Old La Honda Road Bridge Replacement Project (Bridge Number 35C0190) (CEQA 2019-0006, CUSE 2019-0004)

Town of Woodside, San Mateo County, California Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration





Town of Woodside 2955 Woodside Road Woodside, CA 94062 Contact: Sean Rose, Public Works Director (650) 851-6790 email: Srose@woodsidetown.org

September 2019

Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration Town of Woodside Old La Honda Road Bridge Replacement Project (Bridge Number 35C0190)

INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared to evaluate the Old La Honda Road Bridge Replacement Project (also referred to as "proposed Project" or "Project") for compliance under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Town of Woodside (Town) is the lead agency responsible for complying with the provisions of CEQA.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Project would replace the Old La Honda Road Bridge (Bridge Number 35C0190) with an 84-inch diameter culvert. The culvert would be installed under the existing bridge, supported by new headwalls, and the area under the bridge would be filled with lean (lighter) concrete.

FINDINGS

As lead agency for compliance with CEQA requirements, the Town finds that the proposed Project would be implemented without causing a significant adverse impact on the environment, based on the analysis presented in this Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). Mitigation measures for potential impacts associated with biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and tribal cultural resources would be implemented as part of the proposed Project through adoption of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this evaluation, the Town concludes:

- The proposed Project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- The proposed Project would not achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- The proposed Project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

- The proposed Project would not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
- No substantial evidence exists to demonstrate that the proposed Project would have a substantive negative effect on the environment.

This document has been prepared to provide the opportunity for interested agencies and the public to provide comment. Pending public review and approval by the Town Planning Commission (CEQA¹ and Conditional Use Permit approval) and Town Council (Funding¹ approval), this MND will be filed pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15075. Written comments should be submitted to the Town Planning Department at 2955 Woodside Road Woodside, CA 94062 by 5:00 p.m. on October 9, 2019.

Signature

Jackie Young, AICP CEP Planning Director

Date

¹ The project includes federal funding. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance is being addressed separately.

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Project Overview	1
1.2	Purpose of this Document	1
1.3	Public Review Process	1
1.4	Town Approval Process	1
1.5	Organization of the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration	1
1.6	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	2
2.0	Project Description	5
2.1	Project Location	5
2.2	Project Purpose	6
2.3	Bridge Design	6
2.4	Utilities	6
2.5	Right of Way	6
2.6	Construction Approach and Staging Areas	.11
2.7	Traffic Handling	.11
2.8	Other Build Alternatives Considered	.12
2.9	No-project Alternative	.12
2.10	Permits and Approvals Needed	.12
3.0	Environmental Checklist	.13
3.1	Aesthetics	.13
3.2	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	.15
3.3	Air Quality	16
3.4	Biological Resources	18
3.5	Cultural Resources	.30
3.6	Energy	.34
3.7	Geology and Soils	.35
3.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	.38
3.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	.39
3.10	Hydrology and Water Quality	41
3.11	Land Use and Planning	45
3.12	Mineral Resources	.46
3.13	Noise	47
3.14	Population and Housing	.49
3.15	Public Services	50
3.16	Recreation	52
3.17	Transportation	53
3.18	Tribal Cultural Resources	54
3.19	Utilities and Service Systems	56
3.20	Wildfire	58
3.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance	59
4.0 Li	st of Preparers	.62
5.0 Re	ferences	.63

List of Figures

Figure 1. Project Vicinity	7
Figure 2. Project Location	8
Figure 3. Proposed Project	9
Figure 4. Habitat Types in the Project Area	21
Figure 5. Aquatic Delineation	28
Figure 6. FEMA Floodplain Map	43

List of Tables

Table 1. Habitats within the Study Area and Project Footprint	20
Table 2. Maximum Ambient Noise Levels (Ldn) by Use	48
Table 3. Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels	. 48

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Appendix B	Site Photos

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AASHTO	American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials
ADT	Average daily traffic
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CalFire	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFGC	California Fish and Game Code
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CIDH	cast-in-drilled-hole
CNDDB	California Native Diversity Database
Corps	U.S Army Corps of Engineers
CWA	Clean Water Act
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DBH	diameter at breast height
DPM	diesel-exhaust particulate matter
DOC	Department of Conservation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
FE	Federally Endangered
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FP	Fully Protected
FT	Federally Threatened
GHG	greenhouse gas
IS/MND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
L _{dn}	ambient noise level
LUST	leaking underground storage tank
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MTCO ₂ <i>e</i> /year	metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NRCS	National Resources Conservation Service
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric

PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
Project	Old La Honda Road Bridge Replacement Project
REC	recognized environmental condition
RSP	Rock slope protection
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCP	Special Conservation Planning
SE	California State Endangered
SSC	Species of Special Concern
Town	Town of Woodside
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WEAT	Worker Environmental Awareness Training
WPCP	Water Pollution Control Plan

1.1 **Project Overview**

The Town of Woodside (Town) is proposing to replace the Old La Honda Road Bridge (Bridge Number 35C0190) with an 84-inch diameter culvert. The culvert would be installed under the existing bridge, supported by new headwalls, and the area under the bridge would be filled with lean concrete².

1.2 Purpose of this Document

The purpose of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is to disclose environmental impacts that may result from the proposed Project. This IS/MND assesses the environmental effects of the proposed Project, as required by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and is in compliance with state CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000, et seq.), which requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

1.3 Public Review Process

This IS/MND is being circulated for a 30-day public review period to all individuals who have requested a copy, local libraries, and appropriate resource agencies. A Notice of Intent (NOI) is also being distributed to all property owners of record identified by the Town Assessor's office as having property within 300 feet of the proposed Project and staging area, and all properties along Old La Honda Road and adjoining roads with primary access off of Old La Honda Road. The NOI identifies where the document is available for public review and invites interested parties to provide written comments for incorporation into the final IS/MND.

1.4 Town Approval Process

After comments are received from the public and reviewing agencies, the Town Planning Commission must adopt the IS/MND and approve the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) (Appendix A) before it can approve the Conditional Use Permit for the proposed Project.

1.5 Organization of the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

This IS/MND is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter 1 – Project Overview and Background: provides summary information about the proposed Project, describes the public review process for the IS/MND, and includes the CEQA determination for the proposed Project.

 $^{^{2}}$ Lean concrete is concrete that can be poured or pumped with a minimum cement content of 1.5 sacks per cubic yard of concrete and a compressive strength of 2,000 pounds per square inch (psi).

Chapter 2 – Project Description: contains a detailed description of the proposed Project.

Chapter 3 – Environmental Checklist: provides an assessment of proposed Project impacts by resource topic. The Environmental Checklist form, from Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, is used to make one of the following conclusions for impacts from the proposed Project:

- A conclusion of *no impact* is used when it is determined that the proposed Project would have no impact on the resource area under evaluation.
- A conclusion of *less than significant impact* is used when it is determined that the proposed Project's adverse impacts to a resource area would not exceed established thresholds of significance.
- A conclusion of *less than significant impact with mitigation* is used when it is determined that mitigation measures would be required to reduce the proposed Project's adverse impacts below established thresholds of significance.
- A conclusion of *potentially significant impact* is used when it is determined that the proposed Project's adverse impacts to a resource area potentially cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.

Mitigation measures, if necessary, are noted following each impact discussion.

Chapter 4 – List of Preparers: identifies the individuals who contributed to the environmental document.

Chapter 5 – References Cited: identifies the information sources used in preparing this document.

Appendices – Contains the MMRP and representative photos.

1.6 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

Impacts to the environmental factors below are evaluated using the checklist included in Chapter 3. The Town determined that the environmental factors checked below would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. It was determined that the unchecked factors would have a less-than-significant impact or no impact.

	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry		Air Quality
\boxtimes	Biological Resources	\boxtimes	Cultural Resources		Energy
\boxtimes	Geology/Soils		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards and Hazardous Materials
	Hydrology/Water Quality		Land Use/Planning		Mineral Resources
	Noise		Population/Housing		Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation/Traffic	\square	Tribal Cultural Resources ³
	Utilities/Service Systems		Wildfire	\boxtimes	Mandatory Findings of Significance

³ Mitigation measures applicable to Tribal Cultural Resources are contained in the Cultural Resources section.

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- 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 revisions in the proposed Project have been made by or agreed to by the proposed Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

□ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Jackie Young, Al

Planning Director

Page intentionally blank

The proposed Project would replace the Old La Honda Road Bridge in the Town of Woodside on Old La Honda Road, as described in detail below.

2.1 Project Location

The Project is located in the Town on Woodside, San Mateo County, California, 2.3 miles from the center of Town (Figure 1). The existing two-lane bridge on Old La Honda Road is approximately 0.1 miles west of Portola Road and approximately 3 miles west of Route 280. The Project is located within the *Palo Alto* U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle map outside of the Township and Range system (Figure 2).

2.2 Background and Setting

The existing two-lane bridge in the Town of Woodside is located on Old La Honda Road, 0.1 miles west of Portola Road (Figure 1). The bridge carries vehicular traffic on Old La Honda road over a culverted section of an ephemeral drainage, which flows after high rain events. The ephemeral drainage flows from adjacent properties, drops 8 to 10 feet over a decorative concrete wall immediately upstream of the bridge, enters an over-sized aesthetically-treated cement culvert, and lowers another 3 feet at the downstream side of the bridge. The underside of the Old La Honda Road Bridge is lined with faux-rock concrete, creating a tunnel. After exiting the culvert, water returns to a natural bottom channel then discharges to Dennis Martin Creek. The Project area and surroundings are fully developed with public roads and single family residential buildings. The proposed Project is located within the Western Hills and in close proximity to Portola Road, which is designated by the Town as a Town Scenic Corridor. The proposed Project is located within the Dennis Martin Creek Town-Designated Stream Corridor. Bridge projects within designated stream corridors require approval of a Conditional Use Permit by the Town of Woodside Planning Commission.

The existing bridge, constructed in 1924, is a single span, reinforced concrete T-beam bridge approximately 24-feet long with a total width of 22 feet. There are low decorative concrete bridge railings on the bridge. The bridge consists of five reinforced concrete T-beams with concrete deck on reinforced concrete abutments. It is overlaid with asphalt concrete wearing surface. The type of abutment foundation is unknown. The abutment wingwalls are roughly parallel to Old La Honda Road. The sides and underside of the bridge are surrounded by a decorative non-structural reinforced façade made of welded wire mesh covered by concrete grout, which replicates rock outcroppings and is locally known as part of the Schilling Grotto. Photographs of the existing bridge and vicinity are provided in Appendix B.

2.3 Project Purpose

The existing exterior reinforced concrete T-beam bridge is in poor condition. The latest Caltrans inspection report noted advanced deterioration of the exterior girders and abutment walls. The existing bridge is "Structurally Deficient" with a Sufficiency Rating of 36.8 out of 100. The purpose of this Project is to rehabilitate the existing structure to accommodate safe vehicular travel and pedestrian access.

2.4 Bridge Design

The proposed project would consist of installing a single 84-inch diameter pre-cast reinforced concrete pipe culvert under the existing bridge. The culvert would then be encased with lean concrete from the outside edge of the exterior girders to the bottom of the existing reinforced concrete T-beam bridge deck (Figure 3). The headwalls at each end of the pipe will be supported by reinforced concrete footings and cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) piles with an estimated maximum depth of 50 feet. To prevent erosion at the downstream face, rock slope protection (RSP) would be required at the outlet of the pipe culvert. All improvements would be within the footprint of the existing bridge and within the existing right-of-way.

The existing structurally deficient bridge would be functionally replaced with a culvert by installing the 84-inch diameter pipe culvert. The structure would no longer be considered a bridge as defined in 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 650.305; it would then be considered a culvert. To address community interest in preserving the bridge aesthetics, the existing bridge deck and barriers will remain in place and the roadway will not be widened. A design exception by Caltrans may be needed to keep the existing barriers in lieu of replacing the existing barriers with crash cushions at the approach ends, and to maintain the existing substandard roadway width. In accordance with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Very Low Volume Local Road Guidelines, it is assumed that the existing width is sufficient, and that no approach rails would be required due to the road's low traffic volumes (average daily traffic [ADT] of 120 vehicles per day) and no accident history at the site.

