

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-05

A RESOLUTION OF THE DISTRICT BOARD OF THE COASTSIDE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TO CERTIFY THE FIRE STATION 41 (EL GRANADA) REPLACEMENT PROJECT FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT; ADOPT A STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND A MITIGATION MONITORING REPORTING PROGRAM PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND APPROVE THE FINAL PROJECT DESIGN AND PROCESSING OF ALL REQUIRED PERMITS AND APPROVALS FOR THE FIRE STATION 41 (EL GRANADA) REPLACEMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, The Coastside Fire Protection District desires to replace the existing approximately 50 year old Fire Station 41 located at 531 Obispo Road with the construction of a new Fire Station 41 ("Project") on a 2.7 acre undeveloped parcel of land, approximately 600 feet south of the existing Fire Station 41 and bounded by Avenue Alhambra to the north, Coronado Street to the east, Obispo Road to the south, and Avenue Portola to the west (APN 047-261-030) in the Community of El Granada, unincorporated San Mateo County ("Project Site"); and

WHEREAS, at build out, the proposed Project design would result in a new 12,425-square-foot, single-story (30-foot maximum height above finish grade) fire station at the Project Site with access via Obispo Road, an emergency generator, an above ground diesel fuel tank, a flag pole and a communications antenna within secured areas, and 16 parking spaces on-site. The Project would include native, drought tolerant landscaping and may include a new curb, gutter and sidewalk along the frontage of the proposed Fire Station 41. The proposed Project also includes a minor subdivision to create two lots from the existing 2.7-acre parcel one of which would house the new fire station and the other which is not proposed for development; any future development of this parcel would require independent review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, the proposed Project will provide facilities that are safe, modern, and adequately sized to allow the CFPD to provide for current and future service demands for the next 50 years which the existing Fire Station 41 is not capable of providing; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Project will require the following entitlements from the County of San Mateo, many of which will be considered at a subsequent and separately noticed public hearing before the San Mateo County Planning Commission: a coastal development permit, use permit, variances from height, setbacks and lot coverage restrictions, grading permit, minor subdivision, tree removal permit, and design review. Additionally, the Project will require a building permit from San Mateo County as well as a sewer connection permit, and a possible variance and other discretionary determinations, from the Granada Community Services District; and

WHEREAS, the Coastside Fire Protection District, as lead agency for the proposed Project, prepared an Initial Study for the proposed Project in June 2015 pursuant to the CEQA and, based on the findings of the Initial Study, concluded that the

proposed Project could result in potentially significant environmental impacts and that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") would be required to evaluate the significant environmental impacts of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Coastside Fire Protection District prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation of an EIR and the Initial Study to the public, responsible agencies, and other interested persons for the required 30-day public review period commencing on June 30, 2015 and concluding on July 29, 2016; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public scoping session was held in conjunction with the San Mateo County Planning Commission pre-application meeting on July 16, 2016 inviting comments on the scope and content of the EIR; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Initial Study conclusions and comments received on the NOP, a Draft EIR (December 2016 SCH #2015062089) was prepared by the environmental consultant engaged by the Coastside Fire Protection District (PlaceWorks) assessing the Project's environmental impacts in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Coastside Fire Protection District circulated the Draft EIR for public review and comment for a 48-day public review period commencing on December 2, 2016 and ending on January 19, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the Coastside Fire Protection District transmitted for filing a Notice of Completion of the Draft EIR and a copy of the Draft EIR to the State Clearinghouse, filed a Notice of Availability with the San Mateo County Clerk and distributed the Notice of Availability to all responsible agencies and interested parties inviting comments on the Draft EIR in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. Copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to all responsible agencies and were made available for public review at the following locations:

Coastside Fire Protection District
1191 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

United States Post Office
20 Avenue Portola
El Granada, CA 94018

WHEREAS, on January 11, 2017 the Planning Commission of San Mateo County held a public study session to consider the Project and draft EIR.

WHEREAS, on January 18, 2017 a duly noticed public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR was held before the Coastside Fire Protection District Board and written and verbal comments were received and considered during the public review period; and

WHEREAS, the Coastside Fire Protection District caused PlaceWorks to prepare written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR and text revisions to the Draft EIR in response to the comments received or to clarify the material in the Draft EIR (Responses to Comments) and circulated the Response to Comments to all public

agencies commenting on the Draft EIR; and the Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR and the Response to Comments; and

WHEREAS, at a duly noticed public hearing on April 26, 2017, the Coastside Fire Protection District considered the Final EIR, the record of proceedings of the Final EIR, the Project, and other written correspondence, verbal testimony, staff reports and background reports; and on said date the Public Hearing was opened, held and closed; and

WHEREAS, as detailed in the Statement of Findings, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A, the Final EIR identifies potentially significant impacts resulting from the Project relating to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hydrology, noise, and transportation and circulation; and

WHEREAS, as detailed in the Statement of Findings, the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR reduce all of the Project's potentially significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level and no significant and unavoidable impact would result from the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Final EIR describes a reasonable range of alternatives that would reduce or eliminate significant unavoidable effects associated with the Project while still attaining the Project's goals and objectives; and for the reasons set forth in the Statement of Findings, the proposed alternatives to the Project are not environmentally preferable, fail to fully meet the Project objectives, and/or are otherwise infeasible; and

