Health Division, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Project plans, 2017.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.g. Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** As discussed in Item 17.f, the Project would generate a minimal amount of solid waste during construction and would not lead to a permanent increase in solid waste generation. Therefore, the Project would comply with existing regulations related to solid waste.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Project plans, 2017.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.h. Be sited, oriented, and/or designed to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy; incorporate water conservation and solid waste reduction measures; and incorporate solar or other alternative energy sources?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** The Project would complete a gap in the Crystal Springs Regional Trail, allowing bicyclists and pedestrians to travel between San Bruno to the Town of Woodside, which could reduce energy consumption from transportation if active transportation substitutes for motor vehicle trips. Operation of the Project would not substantially increase energy consumption, water use, or solid waste after construction.

**Discussion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Project plans, 2017.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.i. Generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Discussion:
The Project would not introduce any structures or features that place demands on public facilities or utilities.

**Conclusion:** No impact would occur.

**Source:** Project plans, 2017.

### 19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19.a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, significantly reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** As discussed in Section 4, Biological Resources, the Project has the potential to reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species and reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plants and animals. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-8 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level through biological surveys, measures to prevent the spread of invasive species, best management practices, worker awareness training, and avoidance of or compensatory mitigation for sensitive species. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, the Project would not impair or eliminate any known prehistoric or historic resources. Impacts on unanticipated cultural resources would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-3 requiring adherence to existing local, state and federal regulations related to the discovery of any unanticipated cultural resources during construction activity.

**Conclusion:** Impacts would be potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19.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.)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impacts</th>
<th>Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Cumulative impacts are generally considered in analyses of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and traffic. As discussed in Section 3, Air Quality, emissions of air pollutants during construction of the Project would not exceed applicable thresholds but would...
contribute to regional non-attainment of particulate standards. Cumulative impacts on air quality would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 to control fugitive dust emissions consistent with BAAQMD recommendations. As discussed in Section 4, Biological Resources, the Project has the potential to adversely affect sensitive species; however, implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-8 would reduce project-specific impacts to a less than significant level through biological surveys, measures to prevent the spread of invasive species, best management practices, worker awareness training, and avoidance of or compensatory mitigation for sensitive species. With implementation of these measures, the Project would not have a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on biological resources. The potential impacts of cumulative development on cultural resources would addressed on a case-by-case, site-specific basis in accordance with County requirements. In addition, as discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, the Project’s impacts on unanticipated cultural resources during grading would be reduced to a less than significant level with incorporation of mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-3. As discussed in Section 12, Noise, and Section 16, Transportation/ Traffic, operation of the Project would not generate substantial additional traffic relative to existing conditions.

**Conclusion:** The project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated, but would not be cumulatively considerable with mitigation incorporated.

| 19.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | X |

**Discussion:** As discussed in Item 18.b, implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 to control fugitive dust emissions during construction would reduce impacts to human health from air pollution to a less than significant level. As discussed in Section 12, Noise, the Project would not result in the exposure of persons to noise levels in exceedance of applicable standards; exposure of persons to excessive groundborne noise vibration; a significant increase above ambient noise levels in the project vicinity; or subject people to excessive noise from use of an airport or airstrip. As stated in Section 6, Geology and Soils, construction of the Project would not expose people to substantial adverse effects from fault rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides; result in soil erosion; or involve the construction of habitable structures that could be subject to unstable or expansive soils. Finally, as discussed in Section 8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the Project would not expose people to hazardous conditions.

**Conclusion:** Adverse environmental effects on human beings would be potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated to protect air quality.
**RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES.** Check what agency has permit authority or other approval for the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TYPE OF APPROVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer/Water District</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of fencing and construction staging plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mitigation measures are needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Air Quality:**
- AQ-1: measures recommended by BAAQMD to reduce the impacts on air quality from fugitive dust emissions during construction

**Biological Resources:**
- BIO-1: botanical surveys, avoidance, and restoration of special status plants
- BIO-2: preventing spread of invasive weeds to protect special status plants
- BIO-3: pre-construction wildlife survey
- BIO-4: general best management practices for wildlife protection
- BIO-5: Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) to reduce potential impacts to special-status species
- BIO-6: avoidance and minimization of impacts on California red-legged frogs
- BIO-7: avoidance and minimization of impacts on San Francisco dusky-footed woodrats
- BIO-8: avoidance and minimization of impacts on nesting birds

**Cultural Resources:**
- CUL-1: protection of unanticipated significant cultural resources discovered during ground-disturbing activities
- CUL-2: protection of unanticipated significant paleontological resources discovered during ground-disturbing activities
- CUL-3: protection of unanticipated human remains and notification of County coroner and Native American Heritage Commission

**Tribal Cultural Resources:**
- TCR-1: protection of unanticipated tribal cultural resources discovered during ground-disturbing activities
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.

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

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

12/7/17

(Signature)

Date

PARKS DIRECTOR

(Title)
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