2.5 Utilities

Within the project limits one utility may need to be relocated, California Water Service facilities. No other public utility lines or facilities are anticipated to be relocated in order to implement the proposed project.

2.6 Right of Way

The Project is designed to be kept within the existing right of way. No property acquisition or temporary construction easement would be needed.



Figure 1. Project Vicinity



Figure 2. Project Location



Old La Honda Road Bridge Replacement Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Figure 3. Proposed Project

Page intentionally blank

2.7 Construction Approach and Staging Areas

Although construction means and methods would be determined by the contractor, installation of the new culvert under Old La Honda Bridge would generally include the following steps:

- 1. Install environmental fencing and erosion control
- 2. Clear and trim vegetation for equipment and materials access
- 3. Dismantle and remove faux-rock façade under the bridge
- 4. Relocate utilities, if required
- 5. Install culvert pipe under the bridge
- 6. Install CIDH Piles for culvert headwalls and strengthening wingwalls
- 7. Construct headwalls and strengthen existing wingwalls on downstream sides
- 8. Backfill around culvert with lean concrete in stages (maintaining one lane traffic throughout construction)
- 9. Construct metal beam guard rails if required
- 10. Place RSP at pipe outlet

Anticipated construction equipment includes, but is not limited to, small excavators, truck mounted drill rig, small cranes, dump trucks, concrete trucks, and concrete pumps.

Construction activities would be limited to Monday through Friday 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and Saturdays 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. No work would occur on Sundays and Holidays. Residents will be provided advance notice of the work.

Construction is anticipated to take approximately 18 weeks and would be completed during the summer and fall months when the culvert under the bridge is dry.

There are limited areas immediately adjacent to the bridge that can be used for staging construction equipment and materials due to narrow shoulders. The staging area will be located nearby on the southwest corner of the intersection of Old La Honda Road and Portola Road, and consists of a 10-foot wide, 100-foot long gravel access road and would be suitable for storing building materials and equipment.

2.8 Traffic Handling

Old La Honda road has a low ADT of 120 making it possible to keep one-lane open to traffic during construction. The load capacity of the bridge would not be reduced since none of the structural components of the bridge will need to be removed. One-lane traffic control would be used during construction and driveway access for local residents will be maintained throughout the construction period. No detours are planned. A traffic management plan developed by the contractor and approved by the Town shall be implemented when construction is in progress.

2.9 Other Build Alternatives Considered

Two rehabilitation alternatives and two replacement alternatives were considered in addition to the preferred alternative of converting the bridge into a culvert crossing. The first rehabilitation alternative involved solely replacing the exterior girders. Because this alternative did not address the structural issues with interior girders or abutments, it was removed from consideration. The second rehabilitation alternative involved replacing all girders and deck. Because of the expenses required and need for full road closure, this alternative was removed from consideration. The first replacement option included building a cast-in-place slab bridge. This alternative required a longer construction time than the other alternatives and a 12-week road closure. For these reasons, the cast-in-place slab replacement was not recommended. A single span precast, prestressed concrete slab bridge was also considered. Although desirable due to its reduced construction time, construction would require additional right of way acquisition and longer retaining walls. Although it is possible to stage construction to allow traffic to continue to pass during the build, this option would be more expensive and would close the bridge for 8 weeks. All of these alternatives would require complete removal of the existing bridge barrier rails and faux rock façade, which has some aesthetic value.

2.10 No-project Alternative

The No-Build Alternative (No Project) maintains the existing structurally deficient bridge on Old La Honda Road. The existing bridge has been experiencing several structural deficiencies and has been deemed to be functionally obsolete. Under the No-Build Alternative, the existing issues at the bridge would likely worsen and could pose a threat to roadway safety and may result in bridge or road materials entering the waterways.

2.11 Permits and Approvals Needed

Upon completion of final design for the proposed Project, the following agencies will be contacted, as needed, to obtain their jurisdictional permits or approvals.

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Nationwide Permit 14 – Linear Transportation Projects
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Streambed Alteration Agreement
- Town of Woodside Creek Permit Municipal Code "Sec. 153.444 Conditional uses" indicates that bridges are subject to approval of a use permit by the planning department.

This checklist identifies physical, biological, and social factors that might be affected by the proposed Project. If it is determined that a particular impact to the environment could occur, the checklist must indicate whether the impact is Potentially Significant, Less Than Significant with Mitigation, or Less Than Significant. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the project indicate No Impacts, which do not require further discussion. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included following the applicable checklist questions. The questions in this form are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

3.1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Aesthetics				
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 210	99, would the pr	oject:		
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\square
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				\square
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				
 d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? 				

Environmental Setting

The proposed Project is located within the Town of Woodside, San Mateo County and is governed by the Town of Woodside General Plan (Town of Woodside 2012). The proposed Project area consists of coastal mixed forest along a rural road adjacent to Dennis Martin Creek. Lands within and surrounding the Project area are residential. Old La Honda Road is regularly used by bicyclists and sometimes by horseback riders due to the close proximity of the Thornewood Open Space Preserve located approximately 0.12 miles west of the Project area and Bridle trail located 0.25 miles south of the Project area.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The proposed Project area is not located within a local or state-designated scenic vista. There would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required

b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

The Project is not within a state scenic highway. The proposed Project area is located approximately 1 mile east of State Route 35 (Skyline Boulevard) and 3 miles east of Route 280 (Father Juniper Serra Freeway), both of which are designated as State Scenic Highways. The proposed Project is not visible from Skyline Boulevard or Route 280, therefore *no impacts* would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None required

c) Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or the quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

The proposed Project is located within 300 feet of Portola Road, which is designated by the Town of Woodside as a Town Scenic Corridor (Town of Woodside 2012).

The Project will comply with the Town's goals, policies, and strategies with regards to scenic roads. Namely, the Project will comply with Goal CL2 to maintain a safe and convenient roadway system while preserving the Town's rural and scenic environment.

The Project will require the trimming and/or removal of up to eleven trees to allow for construction access (Figure 3). Because of the surrounding dense canopy, removal or trimming these trees will not significantly reduce the canopy or take away from the aesthetics of Old La Honda Road. During construction, the Project will adhere to all applicable standards stated in the Woodside Municipal Code for section 153.430 - Tree Protection (Woodside Municipal Code 2018).

The Project is designed to maintain roadway safety by rehabilitating a Structurally Deficient bridge while maintaining the existing scenic character along Old La Honda Road. This impact would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required

d. Would the Project create a new substantial source of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The proposed Project would not include any streetlights or traffic lights. There would be *no impact.*

Mitigation Measures: None required

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--------------

2. Agriculture and Forestry 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 prepared by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) 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 forest land, including the Forest Range Assessment Project and Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses?		\boxtimes
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?		\square
 c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (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))? 		\boxtimes
 Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? 		\square
e) 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 forest land to non-forest use?		\square

Environmental Setting

None of the parcels in the proposed Project area or surrounding vicinity are zoned for agriculture. See the Land Use and Planning Section for a full description of land use and zoning policies in the proposed Project area. According to the California DOC Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) 2016 San Mateo County Map (published February 2018), none of the parcels in the proposed Project area or surrounding vicinity are considered Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland (DOC 2018). Additionally, none of the parcels in the proposed Project area vicinity are under Williamson Act contract.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a, b, c, d, and e. Would the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses; conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; or 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 forest land to non-forest use?

The proposed Project area and surrounding vicinity are classified as "Urban and Built-Up Land" and "Grazing Land" in the FMMP map for San Mateo County, and none of the parcels are zoned for agricultural use nor are any under a Williamson Act Contract. There is no forest land in the proposed Project vicinity. There would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Air Quality				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following the second s	applicable air o wing determina	quality manageme ations. Would the	ent district or ai e project:	r
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				\square
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?			\square	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			\square	
 Result in other emissions (such as hose leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? 			\square	

Environmental Setting

The proposed Project area is located within the San Francisco Bay Area Basin and is under the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The proposed Project area is currently designated nonattainment for State and federal ambient air quality standards for ozone and fine particulate matter (less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter) ($PM_{2.5}$), and for State standards for respirable particulate matter (less than 10 micrometers in diameter)

 (PM_{10}) . The area is in designated attainment or unclassified for all other state and federal standards.

Existing land uses in the proposed Project area and vicinity generally consist of residential uses. Nearby sensitive receptors include neighboring residences.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a, b, and c. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; or 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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Proposed projects that generate emissions in excess of the BAAQMD's recommended significance thresholds (BAAQMD 2017) would be considered to potentially conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, result or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, including increases in emissions for which the region is designated non-attainment, and/or 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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in significant long-term increases in vehicle trips in the area. When establishing their CEQA Thresholds of Significance, BAAQMD identified screening criteria for corresponding project sizes that would result in emissions at or in exceedance of their criteria pollutant thresholds. Based on BAAQMD's project size analysis, the proposed Project is well below exceeding the significance threshold for criteria pollutants (BAAQMD 2017).

Construction activities associated with the proposed Project include a small amount of grading, removing the existing concrete façade, drilling CIDH piles, forming concrete headwalls, installing the 84-inch culvert, and filling underneath the bridge with lean concrete. Due to the relatively minimal nature of construction activities, the short-term construction-generated emissions, and the project being well below the operational screening criteria, the project would not exceed applicable thresholds of significance. For these reasons, this impact would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Sensitive receptors in the Project area vicinity include neighboring residences adjacent to the Project area. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the long-term operation of any stationary emission sources and therefore would not result in long-term increases in exposure of sensitive receptors to localized pollutant concentrations.

Construction activities may result in temporary increases of construction-generated emissions, which are short-term, lasting only as long as construction activities occur. These emissions would be temporary and limited to the immediate area surrounding the construction site. Emissions from construction equipment powered by gasoline and diesel engines would include carbon monoxide, nitrous oxides, volatile organic compounds, directly emitted PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, and toxic air contaminants such as diesel exhaust particulate matter (DPM). Health-related risks associated with diesel-exhaust emissions are primarily associated with long-term exposure and associated risk of contracting cancer. Project-related construction activities would be short-term and relatively minor. As a result, exposure to construction-generated DPM would not exceed commonly applied thresholds.

During construction, fugitive dust would be generated by grading and other activities related to construction. Fugitive dust emissions are largely dependent on the amount of ground disturbance associated with site preparation activities. Due to the minimal amount of grading associated with the proposed Project, emissions of fugitive dust would not exceed BAAQMD-recommended thresholds of significance, and would not result in increased nuisance to nearby individuals.

Therefore, short-term construction-generated pollutants would have a *less than significant* impact on nearby sensitive receptors.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Minor sources of odors would be present during construction from diesel engines, which may be considered offensive to some individuals. However, because odors would be temporary and would disperse rapidly with distance from the source, construction-generated odors would not result in frequent objectionable odorous emissions. This impact is *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
4. Biological Resources Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the DFG or USFWS?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the DFG or USFWS?			\boxtimes	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally- protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?		\boxtimes		
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			\square	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				\boxtimes
 f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? 				\boxtimes

Environmental Setting

The proposed Project is located in a rural residential area in the Town of Woodside, with elevation in the Project area ranging from approximately 376 to 422 feet above mean sea level. Based on the soils, hydrology, and Mediterranean climate (cool, wet winters and hot, dry summers), the proposed Project area and the surrounding vicinity support plant species typically associated with the San Francisco Bay Area Floristic Province.

Biological field surveys were completed on October 17 and 18, 2018, consisting of habitat mapping, wetland delineation fieldwork to determine potential waters of the U.S. under the jurisdiction of the Corps pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA and botanical surveys. Additional botanical surveys were completed on April 30 and May 1, 2019.