WHEREAS, the findings contained in the Statement of Findings are true and correct and are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the documents comprising the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Coastside Fire Protection District is required under CEQA to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program in order to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program set forth in the attached Exhibit B, which is incorporated herein by reference, accurately reflects the mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, copies of the Final EIR and other documents and materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which this decision is based are available for public review from the custodian of these records, Assistant Chief Paul Code, Coastside Fire Protection District at the Coastside Fire Protection District administrative offices located at 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA, the United States Post Office at 20 Avenue Portola El Granada, CA 94018, and on the Coastside Fire Protection District website (<http://www.coastsidefire.org/>); and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Coastside Fire Protection District, based on facts and analysis in the Final EIR, all exhibits and documents comprising the Final EIR, all written and oral public testimony, and all evidence submitted in connection with the Final EIR, finds:

1. The Final EIR including documents incorporated by reference has been reviewed and considered by the Coastside Fire Protection District, including the information contained therein prior to adoption of this Resolution; and
2. The Final EIR has been completed in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and
3. The Final EIR adequately describes and identifies all significant environmental impacts of the proposed Project and there are no known potentially significant environmental impacts not addressed in the Final EIR; and
4. The Final EIR reflects the Coastside Fire Protection District's independent judgment and analysis.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Coastside Fire Protection District does hereby certify the Final EIR prepared by Placeworks, Inc. as complete and adequate in accordance with CEQA.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Coastside Fire Protection District in connection with its approval of the Project's final design, hereby adopts the Statement of Findings Under the California Environmental Quality Act as set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Coastside Fire Protection District, in connection with its approval of the Project's final design, hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by this reference, and incorporates the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program into the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Coastside Fire Protection District does hereby approve the final design of the proposed Project analyzed in the Final EIR and the processing of all required entitlements for the Project by the County of San Mateo and the El Granada Community Services District.

PASSED AND ADOPTED as a Resolution of the Coastside Fire Protection District at a Regular Meeting held on April 26, 2017, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Gary Burke, Board President

ATTEST:

Assistant Chief Paul Cole, District Secretary

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

Exhibit A

***Statement of Findings Pursuant to the California
Environmental Quality Act***

I. PURPOSE OF THE FINDINGS

The following findings of fact (Statement of Findings) have been prepared to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq., "CEQA" and Sections 15091, 15092, 15093 and 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Sections 15000, et seq.), in connection with the associated with approval of the Fire Station 41 (El Granada) Replacement Project ("Project") following certification of the Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR). These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Coastside Fire Protection District ("District") Board of Directors regarding the Fire Station 41 (El Granada) Replacement Project. They are divided into general sections, each of which is further divided into subsections. Each addresses a particular impact topic and/or requirement of law. At times, these findings refer to materials, including the EIR, in the administrative record, which is available for review in the District's office at 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA, the United States Post Office at 20 Avenue Portola El Granada, CA 94018, and on the Coastside Fire Protection District website (<http://www.coastsidefire.org/>).

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15124, the EIR must identify the objectives sought by the Project. As shown in Section 3.3, Project Objectives, of Chapter 3, Project Description, of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Project, the specific project objectives of the project proponent are to:

- Replace the aging 50-plus year-old existing Fire Station 41.
- Provide a new fire station that complies with the Essential Services Buildings Seismic Safety Act of 1986 so that the fire station can resist earthquakes, gravity, and winds.
- Provide a new fire station that is adequately sized to house a 34-foot Fire Engine, a 42-foot

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

Truck, and a 39-foot Heavy Rescue Vehicle in a drive through format.

- Provide a new fire station that allows the Coastside Fire Protection District to appropriately, provide for current and future fire and public safety service demands for the next 50 years.
- Provide a new fire station within the central District area currently served by existing Fire Station 41.
- Maintain and if possible improve current response times within the central District area.
- Avoid condemnation of private land to construct the new fire station.
- Minimize interference with ocean and hillside views.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Coastside Fire Protection District proposes to replace the existing approximately 50 year old Fire Station 41 located at 531 Obispo Road with the construction of a new Fire Station 41 (“Project”) on a 2.7 acre undeveloped parcel of land, approximately 600 feet south of the existing Fire Station 41 and bounded by Avenue Alhambra to the north, Coronado Street to the east, Obispo Road to the south, and Avenue Portola to the west (APN 047-261-030) in the Community of El Granada, unincorporated San Mateo County (“Project Site”). The proposed Project design would result in a new 12,425-square-foot, single-story (30-foot maximum height above finish grade) fire station at the Project Site with access via Obispo Road, an emergency generator, an above ground diesel fuel tank, a flagpole and a communications antenna within secured areas, and 16 parking spaces on-site. The Project would include native, drought tolerant landscaping and may include a new curb, gutter and sidewalk along the frontage of the proposed Fire Station 41. The Project also includes a minor subdivision to create two lots from the existing 2.7-acre parcel one of which would house the new fire station and the other which is not proposed for development; any future development of this parcel would require independent review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

At build out, the Project will replace the existing Fire Station 41 with a new Fire Station 41 that will provide facilities that are safe, modern, and adequately sized to allow the CFPD to provide for current and future service demands for the next 50 years which the existing Fire Station 41 is not capable of providing. The proposed Project will require the following entitlements from the County of San Mateo, many of which will be considered at a subsequent and separately noticed public hearing before the San Mateo County Planning Commission: a coastal development permit, use permit, variances from height, setbacks and lot coverage restrictions, grading permit, minor subdivision, tree removal permit, and design review. Additionally, the Project will require a building permit from San Mateo County as well as a

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

sewer connection permit, and a possible variance and other discretionary determinations, from the Granada Community Services District.

IV. THE CEQA PROCESS

A draft and a final Environmental Impact Report (collectively, the "EIR") has been prepared for and by the District in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA", Public Resources Code Sec 21000 et seq.), and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.) in connection with the Project. The EIR for the Project consists of the following:

- A. Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR"), issued XX XX, 2016;
- B. All appendices to the DEIR;
- C. Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR"), issued XX XX, 2017, containing all written comments and responses on the DEIR, refinements and clarifications to the DEIR, the mitigation monitoring and reporting program, and technical appendices;
- D. All of the comments and staff responses entered into the record orally and in writing, as well as accompanying technical memoranda or evidence entered into the record.

In conformance with CEQA, the District, as lead agency for the Project, has taken the following actions in relation to the EIR:

- A. Determined that the Project constitutes a "project" under CEQA, and prepared an Initial Study for the proposed Project in June 2015 pursuant to CEQA and, based on the findings contained in the Initial Study, concluded that the proposed Project could result in potentially significant environmental impacts and that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") would be required to evaluate the significant environmental impacts of the Project.
- B. Prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation of an EIR (NOP) and the Initial Study to the public, responsible agencies, and other interested persons for the required 30-day public review period commencing on June 30, 2015 and concluding on July 29, 2016.
- C. Held a duly noticed public scoping session in conjunction with the San Mateo County Planning Commission pre-application meeting on July 16, 2016 inviting comments on the scope and content of the EIR.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

- D. Pursuant to the Initial Study conclusions and comments received on the NOP, the environmental consultant PlaceWorks to prepared Draft EIR (December 2016 SCH #2015062089) assessing the Project's environmental impacts in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.
- E. Circulated the Draft EIR for public review and comment for a 48-day public review period commencing on December 2, 2016 and ending on January 19, 2017.
- F. Transmitted for filing a Notice of Completion of the Draft EIR and a copy of the Draft EIR to the State Clearinghouse, filed a Notice of Availability with the San Mateo County Clerk and distributed the Notice of Availability to all responsible agencies and interested parties inviting comments on the Draft EIR in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.
- G. Distributed copies of the Draft EIR to all responsible agencies and caused copies to be made available for public review at the following locations at the Coastsides Fire Protection District administrative offices located at 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA, the United States Post Office at 20 Avenue Portola El Granada, CA 94018, and on the Coastsides Fire Protection District website (<http://www.coastsidefire.org/>).
- H. Participated in a duly noticed public study session on the Project and the Draft EIR before the San Mateo County Planning Commission on January 11, 2017.
- I. On January 18, 2017, held a duly noticed public hearing to receive comments on the Draft EIR was held before the Coastsides Fire Protection District Board and written and verbal comments were received and considered during the public review period.
- J. Caused PlaceWorks to prepare written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR and text revisions to the Draft EIR in response to the comments received or to clarify the material in the Draft EIR ("Final EIR") and circulated the Response to Comments to all public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR at least 10 days prior to the April 26, 2017 hearing referenced below. Together the Draft EIR and the Final EIR constitute the "EIR".
- K. On April 26, 2017, held a duly noticed public hearing to Consider the EIR, the record of proceedings of the EIR, the Project, and other written correspondence, verbal testimony, staff reports and background reports; and on said date the Public Hearing was opened,

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

held and closed and pursuant to Resolution 2017-05 ("Resolution"), the District voted to certify the EIR, adopt this Statement of Findings attached to the Resolution as Exhibit A, adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program attached to the Resolution as Exhibit B, and approved the final Project design and processing of all required permits and approvals by the County of San Mateo and the El Granada Community Services district.

- L. Caused copies of the EIR and other documents and materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which this decision is based to be made available for public review from the custodian of these records, Assistant Chief Paul Code, Coastside Fire Protection District at the Coastside Fire Protection District administrative offices located at 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA, the United States Post Office at 20 Avenue Portola El Granada, CA 94018, and on the Coastside Fire Protection District website (<http://www.coastsidefire.org/>).

V. FINDINGS ARE DETERMINATIVE

In consideration of the foregoing, the District Board of Directors ("Board of Directors") makes the findings described below concerning the environmental impacts of the Project, the mitigation measures identified to reduce these impacts, and the feasibility of the Project alternatives.

Each finding herein is based on the entire record. The omission of any relevant fact from the summary discussions below is not an indication that a particular finding is not based in part on the omitted fact.

Many of the mitigation measures imposed or adopted pursuant to this Exhibit A to mitigate the environmental impacts identified in the administrative record may have the effect of mitigating multiple impacts (e.g., conditions imposed primarily to mitigate traffic impacts may also secondarily mitigate air quality impacts, etc.). The Board of Directors has not attempted to exhaustively cross-reference all potential impacts mitigated by the imposition of a particular mitigation measure; however, such failure to cross-reference shall not be construed as a limitation on the potential scope or effect of any such mitigation measure.

Reference numbers to impacts, mitigation measures, and page numbers in the following sections are to the page numbers used in the EIR, as specified.

VI. FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

In summary, as detailed below, the Board of Directors finds as follows. The EIR identifies

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

potentially significant impacts resulting from the Project relating to the following topic areas: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hydrology, noise, and transportation and circulation. In conformance with Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this section of the findings lists each significant environmental effect of the project identified in the EIR; describes those mitigation measures recommended in the EIR; and, as required by Section 15091, further finds that the mitigation measures identified in the EIR reduce all of the Project's potentially significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level and no significant and unavoidable impact would result from the Project. All feasible mitigation measures listed below have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") attached as Exhibit B to the Resolution. Compliance with the MMRP is a condition of approval of the Project, and the construction of the Project will incorporate all conditions contained in the MMRP. Further, the EIR describes a reasonable range of alternatives that would reduce or eliminate significant unavoidable effects associated with the Project while still attaining the Project's goals and objectives; and for the reasons set forth in the Statement of Findings, these alternatives to the Project are not environmentally preferable, fail to fully meet the Project objectives, and/or are otherwise infeasible.