The Project area predominately consists of mixed coastal forest. Old La Honda Road is a narrow paved rural road with ruderal roadside shoulders. Residential houses border Old La Honda Road. An ephemeral drainage flows through the culvert and under the bridge during and after storm events. This ephemeral drainage is a tributary to Dennis Martin Creek, a seasonal intermittent creek that parallels the east side of Old La Honda Road. The proposed Project footprint includes a total of approximately 0.194 acres; this area includes all permanent and temporary impacts related to construction activities. The staging area consists predominantly of developed land with a gravel road (Appendix B, Figure 4).

The proposed Project area includes the following habitat classifications based on the California Wildlife Habitat Relationship system (Mayer and Laudenslayer 1988) and Cowardin classification of wetlands (Cowardin et al. 1979):

- developed;
- ruderal;
- ephemeral drainage;
- culvert
- intermittent stream; and
- coastal mixed forest.

Table 1. Habitats within the Study Area and Project Postprint						
Habitat Classification	Acres within the Study Area	Acres within the Project Footprint				
Developed	0.506	0.109				
Ruderal	0.071	0.011				
Ephemeral Drainage	0.030	0.007				
Culvert	0.004	0.004				
Intermittent Stream	0.161	0				
Coastal Mixed Forest	1.646	0.063				
Total	2.418	0.194				

Table 1. Habitats within the Study Area and Project Footprint

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Will the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?

No special-status plant species were observed during protocol-level botanical surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period for special-status plant species with potential to occur in the Project area. Therefore, the proposed Project would not affect any special-status plant species.

A State	All and a second	No.		1000	10 M 10
		ST /	200		
		Statist.	1 all	1.3.5	1948
Charles I.	ESCALE OF		18	Citize.	
		18000	here .		A.F. STOL
	COLOR A		and the second	1	
	1	1 and the	ADAM .		States and
14.25/10			(Second	and the second	
100					
		A	a Road	P	
11444		OldLaHom			
		N			
a de	martin				
		1			
					Pott
	IP	, est	a street	. 6. 10 . 11	JaRos
		stin			8
120					111 A. 19
		14250			
		1 all the second	P. An		211
				15 30	
1993	and berger		A. 1 . 4	12 38	1.0
	and the				
10 18	and stands			19440	1925-94
A States				1.10	
2 1	HE REAL	ALC: NO DE		1.464	
		OLD LA HONDA BRIDG	GE REPLACEMENT		
Study Area	Habitat Communities				
Project Area	Developed			۵ ا	50 100
	Enhemeral Drainage			Data Source:	
= = = Culvert	Intermittent Creek			- ESRI Topographic Ba	semap, November 2, 2018 ntal. Inc. 2018: Date: 9.4-19
	Coastal Mixed Forest			A COLUMN COLUMN COULD	, 10. 2010, Dut. 0-7-10
IAWE\GIS Dekstop\AWE\18-018-001 JMEC Ok	d La Hondalmxd\BA\Veg_community2019058.mxd				

Figure 4. Habitat Types in the Project Area

The following special-status wildlife have potential to occur within the Project area:

- California giant salamander (*Dicamptodon ensatus*, Species of Special Concern [SSC])
- California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*, Federally Threatened [FT], SSC)
- Santa Cruz black salamander (*Aneides flavipunctatus niger*, SSC)
- San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*, Federally Endangered [FE], State Endangered [SE], Fully Protected [FP])
- San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (*Neotoma fuscipes annectens*, SSC)
- Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*, SSC)
- Pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*, SSC)

Habitat for migratory birds and nesting raptors is also present. A discussion of potential impacts on habitats and special-status species is provided below.

Potential Impacts to Special-status Amphibians

Aquatic habitats and surrounding uplands provide suitable habitat for California giant salamander (SSC), California red-legged frog (FT, SSC), and Santa Cruz black salamander (SSC). Construction of the proposed Project could result in both direct and indirect impacts to these amphibians. Direct impacts to amphibians resulting from ground disturbance, equipment use, and other proposed Project activities, as well as indirect effects to amphibians resulting from impacts to water quality and aquatic habitat, would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-5, BIO-9, BIO-10, and BIO-11. All biological resources mitigation measures are described at the end of this impact discussion.

Potential Impacts to Special-status Reptiles

The Project area does not contain suitable aquatic habitat for San Francisco garter snake (FE, SE, FP) and no prey or small mammal burrows were observed. However, San Francisco garter snake could disperse through the Project area. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project could result in both direct and indirect impacts to San Francisco garter snake. Direct impacts to San Francisco garter snake could result from ground disturbance, equipment use, and other proposed Project activities. Indirect effects to San Francisco garter snake could result from erosion or invasive plant species infestation degrading downstream habitat. Impacts would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4, BIO-9, BIO-10, and BIO-11. All biological resources mitigation measures are described at the end of this impact discussion.

Potential Impacts to Special-status Mammals

San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (SSC) could potentially occur in the Project area. Habitat for San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat is present in the Project area in dense wooded areas with heavy undergrowth. This species builds nest houses of debris on the ground or in trees. Signs of

the species were not detected during reconnaissance surveys on October 17 and 18, 2018; woodrats were detected during a previous study (Mahony and Allaback 2013), near the staging area. Soil disturbance and removal of vegetation within the Project area could directly affect special-status mammals, if present. Additionally, noise associated with construction activities involving heavy equipment operation could disturb denning/nesting mammals if an active den/nest is located near these activities. Potential direct impacts to mammals would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3 BIO-6, BIO-9, and BIO-11.

Potential Impacts to Special-status Roosting Bats

Trees in the Project area represent potential breeding and/or foraging habitat for some specialstatus roosting bats. Townsend's big-eared bat (SSC) and Pallid bat (SSC) could potentially breed in the proposed Project area. There are no rock outcrops that represent potential roosting habitat. Removal of trees and vegetation could disturb roosts and roosting bats foraging availability in the area. Noise associated with construction activities involving heavy equipment could disturb roosting bats if a roosting colony is located near these activities. Construction activities are not expected to disturb foraging bats, as Project activities would not be conducted during dusk or dark when bats would be actively foraging. Potential impacts would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3, BIO-7, and BIO-9.

Potential Impacts to Special-status and Migratory Birds

Trees and shrubs in the Project area represent potential breeding and/or foraging habitat for some species of special-status and migratory birds. Though no bird nests were identified within the Study Area during the wildlife surveys on October 17 and 2018; the surveys were conducted outside of the nesting season. The existing bridge structure may provide habitat for nesting birds. Additionally, the proposed Project area also contains potential foraging habitat for numerous birds and raptors protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code (CFGC) Section 3503.5. Removal of trees and vegetation could lead to elimination of nests, nest abandonment and/or could disturb birds foraging in the area. Potential impacts would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, BIO-8, and BIO-9.

Impacts to special-status wildlife species would be *less than significant with implementation of all of the following mitigation measures*.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Conduct Worker Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT) Before any work occurs in the proposed Project area, including grading and equipment staging, all construction personnel shall participate in an environmental awareness training regarding special-status species and sensitive habitats present in the proposed Project limits. If new construction personnel are added to the proposed Project, they must receive the mandatory training before starting work. As part of the training, an environmental awareness handout will be provided to all personnel that describes and illustrates sensitive resources (i.e., waters of the U.S. and state, special-status species and habitat [including California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake], nesting birds/raptors) to be avoided during proposed Project construction and lists applicable permit conditions identified by state and federal agencies to protect these resources.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Install Temporary Fencing around Environmentally Sensitive Habitat

The Town shall ensure that temporary wildlife exclusion fencing is installed between the work area and environmentally sensitive habitat areas, before any ground-disturbing activity occurs within the Project footprint, as appropriate. The exclusion fence shall be buried a minimum of 4 inches below the surface, shall be a minimum of 4 feet tall, and shall include one-way exits to avoid entrapment of wildlife. Construction personnel and construction activity shall remain within the defined project boundary and avoid areas identified as environmentally sensitive by the fencing. The fencing shall be checked regularly and maintained until all construction is complete. No construction activity shall be allowed until this condition is satisfied.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Stabilize Temporarily Disturbed Areas

All temporarily disturbed areas shall be stabilized upon completion of construction. These areas will be properly protected from washout and erosion using appropriate erosion control devices including coir netting, hydroseeding, and revegetation.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Conduct a Preconstruction Survey for Special-status Amphibians and Reptiles

A USFWS-approved biologist shall conduct a preconstruction clearance survey for special-status amphibians and reptiles with potential to occur in the vicinity of the Project (California giant salamander, California red-legged frog, Santa Cruz black salamander, and San Francisco garter snake) within 24 hours prior to any ground disturbance. The qualifications of the biologist(s) will be submitted to the USFWS for review and written approval at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the date earthmoving is initiated at the Project site. This survey will consist of walking surveys of the Project footprint and BSA, where accessible. The qualified biologist will investigate all potential cover sites for special status amphibians. This includes an adequate examination of mammal burrows, such as California ground squirrels or gophers. If any of these species are found within the construction work area, the biologist will contact CDFW and/or USFWS, as appropriate, and the species shall be allowed to voluntarily move outside of the work area on its own.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Avoid Peak Dispersal Period for Special-status Amphibians

No construction-related activities shall occur between November 1 and March 31 to avoid wet, rainy, or humid periods when special-status amphibians, such as California red-legged frog, are most likely to travel between upland and aquatic habitats. To the maximum extent practicable, no construction activities will occur during rain events or within 24-hours following a rain event. A rain event is defined as ¹/₂-inch of rain in a 24-hour period. If ground disturbing work must occur during this period, CDFW and USFWS shall be contacted for guidance.

Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct a Preconstruction Mammal Survey

The following measures shall be implemented to minimize or avoid potential impacts to specialstatus mammal species:

- A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for San Francisco duskyfooted woodrat (SSC) and active special-status mammal nests or dens within the Study Area.
- For surveys in inaccessible areas, the surveying biologist shall use binoculars to scan any suitable denning substrate for potential individuals or nests/dens.
- The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days before the initiation of construction activities.
- If an active special-status mammal nest/den is identified within the Study Area, a no-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest/den to avoid disturbance of the nesting/denning mammal until a qualified biologist determines that the young have dispersed. The extent of these buffers shall be determined by the biologist in coordination with CDFW and the Town and shall depend on the species identified, level of noise or construction disturbance, line-of-sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. In addition to the establishment of buffers, other avoidance measures (determined during agency coordination) may be implemented.
- If any non-denning species are observed in the Study Area, the species will be allowed to move out of harm's way on its own. If needed, a qualified biologist will move the species to the nearest area of suitable habitat outside of the Project area. If applicable, depending on the location and status of the species, agency approval will be obtained before any species is moved.
- If no active nests/dens are found during the preconstruction surveys, then no additional mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measure BIO-7: Conduct a Preconstruction Survey for Bats

During April–September before construction begins, a qualified biologist will survey trees and within the proposed Project area and identify any rock crevices, snags, hollow trees, or other refuge with cavities that may provide suitable roosting habitat for bats. If no suitable roosting sites are found, construction may proceed. If suitable roosting sites are found, they will be examined for roosting bats or their sign. If bats are not found and there is no evidence of use by bats, construction may proceed. If bats are found or evidence of use by bats is present, the qualified biologist will work with CDFW and the Town to implement measures to avoid or minimize disturbance to the colony. Additional measures may include excluding bats from the site before their hibernation period (mid-October to mid-March) and before construction begins.

Mitigation Measure BIO-8: Conduct a Preconstruction Nesting Migratory Bird and Raptor Survey

If vegetation removal will occur during the breeding season for migratory birds and raptors (generally February through August), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird and raptor survey prior to the start of vegetation removal and construction activities (including equipment staging). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days before the initiation of construction activities or vegetation removal. This survey will adhere to all protocol-level survey requirements as described in the *Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California Central Valley* (Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000).

If an active bird or raptor nest is identified within the construction work area or an active raptor nest is identified within 250 feet from the construction work area, a no-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest to avoid disturbance of the nesting birds or raptors until a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged and are foraging on their own. The extent of these buffers shall be determined by the biologist and shall depend on the species identified, level of noise or construction disturbance, line-of-sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. If no active nests are found during the preconstruction surveys, then no buffers or additional mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measure BIO-9: Monitor during Demolition, Ground Disturbance and Vegetation Removal

A USFWS-approved biological monitor will be present during all Project activities requiring demolition (such as removal of the bridge façade), ground disturbance, or vegetation removal within the construction area.

Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Avoid Harm to California Red-legged Frog and San Francisco Garter Snake

The following measures will be implemented to avoid harm to California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake:

- If a California red-legged frog or San Francisco garter snake is observed in the work limits during construction, work will immediately stop, the individual will be allowed to move out of harm's way on its own accord, and USFWS will be contacted within 24 hours.
- To ensure that diseases are not conveyed between work sites by the USFWS-approved biologist, the fieldwork code of practice developed by the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force will be followed at all times.
- No pets will be permitted at the project site.
- No firearms will be allowed at the project site except those carried by authorized security personnel, or local, State, or Federal law enforcement officials.
- Pipes, conduits, and other materials that are stored onsite and could provide shelter for wildlife shall be stored on an open-top trailer or otherwise elevated above the ground to reduce the potential for wildlife to become trapped.
- All food scraps, paper wrappers, food containers, cans, bottles, and other trash will be deposited in covered or closed trash containers and removed from the project at the end of each working day to reduce the attraction of predators to the project site.

Mitigation Measure BIO-11: Provide Escape Ramps or Cover Open Trenches

To avoid entrapment of wildlife, all excavated steep-walled holes or trenches more than 4 inches deep will be provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks

at the end of each workday. If escape ramps cannot be provided, then holes or trenches will be covered with plywood or similar materials. Providing escape ramps or covering open trenches will prevent injury or mortality of wildlife resulting from falling into trenches and becoming trapped. The trenches will be thoroughly inspected for the presence of federally listed species at the beginning of each workday. Any species observed shall be allowed to voluntarily move outside of the work area on its own.

b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS?

Within the Project study area, riparian vegetation occurs along Dennis Martin Creek. Trees within the Project footprint are contiguous with this riparian corridor. Species associated with CDFW and USFWS sensitive communities such as Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and Coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) were identified within the Project footprint and would be affected by construction activities. During construction, tree removal and trimming will be necessary to access the site along the east side of Old La Honda Road; however due to the limited number or tree removals/trimming required and density of the overall canopy, the impact will be *less than significant*. See question E for further discussion.

c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the federal CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?

The aquatic resources delineation for the Project area identified a total of 0.030 acre of aquatic resources within the Project Footprint, comprised of an ephemeral drainage that flows through the culvert and under the bridge (Figure 5). Permanent and temporary impacts from construction activities will affect 0.007 acres of the ephemeral drainage. Dennis Martin Creek is present downstream of the Project area. No permanent or temporary impacts would affect Dennis Martin Creek, a Town-designated stream.

The Project could result in indirect effects on jurisdictional waters. Earth moving adjacent to an ephemeral drainage due to construction related activities could result in increased sediment loads, turbidity, and siltation into the aquatic resource. The accidental introduction of washwater, solvents, oil, cement, or other pollutants during construction could also harm aquatic environments.

Implementation of standard erosion and sediment control practices, as required by Caltrans Standard Specifications and Special Provisions for water pollution control measures, and as required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), would prevent potential effects on water quality in receiving waters. The project contract documents will require the contractor to follow the State Standard Specifications Section 13, "Water Pollution Control" and provide a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP will identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent discharge from the site of soil or construction wastes or debris, including contaminants from construction materials, tools, and equipment.



D:/AWE\18-018-001 JMEC Old La Honda\mxd\NES\WD_20190508.mxd

Figure 5. Aquatic Delineation
Potential direct impacts to Waters of the U.S. would be avoided and minimized though Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3, BIO-12 and BIO-13. Therefore, impacts would be *less than signification with implementation of mitigation*.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3, described under question a.

Mitigation Measure BIO-12: Implement Measures to Reduce the Spread of Invasive Species To prevent the accidental introduction or spread of invasive species in the Project area during construction, the following measures would be implemented:

- Only certified noxious weed-free erosion control materials will be used. All straw and seed material will be certified as weed-free prior to being used at the proposed Project area.
- Contractor will wash all construction equipment prior to bringing it onto the job site. Inspection will ensure that equipment arrives on site free of mud and seed-bearing material.
- Any reseeding of disturbed soil areas and newly constructed slopes will use an appropriate native seed mix.
- The Environmental awareness training described under BIO-1 will include information on noxious weeds in the Project area.

Mitigation Measure BIO-13: Compensate for Permanent Impacts to Waters of the U.S. and State

To ensure the Project would not result in a net loss of waters of the U.S. and State, the Town shall implement compensation measures required by the Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW during project permitting. These measures will include, but are not limited to, implementing enhancement projects approved by the RWQCB within the San Francisquito Watershed.

d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Stream/riparian corridors are commonly used by wildlife as migration and movement corridors. An ephemeral stream present within the Project area cascades down an approximately 10-feet high wall on the upstream/west side of the existing bridge which creates a barrier for amphibian larvae and fish. The ephemeral stream is a tributary to Dennis Martin Creek, which could be used as a migratory corridor for terrestrial and aquatic species. Downstream of Dennis Martin Creek, Searsville Lake is dammed which prevents fish from migrating up or downstream from the San Francisco Bay. During Project construction, impacts to species migrating through the Project area or using the ephemeral drainage corridor for dispersal would be temporary, would occur during the dry season, and wildlife could continue to migrate through existing habitat adjacent to the Project area. After completion of the Project, there would be no substantial change to conditions for dispersing or migrating species. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

e. Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Chapter 153.430 of the Town of Woodside Municipal Code contains a Tree Protection Ordinance with the objectives of maintaining the rural character, preserving air quality and ecologic balance, maintaining property values, ensuring maximum preservation of valuable natural features, protecting against erosion of top soil, preserving natural scenic qualities and healthy ecosystems, and protecting mature trees and significant stands of trees.

During Project construction trees may be removed or trimmed to allow for construction access along the east side of Old La Honda Road (Figure 3). Based on the current plans, two mature redwood trees (approximately 36 inches and 32 inches diameter at breast height [dbh]) and six smaller trees (less than 24 inches dbh) may need to be removed.

Prior to the removal or encroachment into the dripline of any mature tree in the Project area, a Tree Destruction Permit would be obtained from the Town. All terms and conditions of the Tree Destruction Permit, including any required mitigation, would be implemented. Therefore, there will be no conflict with local policies and *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservations Plans or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that overlap with the proposed Project area. Therefore, the proposed Project would have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
5. Cultural Resources				
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		\boxtimes		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?		\square		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		\boxtimes		

To identify the potential for cultural resources to be affected by the proposed Project, a cultural resources inventory was conducted for the Project area, consisting of a records search, written contact with Native American groups and related agencies, and onsite fieldwork (Bailey 2019, McMorris and Freeman 2019).

A cultural records search was requested and obtained from the Northwest California Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System. The records search included the Project area and a ¹/₄-mile radius around the Project area. The NCIC records search identified no prehistoric resources or historical resources in the Project area.

An intensive pedestrian survey was conducted for the Project on October 19, 2018 for archaeological resources. No surface prehistoric or historic-era resources were located during the pedestrian survey (Bailey 2019).

In addition to the archaeological pedestrian survey, a field survey for historical and architectural historical resources was conducted on February 7, 2019 (McMorris and Freeman 2019). The existing bridge was evaluated to determine if the bridge is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the California Register of Historic Places (CRHR).

The reinforced concrete T-beam bridge was constructed in 1924 by San Mateo County. The bridge is an example of a very common bridge type built in the early 20th century in California. The bridge on Old La Honda Road includes short concrete railings that flank the road and cylindrical pilaster at the structure's four corners. These features are reflective of a style used on other San Mateo County bridges in the first few decades of the twentieth century. (McMorris and Freeman 2019)

When the bridge was constructed, Old La Honda Road crossed the Schilling estate, owned by August and Agnes Schilling who operated companies that sold spices, teas, and coffees. Following construction of the bridge, the Schillings had faux-rock constructed within the creekbed and underside of the bridge, creating a grotto and waterfall. The grotto consisted of faux-rock concrete lining (akin to shotcrete or gunite) with built-in planters and faux boulders. The Schillings developed these features as part of the overall landscape of their larger property. Most of the landscape features from the Schilling period appear to have been removed, substantially altered, overgrown with vegetation, or significantly deteriorated. At the Old La Honda Bridge, deterioration of the faux rock includes several large holes, as well as damage and deterioration at multiple locations. Through these holes, the method of attachment (i.e. heavy-duty metal chains attached to the existing bridge structure) is visible. Graffiti covers large

sections of the underside of the bridge. The majority of the grotto is not visible from the roadway. See Appendix B, Site Photos. (McMorris and Freeman 2019)

Although the faux-rock grotto and waterfall under and adjacent to the bridge is associated with August Schilling, who arguably made important contributions to history through his work manufacturing and selling spices, teas, and coffees, the grotto and waterfall are not directly related to Schilling's important contributions within that context. Instead, Schilling developed the grotto well after he retired from business and the faux-rock elements of the site are not significant for their association with Schilling's later life. (McMorris and Freeman 2019)

Based on results of the historic evaluation (McMorris and Freeman 2019), the Old La Honda Road Bridge is not eligible for listing on either the NRHP or CRHP, but the concrete bridge itself is listed in the Town of Woodside Resources of Historic and Cultural Significance Inventory (Town of Woodside 2012). Therefore, the Old La Honda Road Bridge is a historic resource pursuant to CEQA. The faux-rock grotto built after the original bridge was not determined to contribute to the local listing of the bridge. The decorative bridge rails visible from the roadway shall be maintained.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a, b and c. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5; or directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

As stated above, the Old La Honda Road Bridge was determined to be a historic resource pursuant to CEQA. No other historical or archaeological resources listed on or eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources, or that meet other criteria of significance under CEQA Section 15064.5, were identified within the proposed Project area.

The Old La Honda Road Bridge is a 1924 reinforced concrete T-beam bridge. The bridge on Old La Honda Road includes short concrete railings that flank the road and cylindrical pilaster at each corner. This is reflective of the style of bridges built in San Mateo County in the first few decades of the twentieth century.

The proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse change to known significant cultural resources. A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource means the physical demolition, destruction, or alteration of the resource or its setting. The proposed Project does not include demolition or destruction of the existing bridge. Portions of the concrete grotto features would be removed, but these elements have deteriorated substantially over time and are generally not visible from the roadway (Appendix B, Site Photos). The fauxrock waterfall immediately upstream of the bridge would remain. Alterations to the bridge include installing a culvert and headwalls and filling with lean concrete; the decorative concrete railings would remain. These alterations would not change the general integrity of materials, workmanship, design, location, setting, and feeling for this historic resource.

It is possible that previously unknown historical, and/or archaeological resources could be discovered during grading and excavation work associated with new construction. Potential impacts to previously undiscovered historic, and/or archaeological resources would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2. Impacts are considered *less than significant with mitigation*

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Conduct Worker Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT). Prior to any excavation or other substantial subsurface disturbance activities, any individuals conducting the work should be given a cultural resource awareness training session and advised to watch for cultural resource materials during construction activities. This training will cover both the identification of resources that may be encountered during construction and procedures to be followed in the event of a discovery. This training can be conducted concurrently with WEAT for sensitive biological resources (Mitigation Measure BIO-1).