1. Air Quality

AIR-1 **Impact.** During construction of the project, construction activities would generate fugitive dust during ground-disturbing activities and would generate substantial construction-related exhaust emissions from on-site construction equipment and on-road vehicle trips that exceeds the BAAQMD significance thresholds identified in Table 4.2-5.

Mitigation. The Applicant shall require their construction contractor to comply with the following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for reducing construction emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}:

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily or as often as needed to control dust emissions. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible.
- Pave, apply water twice daily or as often as necessary to control dust, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

- space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer).
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) or as often as needed all paved access roads (e.g., Obispo Road, Avenue Alhambra, and Coronado Road), parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site to control dust.
 - Sweep public streets daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) in the vicinity of the project site, or as often as needed, to keep streets free of visible soil material.
 - Hydro-seed (using native species, whenever possible) or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
 - Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (e.g., dirt, sand).
 - Limit vehicle traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.
 - Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
 - Install fiber rolls, silt fencing or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff onto public roadways.
 - The County of San Mateo Planning and Building Official or their designee shall verify compliance that these measures have been implemented during normal construction site inspections.

Finding. The Board of Directors finds that Mitigation Measure ("MM") AIR-1 is feasible and will avoid or substantially lessen the Project's construction related impacts associated with emissions of fugitive dust generated by ground disturbing activities and exhaust emissions from on-site construction equipment and on-road vehicle trips that exceeds the BAAQMD significance thresholds identified in Table 4.2-5. Specifically, the Board of Directors finds that implementation of the BAAQMD recommended dust control measures and restrictions on vehicle traffic contained in MM AIR-1 would reduce Impact AIR-1 resulting from the Project to a less-than-significant level.

AIR-2 **Impact.** Construction of the proposed project would cumulatively contribute to the non-attainment designations of the SFBAAB.

Mitigation. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-3 would reduce cumulative air quality impacts.

Finding. The Board of Directors finds that MM AIR-2 is feasible and will avoid or substantially lessen the Project's construction related impacts that would

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

cumulatively contribute to the non-attainment designations of the SFBAAB. Specifically, the Board of Directors finds that implementation of the dust control and vehicle and equipment restriction measures set forth in MM AIR-1 and AIR-3 would reduce Impact AIR-2 resulting from the Project to a less-than-significant level.

AIR-3 **Impact.** Construction activities of the project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of TAC and PM_{2.5}.

Mitigation. During construction, the construction contractor(s) shall use construction equipment fitted with Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) and engines that meet the USEPA Certified Tier 3 emissions standards for all equipment of 25 horsepower or more.

The construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the project site for verification by the County of San Mateo Building Division official or his/her designee. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and number of construction equipment on-site. Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with manufacturer recommendations. The construction contractor shall ensure that all non-essential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with California Air Resources Board Rule 2449. Prior to issuance of any construction permit, the construction contractor shall ensure that all construction plans submitted to the County of San Mateo Planning Division and/or Building Division clearly show the requirement for Level 3 DPF and USEPA Tier 3 or higher emissions standards for construction equipment over 25 horsepower.

Finding. The Board of Directors finds that MM AIR-3 is feasible and will avoid or substantially lessen the Project's construction related impacts that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of TAC and PM_{2.5}. Specifically, the Board of Directors finds that implementation of the operating equipment restriction measures set forth in MM AIR-3 would reduce Impact AIR-3 resulting from the Project to a less-than-significant level.

AIR-4 **Impact.** Implementation of the project would cumulatively contribute to air quality impacts in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin.

Mitigation. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-3 would reduce cumulative air quality impacts.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

Finding. The Board of Directors finds that MM AIR-4 is feasible and will avoid or substantially lessen the Project's impacts that would cumulatively contribute to air quality impacts in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. Specifically, the Board of Directors finds that implementation of the dust control and vehicle and equipment restriction measures set forth in MM AIR-1 and AIR-3 would reduce the Project's cumulative impacts set forth in Impact AIR-4 to a level that is not cumulatively considerable.

2. Biological Resources

BIO-1a Impact. Proposed development could potentially result in an inadvertent take of individual CLRF or SFGS in the remote instance that individuals were to disperse onto the site in the future, in which case this could result in a potential violation of the Endangered Species Acts if adequate controls and preconstruction surveys are not implemented.

Mitigation. Ensure Avoidance of California Red-legged Frog and San Francisco Garter Snake. The following measures shall be implemented as recommended in the 2015 Preliminary Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Assessment of the site to ensure avoidance of individual California red-legged frog (CRLF) or San Francisco garter snake (SFGS) in the remote instance individuals were to disperse onto the site in the future in advance of or during construction:

- *Wildlife exclusion fence:* Wildlife exclusion fencing shall be installed prior to the start of construction and maintained until construction of the proposed project is complete. Such fencing shall, at a minimum, run along the proposed project boundaries with riparian habitat and for a distance of at least 100 feet perpendicular to riparian habitat. Silt fence material may be used to also provide erosion control, however, per CRLF and SFGS fence standards, it must be at least 42 inches in height (at least 36 inches above ground and buried at least 6 inches below the ground) and stakes must be placed on the inside of the project (side on which work will take place).
- *Pre-construction survey:* Pre-construction surveys for CRLF and SFGS shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities including fence installation) and within 48 hours of the start of ground disturbance activities following completion of exclusion fence installation. Surveys are to be conducted by approved qualified biologists with experience surveying for each species.
- If project activities are stopped for greater than 7 days, a follow-up pre-

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

construction survey may be required within 48 hours prior to reinitiating project activities.

- *Earth Disturbing Activities only during dry weather:* No earth disturbing activities shall take place during rain events when there is potential for accumulation greater than 0.25-inch in a 24-hour period. In addition, no earth disturbing activities shall occur for 48 hours following rain events in which 0.25 inch of rain accumulation within 24 hours.
- *Biological monitoring:* An approved biologist shall be required to inspect and approve installation of the exclusion fence.
- *Erosion Control Materials:* Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibians and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic mono-filament netting (erosion control matting), rolled erosion control products, or similar material shall not be used.

Finding. The Board of Directors finds that MM BIO-1a is feasible and will avoid or substantially lessen the Project's impacts that could potentially result in an inadvertent take of individual CLRF or SFGS in the remote instance that individuals were to disperse onto the site in the future, in which case this could result in a potential violation of the Endangered Species Acts if adequate controls and preconstruction surveys are not implemented. Specifically, the Board of Directors finds that implementation of the exclusion fencing, erosion and other controls, preconstruction surveys and biological monitoring set forth in MM BIO-1a would reduce the Project's impacts set forth in Impact BIO-1b to a less than significant level.

BIO-1b **Impact.** Proposed development could potentially result in inadvertent loss of bird nests in active use, which would conflict with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code if adequate controls and preconstruction surveys are not implemented.

Mitigation. Ensure Avoidance of Bird Nests in Active Use. Tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building demolition shall be performed in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and relevant sections of the California Fish and Game Code to avoid loss of nests in active use. This shall be accomplished by scheduling building demolition, tree removal and landscape grubbing outside of the bird nesting season (which occurs from February 1 to August 31) to avoid possible impacts on nesting birds if new nests are established in the future. Alternatively, if building demolition, tree removal and landscape grubbing cannot

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

be scheduled during the non-nesting season (September 1 to January 31), a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted. The pre-construction nesting survey shall include the following:

- A qualified biologist (Biologist) shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird (both passerine and raptor) survey within seven calendar days prior to tree removal, landscape grubbing, and/or building demolition.
- If no nesting birds or active nests are observed, no further action is required and tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building demolition shall occur within seven calendar days of the survey.
- Another nest survey shall be conducted if more than seven calendar days elapse between the initial nest search and the beginning of tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building demolition.
- If any active nests are encountered, the Biologist shall determine an appropriate disturbance-free buffer zone to be established around the nest location(s) until the young have fledged. Buffer zones vary depending on the species (i.e., typically 75 to 100 feet for passerines and 300 feet for raptors) and other factors such as ongoing disturbance in the vicinity of the nest location. If necessary, the dimensions of the buffer zone shall be determined in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.
- Orange construction fencing, flagging, or other marking system shall be installed to delineate the buffer zone around the nest location(s) within which no construction-related equipment or operations shall be permitted. Continued use of existing facilities such as surface parking and site maintenance may continue within this buffer zone.
- No restrictions on grading or construction activities outside the prescribed buffer zone are required once the zone has been identified and delineated in the field and workers have been properly trained to avoid the buffer zone area.
- Construction activities shall be restricted from the buffer zone until the Biologist has determined that young birds have fledged and the buffer zone is no longer needed.
- A survey report of findings verifying that any young have fledged shall be submitted by the Biologist for review and approval by the County of San Mateo prior to initiation of any tree removal, landscape grubbing, building demolition, and other construction activities within the buffer zone. Following written approval by the County, tree removal, and construction within the nest-buffer zone may proceed.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

Finding. The Board of Directors finds that MM BIO-1b is feasible and will avoid or substantially lessen the Project's impacts that could potentially result in inadvertent loss of bird nests in active use, which would conflict with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code if adequate controls and preconstruction surveys are not implemented. Specifically, the Board of Directors finds that implementation of the construction schedule restrictions, pre-construction nesting surveys, establishment of buffer zones, construction fencing around buffer zones, can confirmation by a qualified biologist and approval by the San Mateo County that young have fledged before construction resumes within a buffer zone, would reduce the Project's impacts set forth in Impact BIO-1b to a less than significant level.

VII. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS

With respect to the foregoing findings and in recognition of those facts that are included in the record, the District has determined that the Project will result in no significant unmitigated and unavoidable impacts.

VIII. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. Legal Requirements

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmental impact report include a "reasonable range of alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project." The EIR alternatives were designed to avoid or reduce significant impacts, while attaining at least some of the proposed objectives of the Project. The Board of Directors has reviewed the significant impacts associated with the reasonable range of alternatives as compared to the Project, and in evaluating the alternatives has also considered each alternative's feasibility, taking into account a range of economic, environmental, social, legal, and other factors. The basic Project objectives are set forth in Section II above.

A. No Project Alternative

1. Description. The No Project Alternative assumes that the Project site would remain in its existing condition and no new improvements, including the Project, would be constructed on the Project site.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

2. Comparison to the Proposed Project. Because no construction would occur, the No Project Alternative would avoid each of the identified significant impacts of the Project potentially significant impacts resulting from the Project relating to the following topic areas: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hydrology, noise, and transportation and circulation.

3. Finding. Implementation of the No Project Alternative preserves the existing site conditions thereby avoiding all identified potentially significant impacts of the Project and therefore would result in less severe impacts in comparison to the Project for all topic areas listed above. However, by preserving the project site in its existing condition, the Board of Directors finds that it would *not* accomplish most of the key Project objectives as follows: "Replace the aging 50-plus year-old existing Fire Station 41; Provide a new fire station that complies with the Essential Services Buildings Seismic Safety Act of 1986 so that the fire station can resist earthquakes, gravity, and winds; Provide a new fire station that is adequately sized to house a 34-foot Fire Engine, a 42-foot Truck, and a 39-foot Heavy Rescue Vehicle in a drive through format; Provide a new fire station that allows the Coastside Fire Protection District to appropriately, provide for current and future fire and public safety service demands for the next 50 years; Provide a new fire station within the central District area currently served by existing Fire Station 41; or Maintain and if possible improve current response times within the central District area." Therefore because the No Project Alternative would not avoid any identified significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project and fails to meet the majority of the key Project objectives, the Board of Directors rejects this alternative as infeasible.