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Protect Discovered Cultural Subsurface Resources. If any evidence of prehistoric cultural resources (freshwater shells, beads, bone tool remnants or an assortment of bones, soil changes including subsurface ash lens or soil darker in color than surrounding soil, lithic materials such as flakes, tools or grinding rocks, etc.) or historical cultural resources (adobe foundations or walls, structures and remains with square nails, refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often associated with wells or old privies) are observed during ground disturbing activities, all work must immediately cease within 50 feet of the find, the Town and Caltrans must be notified, and a qualified archaeologist must be consulted to assess the significance of the cultural materials. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with the Town and—if the find is prehistoric or Native American in nature—appropriate Native American group(s), shall develop and implement a treatment plan with an emphasis toward preservation in place.

d. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No human remains have been previously encountered in the vicinity of the proposed Project. However, this does not preclude the potential for discovering buried human remains during ground disturbance associated with construction of the proposed Project. In the event that human remains are discovered during proposed Project construction, Mitigation Measure CUL-3 shall be implemented. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3, potential impacts resulting from disturbance of human remains as a result of the proposed Project would be considered *less than significant with incorporated mitigation*.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Procedures for Human Remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, and the Public Resources Code 5097.98, regarding the discovery of human remains, if human remains are discovered during construction, all work must immediately cease, and the San Mateo County coroner must be contacted. If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, the Coroner shall contact

the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and subsequent procedures shall be followed, according to State Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9 to 5097.99, regarding notification of the Native American Most Likely Descendant.

3.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
6. Energy				
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			\square	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				\square

Environmental Setting

The proposed Project is a bridge replacement project. Energy would be consumed during the construction phase in the form of diesel or gasoline fuel consumption for construction equipment and vehicles. No changes to operational energy consumption would occur.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

During construction, the proposed Project would require the use of construction vehicles to deliver construction personnel and materials to the site, install the culvert, and pump lean concrete. Construction will be temporary in nature and will follow typical processes. Construction vehicles will be maintained and it is reasonable to assume that construction contractors will avoid wasteful or unnecessary fuel consumption to reduce construction costs and wastes. Therefore, the proposed Project would not involve the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during construction. This impact would be considered *less than significant* to construction conditions.

During project operation, the proposed Project would retain its existing use as a transportation facility and would not include any changes to the roadway profile. Therefore, the proposed Project is not expected to cause any operational change in the number of vehicle miles traveled and would not lead to inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. There would be *no impact* to operational conditions.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

The proposed Project is a transportation project and does not include any energy-consuming features. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
7. Geology and Soils				
Would the project:				
 a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 				
 Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines & Geology Special Publication 42. 				\boxtimes
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				\square
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				\square
iv) Landslides?				\square
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\square	
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, liquefaction, or collapse?				\boxtimes
 d) Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? 				\boxtimes
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				\boxtimes
 f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? 		\boxtimes		

Two soil map units, Alambique-McGarvey complex, 30 to 75 percent slopes and Botella-Urban land complex, 0 to 5 percent slopes are present within the Project area (National Resources Conservation Services [NRCS] 2019). The proposed Project area is located in the Town of Woodside, San Mateo County, CA, within the physiographic unit referred to as the Coast Ranges Geomorphic Province, approximately 9.5 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. This province is subparallel to the active San Andreas Fault and extends from Point Arena to the Gulf of California. This province is bounded by the Klamath Mountains to the north, Great Valley to the east, Transverse Ranges to the south and Pacific Coast to the west (CDOC 2002)

According to the online Fault Activity Map (DOC 2010) issued in compliance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the *Palo Alto* USGS 7.5 minute quadrangle, including the Project area, is located within an Alquisto-Priolo Earthquake fault zone. The San Andreas Fault is subparallel approximately 1 mile east of the Project area.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a, i-iv. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides?

The Project area does not cross any known earthquake fault lines but is within an active fault zone (California DOC 2010). The San Andreas Fault is approximately 1/3 mile east of the Project area.

The Project area lies within an active liquefaction zone (California DOC 2019). Liquefaction is a specialized form of ground failure caused by earthquake ground motion. It is a "quicksand" condition occurring in water-saturated, unconsolidated, relatively clay-free sands and silts caused by hydraulic pressure (from ground motion) forcing apart soil particles and forcing them into quicksand-like liquid suspension. Since the Project area consists of well drained loam and clay-loam soils, they are not considered highly susceptible to liquefaction.

The Project area is within a fault zone area, however, the Project would not expose people or structures to additional risk associated with seismic activity or liquefaction. The Project would have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Soils in the Project area have a moderate erosion potential (NRCS 2019). Construction of the proposed Project would involve minor site grading and earthmoving activities, which would expose soils at the site and could result in soil erosion. However, the area of disturbance for the culvert replacement is small (0.004 acre). Soil erosion and topsoil loss would be limited by implementing standard construction practices and BMPs for erosion and sediment control, consistent with the Woodside General Plan Policy CV1.3 (Town of Woodside 2012) and through

implementation of BIO-3 Stabilize Temporarily Disturbed Areas. Because erosion control and stormwater pollution prevention measures would be implemented, the proposed Project has limited potential to result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. This impact would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c. Would the project 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, liquefaction, or collapse?

The proposed Project area is located within an active fault zone and active liquefaction zone. The Project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the proposed Project. The proposed Project is committed to implementing all recommended standard practices and standard engineering practices to minimize the risk of liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. The proposed Project would have *no impact.*

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d. Would the project be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Soils in the proposed Project area are classified by the NRCS as well drained loam and clay loam (NRCS 2019). Expansive soils are typically clay soils that are prone to large volume changes related to changes in water content; soils in the proposed Project area are not considered expansive and would not create substantial risks to life and property. The Project would have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

e. Would the proposed project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the Project. There would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

f. Would the proposed project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Paleontological sensitivity of the site is tied to the underlying geologic unit. Fossils are typically found in sedimentary rocks, which are formed by the deposition of sediment on the earth's surface. This site is underlain by Ecocene marine rock, a sedimentary rock formed during the Paleocene to Oligocene geologic periods. Since sedimentary rock is present within the Project area, paleontological resources could be unearthed during construction. Potential direct and

indirect impacts would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1. The Project would have *less than significant impact with mitigation*.

Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Protect Discovered Paleontological Resources. If any evidence of paleontological resources is inadvertently unearthed during construction, all work will cease within 50-feet of the discovery, the county and the Town of Woodside will be notified, and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the resources and recommend appropriate conservation measures.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
8.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
W	ould the project:				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment?			\boxtimes	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				\square

Environmental Setting

The proposed Project area is within the jurisdiction of the BAAQMD. Existing land uses in the proposed Project area and vicinity generally consist of residential uses. Nearby sensitive receptors include neighboring residences.

CEQA requires that lead agencies consider the reasonably foreseeable adverse environmental effects of projects they are considering for approval. Greenhouse gases (GHGs) have the potential to adversely affect the environment because such emissions contribute, on a cumulative basis, to global climate change. In turn, global climate change has the potential to result in rising sea levels, which can inundate low-lying areas; reduce snowpack, leading to less overall water storage in the Sierra Nevada; affect rainfall, leading to changes in water supply, increased frequency and severity of droughts, and increased wildfire risk; and affect habitat and agricultural land, leading to adverse effects on biological and agricultural resources. The State of California has not identified quantitative thresholds of significance for GHGs. However, the BAAQMD has identified recommended GHG thresholds of significance to be used for the analysis of project-related impacts. For land use development projects, the BAAQMD's recommended GHG threshold is 1,100 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year (MTCO_{2e/year}) (BAAQMD 2017). For stationary-source projects, the recommended threshold is 10,000 MTCO_{2e/year}. The threshold is the point at which a project would be deemed to have a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment?

Installation of the culvert in the Project area would not result in long-term increases in vehicle trips in the area. Construction activities associated with the proposed Project include a small amount of grading, culvert installation, and pumping of the lean concrete slurry. Due to the relatively minimal nature of construction activities, the short-term construction-generated GHG emissions would not generate GHG in exceedance of BAAQMD's GHG threshold. Therefore, this impact would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The BAAQMD does not have an adopted recommended GHG threshold for construction-related GHG emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD recommends that a lead agency attempt to quantify and disclose GHG emissions that would occur during construction and make a determination on the significance of construction-generated GHG emission impacts in relation to meeting AB 32 GHG reduction goals. The Project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
			\square
			\square
	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Less-Than-Significant with Significant Mitigation Impact Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Less-Than- Significant Impact Impact Impact Impact Impact Impact Impact Impact Impact

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment?				\square
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				\square
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?			\boxtimes	

Within the Project area, no recognized environmental conditions (RECs) are present. A REC is the presence or likely presence of hazardous substances or petroleum substances in or on a property. According to the results of two database searches (Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC] EnviroStor and the RWQCB GeoTracker), the Project area is not located on or adjacent to a hazardous material site (SWRCB 2019, DTSC 2019). The nearest hazardous material site is a Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup site located 3100 feet away on a private residence. The case was closed in 1999 when a letter of No Further Action was granted. The potential contaminant of concern was diesel fuel and the potential media of concern was soil. Due to the cleanup case closure, this site is not considered to be a REC.

The closest school to the Project area is Woodside Elementary School, located approximately 2.20 miles north of the Project area. The closest airport is the Palo Alto Airport, located approximately 8.5 miles east of the Project area.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a through f. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; 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; emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¹/₄ mile of an existing or proposed school; be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment; be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within

two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The proposed Project is not expected to involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; there is no reasonably foreseeable accident involving the release of hazardous materials; and the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials. There are no schools located with ¹/₄ mile or airports located with 2 miles. The Project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. No ground disturbance would occur in the area where an existing septic system is located. Therefore, there would be *no impacts*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

g. Would the project 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?

The proposed Project area is designated by the Town of Woodside and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) as a Very High Severity Fire Hazard Zone. The Project area is adjacent to land where residences are intermixed with wildlands. The Woodside Fire Protection District is capable of dispatching fire suppression resources to the Project area. Temporary traffic delays may occur during construction which could result in reduced response times for emergency responders; however road access will be available during construction as one lane will remain open with flagger controls in place during construction, and when construction operations are inactive (nights, weekends and holidays), two lanes will be required to remain open. Traffic control systems will comply with state standards. Therefore, the impacts would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
10. Hydrology and Water Quality				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			\boxtimes	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially 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 which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			\ge	
 substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; 			\boxtimes	
 iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or 				\boxtimes
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?				\square
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				\square
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				\square

The proposed Project is in the San Francisquito Creek Watershed. During rain events, water flows from uplands in the surrounding hills, through the Project area in an unnamed ephemeral stream, and then to Dennis Martin Creek. Dennis Martin Creek empties into Sausal Creek approximately 0.2 miles downstream of the Study Area before reaching Searsville Reservoir, a reservoir used by Stanford University to irrigate its campus. Searsville Reservoir empties into San Francisquito Creek and continues approximately 11.5 miles before draining into the San Francisco Bay.

The Project will be constructed outside the boundary of the 100-year floodplain, as indicated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (Figure 6). The boundary of a 100-year floodplain is used to demarcate flood hazards and indicates the geographic area having a one percent chance of being flooded in any given year.

As described in the Biological Resources section, an aquatic resources delineation study was completed for the proposed Project to determine potential waters of the U.S. under the jurisdiction of the Corps pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA. The aquatic resources delineation for the Project area identified a total of 0.191 acre of aquatic resources, comprised of ephemeral drainage and intermittent stream (Figure 4), which conveys water underneath the existing bridge.



Figure 6. FEMA Floodplain Map

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

The proposed Project includes minor ground disturbance that will expose soil and could result in accelerated erosion, which could affect water quality in downstream water bodies by increasing turbidity and/or sedimentation. The proposed Project could also result in the degradation of water quality from runoff of petroleum-based products associated with equipment and vehicles used during construction. Implementation of standard erosion and sediment control practices, as required by the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (C/CAG 2019) and Town policies, would minimize these potential impacts and ensure that the proposed Project does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. These BMPs prevent discharge from the site of soil or construction wastes or debris, including contaminants from construction materials, tools, and equipment. Standard BMPs may include, but are not limited to, installing sediment fencing, fiber rolls, or other erosion and sediment control measures between the designated work area and aquatic features; stabilizing all exposed soil prior to potential precipitation events; and using vehicle tracking control. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

The proposed Project would result in a negligible expansion in the amount of impervious surfaces in the proposed Project area from the new headwalls. The proposed Project is not expected to interfere with groundwater recharge in the Project area. Construction-related excavation of approximately 1-2 feet is not expected to occur to a depth that would encounter groundwater. Therefore, the proposed Project would have *no impact* on groundwater resources.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows?

The proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner that would result in erosion, siltation, or flooding on- or off-site. The proposed Project would maintain the existing drainage pattern and provide additional project features (i.e. rip-rap) to prevent erosion or siltation. The negligible expansion of impervious surfaces will not increase the rate or volume of surface water. The proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff

water that would exceed the capacity of stormwater drainage systems, provide additional sources of polluted runoff, or impede or redirect flood flows.

For these reasons, the potential impacts of the proposed Project resulting from altered drainage patterns, and the capacity of existing storm water drainage facilities would be considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

The proposed Project is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area (Figure 6). No project activities would occur within a federally designated 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed Project does not include any features that would release pollutants or expose people and property to flooding in the event of inundation. Therefore, the Project will have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

e. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

The proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. The proposed Project will have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
11. Land Use and Planning				
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				\square
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				

Environmental Setting

The proposed Project is located within the Town of Woodside, San Mateo County, and is governed by the Town of Woodside General Plan (2012) and Woodside Municipal Code (2018). The Project area is zoned as Special Conservation Planning (SCP) 7.5 acres and SCP 10 acres

and Land Use Designation for the Project area is Rural Residential/Environmentally Sensitive Area. The purpose of the SCP Districts is to provide low human densities for land containing problem areas such as steep hillsides, geological hazards, difficult road access, and soil or water problems (Woodside Municipal Code 2018).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a and b. Would the project physically divide an established community; conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. The proposed Project is consistent with applicable General Plan and Zoning policies and would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The Project is consistent with the Town of Woodside General Plan goal to preserve and enhance Woodside as a scenic, rural residential community while accommodating safer vehicular travel and pedestrian access. For these reasons, there would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

Less-Than-Significant Potentially with Less-Than-Significant Mitigation Significant No Impact Incorporation Impact Impact 12. Mineral Resources Would the project: a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral \times resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local |X|general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

3.12 Mineral Resources

Environmental Setting

Mineral resources in San Mateo County consist of aggregate materials include sand, gravel and crushed stone. The proposed Project area is located within Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 4, which includes areas where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other MRZ zone, as described by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act Mineral Land Classification Report. No important mineral resources are known from the proposed Project area. (California DOC, Division of Mines and Geology 1996).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a and b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State; or 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?

There are no known mineral resources associated with the proposed Project area. There would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
13. Noise				
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			\square	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

Environmental Setting

The most significant noise sources throughout the Town are the major highways and roadways, including Interstate 280, Highway 84 (Woodside Road), Cañada Road, Portola Road, Whiskey Hill Road, and Sand Hill Road (Town of Woodside 2012). The proposed Project is located approximately 400 feet from Portola Road, but in an area with a quiet, rural ambiance. Nearby sensitive receptors include neighboring residences, the closest of which is approximately 100 feet from the proposed Project.

Table 2 below, which is derived from Table N3 of the Noise Element of the Town of Woodside General Plan, identifies Maximum Ambient Noise Levels by Use. Noise generated by normal construction equipment for authorized construction projects is considered to be adhering to Town noise policy as long as it does not violate the Woodside Municipal Code. (Town of Woodside 2012)

Use	Noise Level (Exterior)	Noise Level (Interior)
Residential	55	40
Commercial	60	45
Open Space	55	N/A

 Table 2. Maximum Ambient Noise Levels (L_{dn}) by Use

The Woodside Municipal Code regulates construction hours and provides BMPs with regard to noise abatement that must be followed. Construction hours are between 7:30 am and 5:30 pm Monday through Friday, and 8:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturday (Town of Woodside §151.55). The Woodside Municipal Code also prohibits construction operations on many holidays. BMPs with regard to noise include, but are not limited to, ensuring construction equipment is well muffled and maintained, prohibiting unnecessary idling, and locating all stationary noise-generating equipment as far from noise-sensitive receptors as possible. Noise complaints are directed to and handled by the San Mateo Sherriff's Office. (Town of Woodside 2012)

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a and b. Would the Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

The proposed Project would not result in long-term changes in vehicle traffic, noise, or groundborne vibration compared to existing conditions along Old La Honda Road. Therefore, noise generated by the proposed Project would be limited to short-term construction activities.

Noise associated with short-term construction activities typically occurs intermittently and varies depending upon the nature or phase of construction (e.g., tree removal, grading, excavation, and concrete pumping). Noise generated by construction equipment, including earth movers and material handling equipment, can reach high levels, but diminishes in volume with distance. Typical noise levels for construction equipment are summarized in Table 3.

Type of Equipment	Typical Noise Level at 50 feet (dBA L _{max})				
Air Compressor	80				
Backhoe	80				
Concrete Mixer	85				
Concrete Pump	82				
Concrete Vibrator	76				
Crane, Mobile	83				
Saw	76				
Truck	84				
Sources: Federal Transit Administration	on. 2018. Road Construction Noise Model.				

 Table 3. Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels

Housing density in the Project area is low, meaning that due to the distance between the proposed Project and nearby residences, the intensity of construction noise would be diminished

before reaching neighboring residences. Similarly, any ground vibration resulting from construction equipment is expected to be diminished to imperceptible levels before reaching neighboring residences.

Construction will be completed under the Town's noise ordinance, unless conditions warrant that certain construction activities occur during evening or early morning hours (e.g., extreme heat). Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing in or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The proposed Project is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport or in the vicinity or a private air strip. However, the Town is within the Airport Influence Area A boundary for the San Francisco International Airport (C/CAG 2012) and the Town is an active participant in the San Francisco Airport/Community Roundtable (Town of Woodside 2012). The Airport Influence Area A boundary identifies areas that are overflown by aircraft to and from San Francisco International Airport at least once per week at altitudes of 10,000 feet or less (C/CAG 2012). However, based on 2011 data, the project vicinity is subject to some of the lowest number of overflights in the Airport Influence Area A (C/CAG 2012; Appendix L). The proposed Project area is generally not subject to high levels of aircraft noise and would not result in a safety hazard for individuals or construction workers located in the proposed Project area. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
14. Population and Housing				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area either directly (<i>e.g.</i> , by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (<i>e.g.</i> , through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				\boxtimes
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

3.14 Population and Housing

The Land Use Designation for the proposed Project is Rural Residential/Environmentally Sensitive Area. See the Land Use and Planning Section for more information. The Town of Woodside had a population of 5,439 in 2008 with a growth rate of 1.6% between 2000 and 2008. By the 2010 census, the population had declined to 5,287. The number of households in Woodside was 1,978 in 2008 and experienced a 1.4% increase between 2000 and 2008 (Town of Woodside 2012).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The Project would not induce population growth in the area. There will be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The proposed Project would not require the displacement of existing housing or the construction of replacement housing. There would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.15 Public Services

Pote Signi Imp	Less-Than- Significant ntially with ficant Mitigation pact Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--------------

15. Public Services

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

Fire protection?		\bowtie	
Police protection?		\boxtimes	
Schools?			\square
Parks?			\square

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Other public facilities?				\square

In the proposed Project area, fire protection and emergency paramedic response services are provided by the Woodside Fire Protection District. Police services are provided by the San Mateo County Sheriff's Department. In the proposed Project area, public education is provided by Portola Valley School District, with Woodside, Cabrillo, Las Lomitas, and Redwood City School District within the vicinity. The only school located within Town limits is the Woodside Elementary School. Public school students located in Woodside attend the Woodside High School located in an unincorporated area. The town hall, post office and library are located on Woodside Road in the Town Center Area. (Town of Woodside 2012, Town of Woodside 2019).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, 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 fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

The proposed Project would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities. Temporary traffic delays may occur during construction which could result in reduced response times for emergency responders; however road access will be available during construction as one lane will remain open with flagger controls in place during construction, and when construction operations are inactive (nights, weekends and holidays), two lanes will be required to remain open. Traffic control systems will comply with state standards. Therefore, the Project would have a *less than significant* impact on emergency response providers.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
16. Recreation				
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				\boxtimes
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				\boxtimes

Environmental Setting

Thornewood Open Space Preserve, consisting of 167-acres is located adjacent to Old La Honda Road, off La Honda Road, approximately 0.10 mile from the Project area. This Open Space Preserve provides opportunities for hiking and horseback riding. Bridle Trail and Schilling Lake Trail can be accessed via Old La Honda Road; Schilling Lake can be accessed via Schilling Lake Trail.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a and b. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The proposed Project would not increase the use of any recreational facilities and does not include recreational facilities. Temporary delays in accessing Bridle Trail which leads to Thornewood Open Space Preserve, may occur during construction. However, no road closures would occur during construction and the Project would not otherwise affect access to and use of the Thornewood Open Space Preserve and nearby recreation resources. Therefore, the Project would have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
17. Transportation				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			\square	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			\boxtimes	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				\square
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				

Environmental Setting

The Project area is accessed via Old La Honda Road, a windy and generally north-south collector that extends from Portola Road south to Highway 35 (Skyline Boulevard) and then continues south from Highway 35 to Highway 84 (La Honda Road). Old La Honda Road is a narrow two-lane road (one lane in each direction), but without a defined centerline due to insufficient roadway width. The pavement condition is fair to good and Old La Honda Road is designated as a Class III bikeway, a designated bike route where bicycles share the roadway with vehicle traffic.

The operational performance of the Town's roadway system is expressed in the General Plan using roadway daily capacity and average daily traffic (ADT) (Town of Woodside 2012). ADT on Old La Honda Road is 120. Roads in the Town planning area indicate that most roads are being utilized far below their traffic capacity. Traffic operations in the Town are within acceptable standards and land uses in the Town are generally built out, so large future increases in traffic volume are not expected.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a and b. Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; or conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

The proposed Project does not conflict with the Circulation Element of the Town General Plan or any other applicable plan, ordinance, or policy. The bridge repair is not expected to increase nor reduce the number of vehicle trips in the Project area. Similarly, construction activities would be expected to result in a negligible temporary increase in vehicle trips to the Project area by construction personnel. The proposed Project is consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3(b) in that transportation projects that reduce or have no impact on vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. This impact is considered *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The purpose of the proposed Project is to remove a potentially hazardous feature, a "Structurally Deficient" bridge. The proposed Project is located on a relatively straight portion of an otherwise narrow and winding road. The proposed Project would have *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

The proposed Project has been designed to meet the access requirements of public safety and to be consistent with public safety codes. All emergency, transit agencies, and local residents will be notified of the construction work and the contractor will maintain a minimum of one lane of traffic open at all times with flagger controls in place. Therefore, the proposed Project is not expected to result in inadequate emergency access for the Project area. The proposed Project would have a *less than significant impact* on emergency access.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
18. Tribal Cultural Resources				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, 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:				
 i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 		\boxtimes		

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
ii)	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted on November 1, 2018, to request a search of the Sacred Lands file and a list of interested Native American individuals and parties in San Mateo County. The NAHC replied on November 5, 2018, and reported that no recorded Sacred Land was within or adjacent to the project. The NAHC also provided a list of Native American contacts. Assembly Bill 52 letters were sent by the Town of Woodside, on January 23, 2019, in compliance with CEQA requirements for tribal consultation. No response to the letters was received. The Native American Tribes were re-contacted via email on February 12, 2019. Chairperson Valentin Lopez of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band (Galt, CA) replied that the project area was outside of their traditional tribal territory, and he had no comments. Mr. Edward Ketchum, Historian, Amah Mutsun Tribal Band (Davis, CA) replied that he was unaware of any cultural resources at the project site. Mr. Andrew Galvan of the Ohlone Indian Tribe replied, asking if a literature search and pedestrian survey had been done for the project. AWE archaeologist Mary Bailey replied that a record search had been done through the NWIC with no recorded resources onsite or within a ¹/₄-mile radius, and that an intensive pedestrian survey had been conducted. Mr. Galvan also requested a copy of the report once it was completed. A copy of the archaeological study report would be sent to him upon completion of a final report. No other replies to the email re-contacts were received.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a, i and ii. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, 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 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 a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

No tribal cultural resources were located during the background search, survey and through outreach with Native American representatives. However, it is possible that previously unknown tribal cultural resources could be discovered during grading and excavation work. Potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be avoided through implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3, described in the Cultural Resources Section. Potential impacts to tribal cultural resources are considered *less than significant with mitigation*.