B. Relocated Site Alternative

1. Description. Under the Relocated Site Alternative, the Project would remain the same but would be constructed at an alternate site located at the 3.4 acre privately owned vacant parcel on the corner of Capistrano Road and the west side of Highway 1, as shown in Figure 5-1 of the EIR, which is north of the Project site.

2. Comparison to the Proposed Project. Because the Relocated Site Alternative would be subject to the same Municipal Code regulations and design review as the Project relating to visual character, setbacks and height and therefore would result in similar aesthetic impacts in comparison to the Project with the exception of impacts on views of the Pacific Ocean. Because the Relocated Site Alternative is located on the west of Highway 1, there is a greater overall potential for this alternative to impact views of the Pacific Ocean that the proposed project and therefore would have more severe

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

impacts in comparison to the Project with respect to aesthetics. It would also have more severe impacts than the Project with regard to land use (because it would be located on a corner site that is considered a key gateway to the Princeton Plan Area which calls for visitor serving uses for this site) and transportation (because under this alternative the site is within a more intensely urbanized area and directly adjacent to Highway 1). It would result in similar impacts to the Project with regard to air quality (because it would result in the same overall development as the Project); and noise (because while ambient noise levels may be greater at this site, operations would remain similar to the Project); and hydrology (because similar to the Project it would not be located in a tsunami inundation zone). The Relocated Site Alternative would result in less severe impacts in comparison to the Project on biology (because while, like the Project the proposed mitigation measures would reduce the biological impacts of this alternative to a less-than-significant level, the Relocated Site Alternative would be located outside of an area identified as potentially suitable CRLF habitat).

3. Finding. Implementation of the Relocated Site Alternative would construct the Project at a 3.4 acre vacant parcel on the corner of Capistrano Road and the west side of Highway 1, north of the Project site. As discussed above, while it would result in potentially *less severe* biological impacts in comparison to the Project because this site is outside an area identified as potentially suitable CRLF habitat, both this alternative and the Project, as mitigated, would result in less-than-significant biological impacts. Further, the Relocated Site Alternative would result in *more severe* impacts on land use in comparison to the Project because it would be located on a corner site that is considered a key gateway to the Princeton Plan Area which calls for visitor serving uses for this site and the Project is an essential public service facility, not a visitor serving use. It would also result in *more severe* impacts on transportation in comparison to the Project because under this alternative the site is within a more intensely urbanized area that is directly adjacent to Highway 1 which is often severely congested. Moreover, it may fail to meet the following key project objectives: "Avoid condemnation of private land to construct the new fire station; Minimize interference with ocean and hillside views." Therefore because the No Project Alternative would result in more severe impacts with regard to aesthetics and transportation, would not avoid any identified significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, and because it would fail to meet the foregoing Project objectives, the Board of Directors rejects this alternative as infeasible.

C. Modified Site Plan Alternative

1. Description. Under the Modified Site Plan Alternative, the overall project components of this alternative would be similar to the Project as proposed however the

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

Project site would be elevated to at-grade with Avenue Alhambra as shown in Figure 5-2 of the EIR in order to adhere to requirements of Section 6825.3 which as explained in the Hydrology Section of the EIR, are not applicable to the Project because the Project is not in a tsunami inundation zone. This would result in a 22 foot retaining wall along Obispo Road. As a result the Project site access would be relocated from Obispo Road to Avenue Alhambra.

2. Comparison to the Proposed Project. Because the Modified Site Plan Alternative would result in a 22-foot high retaining wall along Obispo Road, while it would be required to comply with all site development standards and design review requirements related to visual character which would mitigate visual impacts to a less than significant level, it would be more visible than the Project from Avenue Alhambra and Highway 1 and therefore have *more severe* aesthetic impacts in comparison to the Project. This alternative would also have more severe impacts in comparison to the Project with regard to air quality (because of the significant fill required which would increase vehicle trips and use of heavy equipment resulting in more construction related emissions); noise (due to increase in amount and duration of vehicle trips and heavy equipment as well as relocation of access closer to existing residential development); and transportation (for the same reasons described for this alternative's increase in noise and transportation impacts in comparison to the Project). The Modified Site Plan Alternative would result in similar impacts in comparison to the Project with regard to biological resources (because the overall disturbance of this alternative's footprint would be similar to the Project); and hydrology (because like the Project it would be located outside the tsunami inundation zone).

3. Finding. Implementation of the Modified Site Plan Alternative on the proposed Project site would entail a 22-foot high retaining wall along Obispo Road which would result in *more severe* aesthetic impacts in comparison to the Project because it would impact views from Avenue Alhambra and Highway 1. The retaining wall would further require significantly more fill than the Project which in turn would require an increase in the amount and duration of vehicle trips and heavy equipment to deliver and install the fill in comparison to the Project. This would result in *more severe* impacts with regard to air quality, noise and transportation as described above. Moreover, it may fail to meet the following key project objectives: "Minimize interference with ocean and hillside views." Therefore because the No Project Alternative would result in more severe impacts with regard to aesthetics, air quality, noise, and transportation in comparison to the Project, because it would not avoid any identified significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, and because it would fail to meet the foregoing Project objectives, the Board of Directors rejects this alternative as infeasible.