Mitigation Measures: Implement Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
19. Utilities and Service Systems				
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the constriction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			\boxtimes	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?				\square
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?				
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			\boxtimes	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			\square	

Environmental Setting

The Town of Woodside, including the Project area has historically utilized private on-site septic systems. Woodside has a limited ability to provide public sewer systems; few parts of Woodside have access to public sewer systems, including the Redwood Creek Trunk Assessment District and the Town Center Sewer Assessment District. The Project area does not have access to a public sewer system and relies on private on-site septic systems. Domestic water service to the Town of Woodside, including the Project area, is provided by the California Water Service and City of Redwood whom purchases their water from the Hetch Hetchy regional water system. Solid waste management services are provided by GreenWaste Recovery. Gas and electric

services are supplied by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). Landline telecommunications services in the proposed Project area are provided by AT&T; cellular services are primarily provided by AT&T and Verizon. (Town of Woodside 2012).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the constriction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The Project would not require the construction of any new utilities nor would it require water or wastewater services. The Project may require the relocation of California Water Service facilities, though this impact would be temporary. Therefore, the impact would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b, c. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years; result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?

The Project would not require water or wastewater services. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d, e. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Construction activities would generate solid waste that may require off-site disposal. Solid waste would be disposed of at a permitted facility. All solid waste generated during construction of the proposed Project would be collected by the contractor and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations. The proposed Project will only generate a small amount of solid waste; therefore, operational and construction-related impacts on solid waste services will be *less than significant*.

3.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
20. Wildfire				
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high hazard severity zones, would the project:				
 a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? 			\boxtimes	
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire of the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				\square
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				
 d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? 			\square	

Environmental Setting

The Town of Woodside is served by the Woodside Fire Protection District and CalFire. The majority of the Town is part of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) area, which includes heavily wooded areas and a large fuel load; these characteristics make the Town susceptible to wildfire. In 2003, in response to the 2002 Albion Fire, the Town put together a Fire Management Plan which outlines fourteen topics including maintenance of private property, maintenance of Town-owned properties and right of ways, evacuation plans, etc. In response to the 2003 Fire Management Plan, the Town of Woodside designated high fire hazard areas; the proposed Project is within a Very High Severity Fire Hazard Zone. CalFire also designated the Project area as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CalFire 2007). The Chipper Program was also established after being recommended in the Fire Management Plan to reduce fuel loads and decrease the threat from wildfires. (Town of Woodside 2012).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed Project will not impair the adopted emergency response plan and will comply with the existing 2003 Fire Management Plan. Temporary traffic delays may occur during construction which could result in reduced response times for emergency responders; however road access will be available during construction as one lane will remain open with flagger controls in place during construction. Therefore, impacts will be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

The proposed Project will not expose residents to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire for any reason. Therefore, there would be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

The proposed Project involves the replacement of a culvert to allow for safer vehicular travel and pedestrian use and does not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure. Therefore, there will be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

The proposed Project will not expose people or structures to significant risks. As mentioned above, the Project involves` the replacement of a culvert, which will allow for safer vehicular travel and pedestrian use. Therefore, there will be *no impact*.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance				
Would the project:				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-Than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less-Than- Significant Impact	No Impact
	the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
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)			\boxtimes	
c)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			\boxtimes	

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?

As described previously in this IS/MND, implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Biological Resources section would ensure that proposed Project implementation would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals. Furthermore, mitigation measures identified in the Cultural Resources section would ensure that the proposed Project would not significantly affect previously undiscovered resources or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Given the existing conditions of the Project area, the fact that potential impacts to biological and cultural resources would primarily occur during construction, and that measures have been identified to reduce these temporary impacts, the overall potential of the proposed Project to degrade the environment is considered *less than significant with mitigation*.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

Section 15064(h)(1) of CEQA Guidelines states that the lead agency shall consider whether the cumulative impact is significant and the incremental effects of the project are cumulatively considerable. The lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution would be less-than-cumulatively considerable when one or more of the following occur: 1) the contribution would be rendered less-than-cumulatively considerable through implementation of

mitigation measures; 2) the project would comply with the requirements of a previously approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's cumulative effects; and/or 3) the project's incremental effects would be so small that the environmental conditions would be essentially the same regardless of whether the project is implemented.

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the proposed Project include the Portola Road Bridge Replacement Project, approximately 0.75 miles northwest of the proposed Project. Potential impacts associated with the proposed Project are primarily short-term (construction-related), and shall be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Long-term incremental effects of the proposed Project are so small that local environmental conditions (e.g., traffic, noise, air quality) would be essentially the same regardless of whether the project is implemented. The Portola Road Bridge Replacement Project will be subject to the same laws and regulations as the proposed Project and is expected to have similarly small effects. Therefore, the proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative conditions would be less-than-cumulatively considerable. The Project would have *less than significant* cumulative impact.

c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potential adverse effects to human beings could occur as a result of construction activities. Potential impacts would include temporary increases in noise. These impacts would be short-term, and would cease upon completion of the construction process. Potential adverse effects on human beings as a result of the proposed Project are considered *less than significant*.

The Public Review Draft IS/MND for the proposed Project was prepared by Area West Environmental, Inc. in cooperation with the Town of Woodside. The following individuals contributed to this IS/MND.

Town of Woodside

Sean Rose, Town Engineer/Director of Public Works

Sindhi Mekala, Senior Engineer

Jackie Young, Planning Director

Area West Environmental, Inc.

Aimee Dour-Smith, Senior Environmental Planner

Chrissy Russo, Environmental Planner/GIS Specialist

Cory Brinkman, Environmental Planner

JMEC Engineering

Esmond Chan, Professional Engineer

- Allaback M. and Mahony, T. 2013. Natural Environment Study Portola Road Culvert Repair Project, Woodside, San Mateo County, California.
- Area West Environmental, Inc. 2019. Wetland Delineation Report for the Old La Honda Road Bridge Replacement Project.
- Bailey, M. 2019. Archaeological Survey Report for the Old La Honda Bridge Replacement Project – Bridge Number 35C0190. July.
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2017. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines. Accessed February 2019. Available online: http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/air-quality-plans/current-plans>.
- C/CAG. See City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County.
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 1996. Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region. Accessed June 3, 2019. Available: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/mlc/
- .2002. California Geological Survey, California Geomorphic Provinces. Accessed May 2019. Available online: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Note_36.pdf>.
- .2010. Fault Activity Map of California. Accessed May 2019. Available online: ">http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/.
 - ___.2019. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Accessed May 2019. Available online: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp.
- California Department of Transportation. 2019. California's Scenic Highway Mapping System Accessed April 2019. Available online: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/.
- CalFire. 2007. San Mateo County Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA. Accessed: June 2019. Available online: http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_mateo/fhszs_map.41.pdf>.
- City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. 2019. San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program. Accessed June 2019. Available online: https://www.flowstobay.org/>.
 - ____. 2012. Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport. Redwood City, California. Accessed June 2019. Available online: http://ccag.ca.gov/plansreportslibrary/airport-land-use/>.

- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter V., F.C. Golet, E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Report No. FWS/OBS/-79/31.Washington, D.C.
- Department of Toxic Substance Control. 2019. EnviroStor. Accessed June 2019. Available online: ">https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.
- Federal Transit Administration. 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. FTA Report No. 0123. Accessed June 2019. Available online: https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/environmental-programs/noise-and-vibration>.
- Mayer, K. and W. Laudenslayer. 1988. A Guide to Wildlife Habitats of California. State of California Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento. 166pp.
- McMorris, C. and J. Freeman. 2019. Historic Resources Evaluation Report Old La Honda Road Bridge Replacement Project, San Mateo County, California. July.

Natural Resources Conservation Service. Web soil survey for Project Site. Accessed May 2019.

- State Water Resources Control Board. 2019. GeoTracker. Accessed June 2019. Available online: ">http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.
- Town of Woodside. 2012. General Plan. Accessed May 2019. Available online: https://www.woodsidetown.org/planning/general-plan-2012-0>.
- . 2018. Woodside Municipal Code. Accessed May 2019. Available: https://library.municode.com/ca/woodside/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=WOCAMUC O>.
- _____. 2019. Accessed May 2019. Available online: <https://www.woodsidetown.org/>.
Appendix A. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Introduction

This mitigation monitoring and reporting program summarizes identified mitigation measures, implementation schedule, and responsible parties for the Old La Honda Road Bridge Replacement Project (Project). The Town of Woodside (Town) will use this mitigation monitoring and reporting program to ensure that identified mitigation measures, adopted as a condition of project approval, are implemented appropriately. This monitoring program meets the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 14074(d), which mandates preparation of monitoring provisions for the implementation of mitigation assigned as part of project approval or adoption.

Mitigation Implementation and Monitoring

The Town will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures designed to minimize impacts associated with the proposed Project. While the Town has ultimate responsibility for ensuring implementation, others may be assigned the responsibility of actually implementing the mitigation. The Town will retain the primary responsibility for ensuring that the proposed Project meets the requirements of this mitigation plan and other permit conditions imposed by participating regulatory agencies.

The Town will designate specific personnel who will be responsible for monitoring implementation of the mitigation that will occur during Project construction. The designated personnel will be responsible for submitting documentation and reports to the Town on a schedule consistent with the mitigation measures and in a manner necessary for demonstrating compliance with mitigation requirements. The Town will ensure that the designated personnel have authority to require implementation of mitigation requirements and will be capable of terminating project construction activities found to be inconsistent with mitigation objectives or project approval conditions.

The Town and its appointed contractor will also be responsible for ensuring that its construction personnel understand their responsibilities for adhering to the performance requirements of the mitigation plan and other contractual requirements related to the implementation of mitigation as part of Project construction. In addition to the prescribed mitigation measures, the following table lists each environmental resource area being affected, the party responsible for ensuring implementation of the mitigation measure, and the corresponding monitoring and reporting requirement.

Mitigation Enforcement

The Town will be responsible for enforcing mitigation measures. If alternative measures are identified that would be equally effective in mitigating the identified impacts, implementation of these alternative measures will not occur until agreed upon by the Town.

	Final Mitigation Monit	oring and Reporting l	Program	
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity
Biological Resources	<i>Mitigation Measure BIO-1</i> : Conduct Worker Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT) Before any work occurs in the proposed Project area, including grading and equipment staging, all construction personnel shall participate in an environmental awareness training regarding special-status species and sensitive habitats present in the proposed Project limits. If new construction personnel are added to the proposed Project, they must receive the mandatory training before starting work. As part of the training, an environmental awareness handout will be provided to all personnel that describes and illustrates sensitive resources (i.e., waters of the U.S. and state, special-status species and habitat [including California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake], nesting birds/raptors) to be avoided during proposed Project construction and lists applicable permit conditions identified by state and federal agencies to protect these resources.	Contractor	Prior to construction	Contractor will submit WEAT sign- in sheets to the Town. The Town will confirm completion of WEAT at the onset of construction activities.
	<i>Mitigation Measure BIO-2</i> : Install Temporary Fencing around Environmentally Sensitive Habitat The Town shall ensure that temporary wildlife exclusion fencing is installed between the work area and environmentally sensitive habitat areas, before any ground-disturbing activity occurs within the Project footprint, as appropriate. The exclusion fence shall be buried a minimum of 4 inches below the surface, shall be a minimum of 4 feet tall, and shall include one-way exits to avoid entrapment of wildlife. Construction personnel and construction activity shall remain within the defined project boundary and avoid areas identified as environmentally sensitive by the fencing. The fencing shall be checked regularly and maintained until all	Contractor to install fencing, in coordination with Qualified Biologist	Prior to construction	Town representative will check fencing/flagging regularly. Maintenance and repairs will be completed by Contractor.

	Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity	
	construction is complete. No construction activity shall be allowed until this condition is satisfied.				
	<i>Mitigation Measure BIO-3:</i> Stabilize Temporarily Disturbed Areas All temporarily disturbed areas shall be stabilized upon completion of construction. These areas will be properly protected from washout and erosion using appropriate erosion control devices including coir netting, hydroseeding, and revegetation.	Contractor	Following completion of construction.	The Town will inspect post-Project conditions to ensure temporarily disturbed areas have been stabilized.	
	<i>Mitigation Measure BIO-4:</i> Conduct a Preconstruction Survey for Special-status Amphibians and Reptiles A USFWS-approved biologist shall conduct a preconstruction clearance survey for special-status amphibians and reptiles with potential to occur in the vicinity of the Project (California giant salamander, California red-legged frog, Santa Cruz black salamander, and San Francisco garter snake) within 24 hours prior to any ground disturbance. The qualifications of the biologist(s) will be submitted to the USFWS for review and written approval at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the date earthmoving is initiated at the Project site. This survey will consist of walking surveys of the Project footprint and BSA, where accessible. The qualified biologist will investigate all potential cover sites for special status amphibians. This includes an adequate examination of mammal burrows, such as California ground squirrels or gophers. If any of these species are found within the construction work area, the biologist will contact CDFW and/or USFWS, as appropriate, and the species shall be allowed to voluntarily move outside of the work area on its own.	Qualified Biologist	Prior to construction	The Town will submit results of preconstruction surveys to Caltrans and applicable permitting agencies.	

	Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity	
	<i>Mitigation Measure BIO-5:</i> Avoid Peak Dispersal Period for Special-status Amphibians No construction-related activities shall occur between November 1 and March 31 to avoid wet, rainy, or humid periods when special-status amphibians, such as California red-legged frog, are most likely to travel between upland and aquatic habitats. To the maximum extent practicable, no construction activities will occur during rain events or within 24-hours following a rain event. A rain event is defined as ½-inch of rain in a 24-hour period. If ground disturbing work must occur during this period, CDFW and USFWS shall be contacted for guidance.	Contractor	During construction	Contractor will report to the Town instances of wildlife species observed in the Project area and provide a description of how disturbance and harm was avoided.	
	 Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Conduct a Preconstruction Mammal Survey The following measures shall be implemented to minimize or avoid potential impacts to special-status mammal species: A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (SSC) and active special-status mammal nests or dens within the Study Area. For surveys in inaccessible areas, the surveying biologist shall use binoculars to scan any suitable denning substrate for potential individuals or nests/dens. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days before the initiation of construction activities. If an active special-status mammal nest/den is identified within the Study Area, a no-disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest/den to avoid disturbance of the nesting/denning mammal until a qualified biologist 	Qualified Biologist	Prior to construction	The Town will submit results of preconstruction surveys to Caltrans and permit agencies. Town will coordinate with CDFW on appropriate buffers if nesting /denning mammals are located during surveys.	

	Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity	
	 determines that the young have dispersed. The extent of these buffers shall be determined by the biologist in coordination with CDFW and the Town and shall depend on the species identified, level of noise or construction disturbance, line-of-sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. In addition to the establishment of buffers, other avoidance measures (determined during agency coordination) may be implemented. If any non-denning species are observed in the Study Area, the species will be allowed to move out of harm's way on its own. If needed, a qualified biologist will move the species to the nearest area of suitable habitat outside of the Project area. If applicable, depending on the location and status of the species is moved. If no active nests/dens are found during the preconstruction surveys, then no additional mitigation is required. 				

	Final Mitigation Monito	oring and Reporting I	Program	
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity
	<i>Mitigation Measure BIO-7:</i> Conduct a Preconstruction Survey for Bats. During April–September before construction begins, a qualified biologist will survey trees and within the proposed Project area and identify any rock crevices, snags, hollow trees, or other refuge with cavities that may provide suitable roosting habitat for bats. If no suitable roosting sites are found, construction may proceed. If suitable roosting sites are found, they will be examined for roosting bats or their sign. If bats are not found and there is no evidence of use by bats, construction may proceed. If bats are found or evidence of use by bats is present, the qualified biologist will work with CDFW and the Town to implement measures to avoid or minimize disturbance to the colony. Additional measures may include excluding bats from the site before their hibernation period (mid- October to mid-March) and before construction begins.	Qualified Biologist	Prior to construction	The Town will submit results of preconstruction bat surveys to Caltrans and permitting agencies and will coordinate with CDFW on appropriate avoidance measures if roosting bat(s) are located during surveys.
	<i>Mitigation Measure BIO-8:</i> Conduct a Preconstruction Nesting Migratory Bird and Raptor Survey. If vegetation removal will occur during the breeding season for migratory birds and raptors (generally February through August), a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre- construction nesting bird and raptor survey prior to the start of vegetation removal and construction activities (including equipment staging). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted no more than 14 days before the initiation of construction activities or vegetation removal. This survey will adhere to all protocol-level survey requirements as described in the <i>Recommended Timing</i> <i>and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in</i> <i>California Central Valley</i> (Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000).	Qualified Biologist	Prior to construction	The Town will submit results of preconstruction nesting bird and raptor surveys to Caltrans and coordinate with CDFW on appropriate buffers if nesting birds and raptors are located during surveys.

	Final Mitigation Monit	oring and Reporting I	Program	
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity
	If an active bird or raptor nest is identified within the construction work area or an active raptor nest is identified within 250 feet from the construction work area, a no- disturbance buffer shall be established around the nest to avoid disturbance of the nesting birds or raptors until a qualified biologist determines that the young have fledged and are foraging on their own. The extent of these buffers shall be determined by the biologist and shall depend on the species identified, level of noise or construction disturbance, line-of-sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. If no active nests are found during the preconstruction surveys, then no buffers or additional mitigation is required.			
	MitigationMeasureBIO-9:MonitorduringDemolition,GroundDisturbanceandVegetationRemoval.AUSFWS-approved biological monitor will be presentduring all Project activities requiring demolition (such as removal of the bridge façade), ground disturbance, or vegetation removal within the construction area.	Qualified Biologist	During construction	Qualified Biologist will provide daily monitoring reports to the Town.
	 Mitigation Measure BIO-10: Avoid Harm to California Red-legged Frog and San Francisco Garter Snake. The following measures will be implemented to avoid harm to California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake: If a California red-legged frog or San Francisco garter snake is observed in the work limits during construction, work will immediately stop, the individual will be allowed to move out of harm's way on its own 	Contractor	During construction	Contractor will report to the Town instances of wildlife species observed in the Project area and provide a description of how disturbance and harm was avoided.

	Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity	
	 accord, and USFWS will be contacted within 24 hours. To ensure that diseases are not conveyed between work sites by the USFWS-approved biologist, the fieldwork code of practice developed by the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force will be followed at all times. No pets will be permitted at the project site. No firearms will be allowed at the project site except those carried by authorized security personnel, or local, State, or Federal law enforcement officials. Pipes, conduits, and other materials that are stored onsite and could provide shelter for wildlife shall be stored on an open-top trailer or otherwise elevated above the ground to reduce the potential for wildlife to become trapped. All food scraps, paper wrappers, food containers, cans, bottles, and other trash will be deposited in covered or closed trash containers and removed from the project at the end of each working day to reduce the attraction of predators to the project site. 				

	Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity	
	Mitigation Measure BIO-11: Provide Escape Ramps or Cover Open Trenches To avoid entrapment of wildlife, all excavated steep- walled holes or trenches more than 4 inches deep will be provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks at the end of each workday. If escape ramps cannot be provided, then holes or trenches will be covered with plywood or similar materials. Providing escape ramps or covering open trenches will prevent injury or mortality of wildlife resulting from falling into trenches and becoming trapped. The trenches will be thoroughly inspected for the presence of federally listed species at the beginning of each workday. Any species observed shall be allowed to voluntarily move outside of the work area on its own.	Contractor	During construction	Town representative will check escape ramps/coverings regularly. Maintenance and repairs will be completed by Contractor.	
	 Mitigation Measure BIO-12: Implement Measures to Reduce the Spread of Invasive Species To prevent the accidental introduction or spread of invasive species in the Project area during construction, the following measures would be implemented: Only certified noxious weed-free erosion control materials will be used. All straw and seed material will be certified as weed-free prior to being used at the proposed Project area. Contractor will wash all construction equipment prior to bringing it onto the job site. Inspection will ensure that equipment arrives on site free of mud and seed-bearing material. Any reseeding of disturbed soil areas and newly constructed slopes will use an appropriate native seed mix. 	Contractor	During construction	Town representative will check implementation measures regularly. Maintenance and repairs will be completed by Contractor.	

	Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity	
	 The Environmental awareness training described under BIO-1 will include information on noxious weeds in the Project area. 				
	Mitigation Measure BIO-13: Compensate for Permanent Impacts to Waters of the U.S. and State To ensure the Project would not result in a net loss of waters of the U.S. and State, the Town shall implement compensation measures required by the Corps, RWQCB, and CDFW during project permitting. These measures will include, but are not limited to, implementing enhancement projects approved by the RWQCB within the San Francisquito Watershed.	Town	Prior to construction	None.	
Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources	Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Conduct Worker Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT). Prior to any excavation or other substantial subsurface disturbance activities, any individuals conducting the work should be given a cultural resource awareness training session and advised to watch for cultural resource materials during construction activities. This training will cover both the identification of resources that may be encountered during construction and procedures to be followed in the event of a discovery. This training can be conducted concurrently with WEAT for sensitive biological resources (Mitigation Measure BIO-1).	Contractor	Prior to construction	Contractor will submit WEAT sign- in sheets to the Town. The Town will confirm completion of WEAT at the onset of construction activities.	

	Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity	
	<i>Mitigation Measure CUL-2</i> : Protect Discovered Cultural Subsurface Resources. If any evidence of prehistoric cultural resources (freshwater shells, beads, bone tool remnants or an assortment of bones, soil changes including subsurface ash lens or soil darker in color than surrounding soil, lithic materials such as flakes, tools or grinding rocks, etc.), or historical cultural resources (adobe foundations or walls, structures and remains with square nails, refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often associated with wells or old privies), are inadvertently unearthed during project-related activities, all work must immediately cease within 50 feet of the find, the Town and Caltrans must be notified, and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the cultural materials and recommend appropriate conservation measures. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with the Town, and—if the find is prehistoric or Native American in nature—appropriate Native American group(s), shall develop and implement a treatment plan with an emphasis toward preservation in place.	Contractor and Qualified Archaeologist	During construction (upon discovery)	Contractor will report and document any discovered subsurface resources to the town and Caltrans, who will take appropriate additional measures, as needed.	
	Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Procedures for Human Remains. In accordance with the California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, and the Public Resources Code 5097.98, regarding the discovery of human remains, if human remains are discovered during construction, all work must immediately cease, and the San Mateo County coroner must be contacted. If the Coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, the Coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and subsequent procedures shall be followed,	Contractor	During construction (upon discovery)	Contractor will report and document any discovered human remains to the San Mateo County coroner, the Town of Woodside and Caltrans, who will take appropriate additional measures, as needed.	

	Final Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impact Area	Mitigation Measure	Responsible Party	Implementation Timing	Monitoring Activity	
	according to State Public Resources Code Sections 5097.9 to 5097.99, regarding notification of the Native American Most Likely Descendant.				
Geology and Soils	Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Protect Discovered Paleontological Resources. If any evidence of paleontological resources is inadvertently unearthed during construction, all work will cease within 50-feet of the discovery, the county and the Town of Woodside will be notified, and a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted to assess the significance of the resources and recommend appropriate conservation measures.	Contractor	During construction	Contractor will report and document any discovered paleontological resources to the Town of Woodside, who will take appropriate additional measures, as needed.	

Appendix B. Site Photos





Photograph 3. Looking west at the faux rock façade under the bridge from downstream.



Photograph 4. Looking east from under the bridge



Photograph 6. View of staging area (gravel road behind chain). Looking south from Old La Honda Road near intersection with Portola Road.