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

XI. THE RECORD

The environmental analysis provided in the EIR and these findings are based on and are supported by the following documents, materials and other evidence, which constitute the administrative record for the approval of the Project:

- A. All application materials for the Project and supporting documents, including but not limited to those materials constituting the Project and listed in Section III of this Exhibit A.
- B. The Initial Study, the NOP, comments received on the NOP and all other public notices issued by the District in relation to the EIR (e.g., Notice of Availability).
- C. The Draft EIR, the Final EIR, all appendices to any part of the EIR, all technical materials cited in any part of the EIR, comment letters, oral testimony, responses to comments, as well as all of the comments and staff responses entered into the record orally and in writing prior to the Board of Director's final action taken at the April 26, 2017 meeting.
- D. All non-draft and/or non-confidential reports and memoranda prepared by the District and consultants related to the EIR, its analysis and findings.
- E. Minutes and transcripts of the discussions regarding the Project and/or Project components at public hearings or scoping meetings held by the Board of Directors.
- G. Staff reports associated with Board of Directors on the Project and supporting technical memoranda and any letters or other material submitted into the record by any party.
- H. Matters of common knowledge to the Board of Directors which they consider any other applicable plans or other similar plans, and the San Mateo County Municipal Code.

XII. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORDS

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the Board of Director findings regarding the mitigation measures are based are located and in the custody of the Coastsides Fire Protection District Headquarters, 1191 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019. The location and custodian of these documents is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e).

XIII. FILING NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS PURSUANT TO CEQA

The Board of Directors hereby directs the District staff to file a Notice of Determination regarding the approval of the Project within five business days of adoption of this resolution.

Exhibit B

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Fire Station 41 (El Granada) Replacement Project is intended to ensure the implementation of mitigation measures identified as part of the environmental review for the proposed project. The MMRP includes the following information:

- A list of mitigation measures
- The party responsible for implementation of each mitigation measure and the action(s) required for implementation
- The timing for implementation of each mitigation measure
- The agency responsible for monitoring and enforcement of each mitigation measure and the action(s) required for such monitoring/ enforcement

The Coastside Fire Protection District must adopt this MMRP, or an equally effective program, if it approves the proposed Project with the mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of Project approval.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility/Action	Implementation Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement Responsibility/Action	Date Completed/ Signature
AIR QUALITY				
<p>AIR-1: The Applicant shall require their construction contractor to comply with the following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for reducing construction emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water all active construction areas at least twice daily or as often as needed to control dust emissions. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. ▪ Pave, apply water twice daily or as often as necessary to control dust, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. ▪ Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer). ▪ Sweep daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) or as often as needed all paved access roads (e.g., Obispo Road, Avenue Alhambra, and Coronado Road), parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site to control dust. ▪ Sweep public streets daily (with water sweepers using reclaimed water if possible) in the vicinity of the project site, or as often as needed, to keep streets free of visible soil material. ▪ Hydro-seed (using native species, whenever possible) or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas. ▪ Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (e.g., dirt, sand). ▪ Limit vehicle traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph. ▪ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. ▪ Install fiber rolls, silt fencing or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff onto public roadways. <p>The County of San Mateo Planning and Building Official or their designee shall verify compliance that these measures have been</p>	<p>Coastside Fire Protection District: include Mitigation Measure AIR-1 requirements in the contract and performance standards for the Project Contractor</p> <p>Project Contractor: fully implement all air quality, erosion control, and dust control measures set forth in Mitigation Measure AIR-1</p>	<p>Prior to execution of the Project Contractor contract</p> <p>During project construction</p>	<p>Coastside Fire Protection District: Make regular, periodic visits to the project site to ensure that all air quality, erosion control, and dust control measures set forth in Mitigation Measure AIR-1 are implemented</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility/Action	Implementation Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement Responsibility/Action	Date Completed/ Signature
implemented during normal construction site inspections.				
AIR-2: Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-3 would reduce cumulative air quality impacts.				
AIR-3: During construction, the construction contractor(s) shall use construction equipment fitted with Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filters (DPF) and engines that meet the USEPA Certified Tier 3 emissions standards for all equipment of 25 horsepower or more. The construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the project site for verification by the County of San Mateo Building Division official or his/her designee. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and number of construction equipment on-site. Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with manufacturer recommendations. The construction contractor shall ensure that all non-essential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with California Air Resources Board Rule 2449. Prior to issuance of any construction permit, the construction contractor shall ensure that all construction plans submitted to the County of San Mateo Planning Division and/or Building Division clearly show the requirement for Level 3 DPF and USEPA Tier 3 or higher emissions standards for construction equipment over 25 horsepower.	Coastside Fire Protection District: include Mitigation Measure AIR-3 requirements in the contract and performance standards for the Project Contractor Project Contractor: fully comply with all equipment requirements set forth Mitigation Measure AIR-1	Prior to execution of the Project Contractor contract During project construction	Coastside Fire Protection District: Make regular, periodic visits to the project site to ensure that all equipment requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure AIR-3 are being implemented	
AIR-4: Implementation of Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-3 would reduce cumulative air quality impacts.				
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
BIO-1a: Ensure Avoidance of California Red-legged Frog and San Francisco Garter Snake. The following measures shall be implemented as recommended in the 2015 Preliminary Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Assessment of the site to ensure avoidance of individual California red-legged frog (CRLF) or San Francisco garter snake (SFGS) in the remote instance individuals were to disperse onto the site in the future in advance of or during construction: * <i>Wildlife exclusion fence:</i> Wildlife exclusion fencing shall be installed	Coastside Fire Protection District: include Mitigation Measure BIO-1a requirements in the contract and performance standards for the	Prior to execution of the Project Contractor contract	Coastside Fire Protection District: Make regular, periodic visits to the project site to ensure that all fencing, survey and erosion control requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility/Action	Implementation Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement Responsibility/Action	Date Completed/ Signature
<p>prior to the start of construction and maintained until construction of the proposed project is complete. Such fencing shall, at a minimum, run along the proposed project boundaries with riparian habitat and for a distance of at least 100 feet perpendicular to riparian habitat. Silt fence material may be used to also provide erosion control, however, per CRLF and SFGS fence standards, it must be at least 42 inches in height (at least 36 inches above ground and buried at least 6 inches below the ground) and stakes must be placed on the inside of the project (side on which work will take place).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Pre-construction survey:</i> Pre-construction surveys for CRLF and SFGS shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities including fence installation) and within 48 hours of the start of ground disturbance activities following completion of exclusion fence installation. Surveys are to be conducted by approved qualified biologists with experience surveying for each species. ▪ If project activities are stopped for greater than 7 days, a follow-up pre-construction survey may be required within 48 hours prior to reinitiating project activities. ▪ <i>Earth Disturbing Activities only during dry weather:</i> No earth disturbing activities shall take place during rain events when there is potential for accumulation greater than 0.25-inch in a 24-hour period. In addition, no earth disturbing activities shall occur for 48 hours following rain events in which 0.25 inch of rain accumulation within 24 hours. ▪ <i>Biological monitoring:</i> An approved biologist shall be required to inspect and approve installation of the exclusion fence. ▪ <i>Erosion Control Materials:</i> Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibians and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic mono-filament netting (erosion control matting), rolled erosion control products, or similar material shall not be used. 	<p>Project Contractor: install wildlife exclusion fencing; use only tightly woven fiber netting or similar materials for erosion control</p> <p>Qualified/ Approved Biologist: conduct pre-construction survey and follow up pre-construction survey as required; approve and inspect installation of exclusion fencing</p>	<p>Prior to project construction</p> <p>Prior to project construction and during seasonal timeframes outlined in Mitigation Measure BIO-1a</p>	<p>BIO-1a are being implemented</p>	
<p>BIO-1b: Ensure Avoidance of Bird Nests in Active Use. Tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building demolition shall be performed in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and relevant sections of the California Fish and Game Code to avoid loss of nests in active use.</p>	<p>Coastside Fire Protection District: include Mitigation Measure BIO-1b</p>	<p>Prior to execution of the Project Contractor contract</p>	<p>Coastside Fire Protection District: Make regular, periodic visits to the project</p>	<p>Prior to construction and during seasonal</p>

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility/ Action	Implementation Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement Responsibility/Action	Date Completed/ Signature
<p>This shall be accomplished by scheduling building demolition, tree removal and landscape grubbing outside of the bird nesting season (which occurs from February 1 to August 31) to avoid possible impacts on nesting birds if new nests are established in the future. Alternatively, if building demolition, tree removal and landscape grubbing cannot be scheduled during the non-nesting season (September 1 to January 31), a pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted. The pre-construction nesting survey shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A qualified biologist (Biologist) shall conduct a pre-construction nesting bird (both passerine and raptor) survey within seven calendar days prior to tree removal, landscape grubbing, and/or building demolition. ▪ If no nesting birds or active nests are observed, no further action is required and tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building demolition shall occur within seven calendar days of the survey. ▪ Another nest survey shall be conducted if more than seven calendar days elapse between the initial nest search and the beginning of tree removal, landscape grubbing, and building demolition. ▪ If any active nests are encountered, the Biologist shall determine an appropriate disturbance-free buffer zone to be established around the nest location(s) until the young have fledged. Buffer zones vary depending on the species (i.e., typically 75 to 100 feet for passerines and 300 feet for raptors) and other factors such as ongoing disturbance in the vicinity of the nest location. If necessary, the dimensions of the buffer zone shall be determined in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. ▪ Orange construction fencing, flagging, or other marking system shall be installed to delineate the buffer zone around the nest location(s) within which no construction-related equipment or operations shall be permitted. Continued use of existing facilities such as surface parking and site maintenance may continue within this buffer zone. ▪ No restrictions on grading or construction activities outside the prescribed buffer zone are required once the zone has been identified and delineated in the field and workers have been properly trained to avoid the buffer zone area. ▪ Construction activities shall be restricted from the buffer zone until 	<p>requirements in the contract and performance standards for the Project Contractor</p> <p>Project Contractor: schedule tree removal and landscape grubbing outside nesting season; alternatively, install orange construction fencing or other marking system around buffer zone established by Qualified Biologist; restrict construction activities from established buffer zone as necessary; remove trees and conduct construction within buffer zone only after receiving written approval from County</p> <p>Qualified/ Approved Biologist: if tree removal and landscape grubbing cannot be scheduled outside</p>	<p>Prior to and during project construction</p> <p>Prior to project construction and during seasonal timeframes outlined in Mitigation</p>	<p>site to ensure that all construction timing, survey and buffer zone requirements set forth in Mitigation Measure BIO-1a are being implemented; verify that consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and/or the County is occurring as warranted.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measures	Implementation Responsibility/Action	Implementation Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement Responsibility/Action	Date Completed/ Signature
<p>the Biologist has determined that young birds have fledged and the buffer zone is no longer needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A survey report of findings verifying that any young have fledged shall be submitted by the Biologist for review and approval by the County of San Mateo prior to initiation of any tree removal, landscape grubbing, building demolition, and other construction activities within the buffer zone. Following written approval by the County, tree removal, and construction within the nest-buffer zone may proceed. 	<p>the nesting season (a) conduct pre-construction surveys; (b) determine appropriate disturbance-free buffer zone as necessary and in consultation with ; California Department of Fish and Wildlife if necessary and (c) conduct survey report to verify young have fledged and submit to County of San Mateo</p>	<p>Measure BIO-1b</p>		

LTS = Less Than Significant S = Significant SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact