

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES AGENCY

Date February 13, 2001

TO Honorable Board of Supervisors
FROM Marcia Raines, Director *M. Raines*
SUBJECT San Mateo County 1999 Trails Plan/Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Supervisors

- 1) Hear a presentation by staff on the Trails Plan/Program EIR
- 2) Open the public hearing
- 3) Close the public hearing
- 4) Adopt resolutions that
 - a) Certify the Program Environmental Impact Report adopting findings and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan as amended by the Planning Commission (see Attachment F)
 - b) Amend the General Plan Policies 6 37 and 6 38 of the Parks and Recreation Chapter to (1) support and encourage the development of the San Francisco Bay Trail, and (2) establish the San Mateo County 1999 Trails Plan as a General Plan Implementation Program respectively
 - c) Adopt the 1999 Trails Plan, as recommended by the Park and Recreation Commission and as amended by the Planning Commission (see Attachment F) to replace the 1990 Trails Plan as an Implementation Program of the General Plan

SUMMARY

The San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division, in consultation with the Trails Advisory Committee, has prepared an update to the 1990 County Trail Plan. This new plan includes regional trails previously proposed in the 1990 Plan, and adds new trails. The 1999 Trails Plan includes policies designed to ensure consistency with the General Plan and guide trail development. Trail design and management guidelines are identified in the Plan to provide guidance to the County on how to design and manage proposed trails. In many cases the policies and design and management guidelines were developed

to address environmental concerns raised when constructing and operating trails. The Trails Plan establishes a broad policy framework for continued development of trails in San Mateo County. The Trails Plan does not identify specific trail alignments, require or authorize development of specific trails, or establish a precise schedule for trail development. Rather, the Trails Plan provides a long-term vision for trails in San Mateo County.

The County has determined that the environmental effects of the 1999 Trails Plan should be addressed in a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Draft Program EIR addresses the potential environmental impacts associated with the 1999 Trails Plan. The Program EIR has been reviewed for consistency by the public, trail user groups, all of the cities in the County, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California State Parks, the San Francisco Water Department, CalTrans, Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District, the Peninsula Open Space Trust, as well as Federal and State resource agencies. The Parks and Recreation and Planning Commissions have held public hearings. Responses to comments have been sent out to all individuals or agencies that have commented.

On July 6, 2000 the Park and Recreation Commission recommended to the Planning Commission that they recommend to the Board of Supervisors that (1) the Trail Plan is consistent with the General Plan, (2) the 1999 Trails Plan should replace the 1990 Trails Plan, and (3) the Program EIR should be certified.

On November 22, 2000 the Planning Commission recommended to the Board of Supervisors that it (1) certify the Program EIR and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as amended by the Planning Commission (see Attachment F), (2) approve a General Plan amendment amending policies 6.37 and 6.38 of the Park and Recreation Chapter of the General Plan, respectively, to (a) support and encourage the development of the San Francisco Bay Trail, and (b) establish the San Mateo County Trails Plan as a General Plan Implementation Program, and (3) find that the 1999 Trails Plan is consistent with the General Plan as amended by the Planning Commission and adopt the 1999 Trails Plan to replace the 1990 Trails Plan as an Implementation Program of the General Plan.

BACKGROUND

The San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division, in consultation with the Trails Advisory Committee (TAC), has prepared an update to the 1990 County Trails Plan. The 1999 Trails Plan includes many of the trails proposed in the 1990 plan, revises previously proposed trails, and adds new trails. The 1999 Trails Plan includes policies designed to ensure consistency with the General Plan and guide trail development. Trail design and management guidelines are identified in the plans to provide guidance to the County on how to design and manage proposed trails. In many cases the policies and design and management guidelines were developed to address environmental concerns raised when constructing and operating trails. The Trails Plan establishes a broad policy framework for continued development of trails in San Mateo County. The Trails Plan does not

identify specific trail alignments on specific parcels, require or authorize development of specific trails, or establish a precise schedule for trail development. Rather, the Trails Plan provides a long-term vision for trails in San Mateo County.

The County has determined that the environmental effects of the Trails Plan should be addressed in a Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Program EIR addresses the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed San Mateo County Trails Plan (Trails Plan).

CHRONOLOGY

April 28, 1999	The County prepared an Initial Study of the Trails Plan, which determined that a Program EIR is required.
May 12, 1999	Park and Recreation Commission held a Scoping Session.
May 3, 1999	Parks Division prepared an Initial Study and began a Scoping Process.
November 2 – December 16, 1999	Draft Program EIR was circulated for public review.
December 2, 1999	Park and Recreation Commission held a hearing to consider the Draft Trails Plan/Program EIR.
June 7, 2000	Responses to Comments (Final EIR) were mailed out to those who had commented on the Draft Trails Plan/Program EIR.
July 6, 2000	Park and Recreation Commission recommended to the Board of Supervisors that the Trail Plan/Program EIR should be approved and certified respectively.
November 22, 2000	The Planning Commission recommended to the Board of Supervisors that (1) the Trail Plan/Program EIR should be approved and certified respectively as amended (see Attachment F), (2) General Plan policies 6.37 and 6.38 should be amended, and (3) that the 1999 Trails Plan should be found consistent with the General Plan as amended (see Attachment F).

A. DISCUSSION

1 1999 Trail Plan

This update of the County Trails Plan is composed of four primary elements

- 1 Proposed trail routes outside the County parks trail routes that when considered together, create a vision for a coordinated system of trails throughout San Mateo County
- 2 County Trails Policies - a set of statements relating to the implementation of the trail routes illustrated on the County Trails Plan Map
- 3 Design Guidelines
- 4 Use and Management Guidelines

The objectives of the Trails Plan are to

- Provide an updated Trails Plan with the latest general alignments
- Provide connection between municipal trail systems and County trails
- Link urban area residents with rural public lands of San Mateo County
- Develop a set of policies and guidelines that can be used during detailed trails planning
- Define environmental issues and mitigation measures to consider for trail planning, design, construction and management.
- Facilitate future environmental review of specific trail proposals
- Provide access for recreation, transportation and education benefits
- Improve access to and along the coast
- Provide trail-related recreation opportunities to County residents

Existing and proposed County trail routes are illustrated on the County Trail Plan Map (Figure 1) as (1) regional trail routes, (2) existing trail routes, and (3) proposed trail routes. Regional trail routes are those trails of National, State or regional recreation significance. In all cases, regional trail routes extend beyond the borders of San Mateo County. Regional trails are generally envisioned as multiple-use trail routes in that they would accommodate a variety of trail users. In some instances, where topography and other physical constraints dictate, separate trails along the same general trail route may be needed to accommodate different users.

2 Proposed General Plan Amendment

Staff recommends that General Plan policy 6.37 of the Parks and Recreation Chapter be amended to formally recognize that the County supports and encourages the development of the San Francisco Bay Trail.

At the time the Program EIR was written and the Park and Recreation Commission considered the Trails Plan the understanding had been that updating the Trails Plan required a General Plan amendment. However, as a result of discussions with County Counsel it is recommended that a General Plan amendment be made to add General Plan Policy 6.38 of the Parks and Recreation Chapter to designate the San Mateo County Trails Plan as a General Plan Implementation Program. Once the proposed Trail Plan is approved and the Program Environmental Impact Report is certified, it will replace the 1990 Trail Plan.

3 Consistency with Other Plans

The Trail Plan has been reviewed for consistency with the San Mateo County General Plan, Local Coastal Program, City Trail Plans, adjacent County's Plans, State Parks, and various species specific Recovery Plans. As revised and mitigated the Trail Plan has been determined to be consistent by both the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Planning Commission as revised per the Planning Commission's Letter of Decision (see Attachment I).

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

1 Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

This Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to meet the requirements and intent of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and follows the CEQA guidelines. For long-term projects with multiple approvals that will not be implemented immediately, a Program EIR is most appropriate. A Program EIR is an EIR that is prepared for a series of actions that can be characterized as part of one large project. The Draft Program EIR addresses the potential environmental impacts associated with the Countywide Trails Plan. Because the Trails Plan is necessarily general, this Draft Program EIR does not evaluate site specific conditions of any individual Countywide trail route or regional trail staging area that is proposed. In accordance with CEQA Section 15168, this Draft Program EIR serves as the primary environmental document that addresses the general and broad or whole action of adopting the Trails Plan and amending the General Plan.

The level of analysis in this Draft EIR considers the effects that may occur on a program-wide basis. The construction of specific trail segments (i.e. individual, more detailed design, construction, and management plans for trail segments) must be reviewed under CEQA to determine their specific impacts. The Program EIR is not the only environmental document for construction of the trails proposed in the Trails Plan. Rather, it serves as the primary source of information in assessing potential impacts of the Trails Plan as a whole, and in determining what additional analysis may be needed to evaluate the impacts of subsequent trail implementation projects required pursuant to an

approved Trails Plan. Future environmental review would be tiered from this Program EIR.

2 Scoping Process

In May 1999, the San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division prepared an Initial Study, circulated a Notice of Preparation to the State Office of Planning and Research, and held a Scoping Session in Redwood City to initiate environmental review of the Trail Plan. The Scoping effort was designed to facilitate identification of potentially significant environmental impacts and public and agency concerns early in the planning process. The Scoping process resulted in the incorporation of feasible mitigation measures into the Trails Plan in the form of additional policies and design and management guidelines. The policies and guidelines address the identified issues and concerns. The Trails Plan is a product of this issue identification and resolution process.

3 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

CEQA requires that alternatives to a proposed project being analyzed as part of the environmental review process. The Alternatives Analysis of the Draft EIR addressed the following:

- Limiting the types of uses permitted on trails
- Limiting the siting of potential trails to avoid environmental impacts by such measures as using only rural lands or public land, avoiding steep slopes and unstable areas, avoiding riparian areas and avoiding rare, threatened, and endangered species habitats
- Siting all trails in the Trails Plan
- No project alternative (retain existing 1990 Trails Plan with no modifications or changes)

A comparison of the proposed project and the no project alternative indicates the proposed project includes far more mitigation measures, guidelines and policies that reduce potential environmental impacts. The existing Trails Plan lacks guidelines, policies, and mitigation measures for nearly all environmental parameters. In particular, the existing plan would have greater impacts on land use, hydrology, geology, soils, air quality, visual and aesthetic resources, and solid waste. The proposed Trail Plan includes mitigation for its potential effects on these parameters, and therefore would have less environmental effects than the no action alternative.

4 List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Who Submitted Written Comments

Following a 45-day comment period from November 2 to December 16, 1999, 20 letters were received with comments on the Trail Plan/Draft Program EIR. All comments have

been responded to the Final Trail Plan/Program EIR. The Final EIR includes a listing of the persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR, contains letters received commenting on the Draft EIR, accompanied by responses to those comments, and an Errata which includes revisions to the Trail Plan and Draft EIR in response to comments. Copies of the responses to comments were mailed out to those who commented on the Draft document June 7, 2000. The complete list of commenters and the designation of the letter is provided. There were two individuals who commented at the Planning Commission hearing which led to revisions to the Trail Plan/Program EIR (see Attachment F).

C. REVIEWING AGENCIES

This Trails Plan is a Programmatic Master Plan. There will be no discretionary approvals at this stage in the planning process, except for adoption of the Trails Plan as an Implementation Program of the San Mateo County General Plan, and certification of the EIR. When the detailed planning of specific trails occurs, additional permitting will be required. Environmental documents prepared to evaluate individual trails will identify the permits that will be required.

The National Park Service (NPS) has permit authority over portions of the proposed trails on San Francisco Watershed lands. NPS concurrence is required for topography and brush cutting on San Francisco Watershed lands. When specific trails are proposed, permits may be required from additional agencies, including

- US Army Corps of Engineers (404 Permit)
- US Fish and Wildlife Service Section 10 Consultation
- US Coast Guard (Bridge Permit)
- US National Marine Fisheries Service
- California Department of Fish and Game (1601/1603 Permit)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (NPDES)
- California Coastal Commission
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
- City Flood Control Districts
- San Mateo County Flood Control District
- City/County Planning and Building Divisions

D. FISCAL IMPACT

Approval of the proposed Trails Plan and certification of the Program EIR will not result in any new fiscal impacts. No specific trails are proposed for construction at this time as part of this Trails Plan. At the time that the County proposes development of specific new trails there will likely be associated fiscal impacts which cannot be determined at this time.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Resolution certifying the Final Trails Plan/Program EIR and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting and Program as complete, correct, and adequate and prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act

Exhibit 1 – Impacts and Mitigation as identified in Program EIR

Exhibit 2 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Attachment B – Resolution amending the General Plan Policies 6 37 and 6 38 of the Parks and Recreation Chapter to (1) support and encourage the development of the San Francisco Bay Trail, and (2) establish the San Mateo County Trails Plan as a General Plan Implementation Program respectively

Attachment C – Resolution adopting the 1999 Trails Plan to replace the 1990 Trails Plan as an Implementation Program of the General Plan

Attachment D – The Draft Trails Plan/ Program EIR (October 1999)

Attachment E - Final Trails Plan/Program EIR (May 2000)

Attachment F – Planning Commission’s Letter of Decision on the Countywide Trails Plan Program EIR

RESOLUTION NO. _____

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * * * *

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN FOR THE SAN MATEO COUNTY TRAILS PLAN AS COMPLETE, CORRECT AND ADEQUATE AND PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, ADOPTING FINDINGS, AND ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

* * * * *

WHEREAS, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines and the County CEQA Guidelines provide that the County must certify that a Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for a project that may have significant environmental effects has been completed in compliance with CEQA, and

WHEREAS, on April 28, 1999, the County prepared an Initial Study of the San Mateo County Trails Plan which determined it was a project subject to CEQA, and concluded that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared to address potentially significant environmental impacts as a result of the project, and

WHEREAS, on May 3, 1999, the County prepared, published and circulated, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Preparation in order to obtain comments from interested persons and agencies on the proposed scope of the EIR, and

WHEREAS, a Scoping session was held on May 12, 1999, to solicit public comment on issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR (DEIR), and

WHEREAS, on November 2, 1999, the County completed the Draft EIR (DEIR) and the DEIR was published and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, State and local agencies and special districts, public libraries, other known interested parties, and was made available to the general public, thereby commencing a 45-day period for public review and comment on the adequacy and contents of the DEIR in accordance with the requirements of CEQA. A Notice of Completion of the DEIR specifying the public review and comment period and hearing date was posted and circulated in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, and

WHEREAS, on December 2, 1999, the Park and Recreation Commission, an appointed Commission to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, held a public hearing on the San Mateo County Trail Plan and received written and verbal comments on the DEIR which were received by the County and were made a part of the record of comments on the DEIR, and

WHEREAS, other written comments on the DEIR were received by the County during the public review period and were made a part of the record of comments on the DEIR, and

WHEREAS, on December 16, 1999, the 45-day public comment period on the DEIR terminated, and

WHEREAS, on June 7, 2000, the County completed and published the Final EIR (FEIR) containing all comments received by the County on the DEIR, responses to those comments raising environmental issues and revisions to the DEIR text made thereby, changes to mitigation measures in connection therewith, and additional environmental information with respect thereto, and

WHEREAS, the FEIR was made available to the public and distributed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, and was made available to those public agencies that had submitted comments on the DEIR, and

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires that when a public agency adopts findings pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (concerning potential significant environmental impacts that will be generated by a project being approved), the public agency must adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment,

WHEREAS, on July 6, 2000 the Park and Recreation Commission held a public hearing on the San Mateo County Trails Plan accepted public testimony concerning the FEIR, and a written transcript was made of the hearings as part of the record of proceedings concerning the FEIR, and

WHEREAS, on November 22, 2000, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the San Mateo County Trails Plan, accepted public testimony concerning the FEIR, a written transcript was made of the hearings as part of the record of proceedings concerning the FEIR, and revisions were made to the mitigation measures (as identified in Attachment F), and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors received and the Board of Supervisors has heard, and has been presented with and is familiar with all of the information in the administrative record, has reviewed and considered the information in the DEIR, and the FEIR for completeness and compliance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the County's CEQA Guidelines, and has independently reviewed and analyzed the FEIR

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors that, based on the foregoing facts and circumstances, and the administrative record concerning the EIR, which includes the public written and oral testimony received on the DEIR and the FEIR that the Board of Supervisors find and determine that

- 1 The San Mateo County Trails Plan Program EIR is complete, correct and adequate and prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act
- 2 The FEIR consists of the following documents

- a The Draft EIR (October 1999)
 - b The FEIR (May 2000), which includes (1) revisions to the DEIR made in response to comments, (2) comments received from the public, written and oral, and written responses to public comments, and (3) the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (August 2000)
 - c Supplemental responses to public comments
- 3 All comments made on the DEIR that raised environmental issues were responded to adequately in the FEIR and in supplemental responses pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, and the FEIR does not contain significant new information requiring additional public review
 - 4 The FEIR reflects the independent judgment of the County
 - 5 The FEIR has been completed and processed in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and the County's CEQA Guidelines
 6. The Statement of Findings and Facts in support of Findings regarding the San Mateo County Trails Plan, attached to this Resolution as Exhibit 1, is adopted.
 - 7 The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the San Mateo County Trails Plan, a copy of which is attached to this Resolution as Exhibit 2, is adopted

Exhibit 1

Impacts and Mitigations as Identified in the Program EIR

LAND USE IMPACTS

- 1 The proposed Trails Plan could result in trails being constructed without proper maintenance being provided
- 2 The trails proposed in the Trails Plan will not be adequately patrolled
- 3 There will not be sufficient funds to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented
- 4 Parties responsible for ensuring the implementation of mitigation measures are not identified
- 5 The project will result in the conversion of prime farmland to non-agricultural uses
- 6 The project will have impacts in the areas of safety and liability on adjacent agricultural lands

Finding

- 1 Trails Plan Policy 6 29 1 requires a trail management plan to be prepared prior to constructing a trail Trails Plan Management Guidelines 3 1 through 3 9, and 6 0 provide provisions for the maintenance of trails
- 2 Management Guidelines 5 1 through 5 7 identify the Parks and Recreation Division as the agency responsible for patrolling County Trails Management Guideline 5 8 2 seeks to augment County security patrols with additional volunteers
- 3 San Mateo County will be responsible for funding all mitigation measures in its jurisdiction because this is a San Mateo County project Trails Plan Policy 6 13 1 requires that Design and Development Plans are prepared whenever a new trail is proposed and this plan will include implementation of mitigation measures
- 4 The mitigation-monitoring program will specify detailed responsibility for monitoring mitigation measures and reporting

- 5 Mitigation Measure 5.2.1 requires that proposed trails be located to avoid prime farmland where possible. If a purchase, lease or easement is granted, then the proposed trail would traverse prime farmland in a manner that will not result in interference with agricultural activities. Operators of agricultural activities shall be consulted to identify appropriate routes on lands they cultivate.
- 6 Trails Policy 6.12.1, Management Guideline 1.3.2, and Design Guideline 2.1 provide measures to protect trail uses through warning signs and set back allowances. Management Guideline 1.4.1 provides for trail closure where adjacent land uses may present unsafe conditions, which could affect the trail user.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

GEOLOGY AND SOIL IMPACTS

- 1 Trail construction or use could create conditions leading to soil erosion. In particular, siting of trails on slopes (in excess of 10%) could lead to erosion. Erosion, in turn, could result in several secondary impacts, such as siltation of aquatic habitats.
- 2 Trails located in or near areas of geologic instability (areas prone to landslides, unstable slopes, or falling rocks) could pose a safety hazard for trail users.
- 3 The Trails Plan may not be consistent with General Plan Policies with respect to geology and soils.

Finding

- 1 Design Guidelines 3.4.2, 3.5, 3.6 and 4.1.1, and Management Guidelines 3.5 and 4.0, combined with the existing County grading ordinance identified in Section 5.3.2, will avoid potential erosion impacts, including potential cumulative effects.
- 2 Design Guideline 1.5 requires that surveys shall be conducted as part of trail route site planning to identify the occurrence of any potentially hazardous geologic conditions. It also requires that such areas shall be avoided or that necessary construction design measures be incorporated into the design of the trail to assure that

users will not be exposed to the identified hazard. Mitigation Measure 5.3.1 outlines specifics on how Design Guideline 1.5 will be carried out.

3. Mitigation Measures 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 will ensure that the Trails Plan is consistent with General Plan Policies 4.16 and 15.24, respectively.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY IMPACTS

1. Trails may alter surface drainage patterns, which could lead to gullyng and related erosion and water quality problems.
2. Staging areas may contribute urban contaminants to storm water runoff and thereby add to the cumulative and regional problem of non-point source water pollution.
3. Trails may generate polluted or increased surface water runoff or may affect groundwater resources.
4. Equestrian and other trail use may cause water quality impacts to watersheds.

Finding

1. Design Guidelines 1.3.3.1 and 1.3.5.1 through 1.3.5.3 will mitigate potential drainage impacts along with Mitigation Measure 5.4.1. This measure defines a specific requirement to comply with erosion control policies in the County General Plan and County Local Coastal Program and shall be incorporated into the Trails Plan Design Guidelines.
2. Mitigation Measure 5.4.2 specifies that Design Guideline 1.3 shall be amended to require the use of storm water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) at staging areas to reduce potential water quality impacts.
3. Design Guidelines 1.3.3.1, 1.3.3.2, 1.3.3.3, 1.3.3.4 provide trail setbacks, the use of natural trail materials within 100 feet of riparian zones, and trail crossings of streams and drainages that minimize disturbance to soils. Design Guidelines 3.4.2, 3.5.1,

3.5.2, 3.5.3, 3.5.4 and 3.5.5 establish a set of criteria that encourage the use of trail surfaces that reduce runoff, limit grading and soil disturbance, distribute runoff efficiently, and require erosion control plans where necessary. Mitigation Measure 5.4.3 specifies that Design Guideline 1.3 shall be amended to require minimum setbacks from seeps, springs, and farm ponds wherever possible.

4. Design Guideline 1.3.5.1 provides that new equestrian trails shall be sited perpendicular to “blue line” streams (as mapped on USGS 7.5 minute Quad maps) and major drainages (as determined during preparation of individual trail Design & Management Plans), with 300-foot buffer zones (150 feet on each side) to minimize impacts from trail runoff. Design Guideline 1.3.5.2 provides that new equestrian trails shall not be located within 150 feet of the high water line of any reservoirs.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES IMPACTS

1. Vegetation in sensitive habitats may be lost or degraded due to trail construction, maintenance, or use.
2. The construction, maintenance, and use of trails in or adjacent to streams, salt/brackish marsh, riparian or other wetland habitats could result in degradation of water quality by increasing erosion and sedimentation or by introducing pollutants into watercourses.
3. Trail use on proposed routes that are within or adjacent to habitat for special-status species could adversely affect those species.
4. The construction of trails over perennial streams could interfere with the movement of native fish.
5. Construction of proposed trails in, and increased human activity and access to areas that were previously inaccessible could increase disturbance to plants and wildlife.
6. Trail construction could require cutting of heritage or significant trees if not properly sited.
7. Trail construction and operation could facilitate the spread of invasive exotic plants into undisturbed areas.

Finding

- 1 Design Guidelines 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3, in the Trails Plan will reduce the potential impacts on biological resources. Management Guideline 1.3.2 allows limits on trail use where sensitive habitats are present. Mitigation Measure 5.5.1 requires that Design Guideline 1.3.2.1 shall be revised so that to the maximum extent feasible, trail alignments shall avoid impacts to sensitive habitats, including habitats for special status plants and animals.
- 2 Design Guideline 1.3.3 includes many specific techniques for trail construction near or through sensitive wetland habitats including streams, salt marsh, brackish marsh, and riparian corridors. If trails occur in or near sensitive aquatic habitats that might be susceptible to water pollution, trail use restrictions could be established according to Design Guideline 1.3.2.2. Mitigation Measure 5.4.2 calls for devices to be installed in staging areas to control storm water to reduce potential water quality impacts to adjacent habitats.
- 3 Design Guideline 1.3.1.4 requires the preparation of biological assessments. Mitigation Measure 5.5.3 modifies Design Guideline 1.3.1.4 by providing specific guidance regarding the procedures and content of these assessments.
- 4 Design Guidelines 1.3.3.3 and 4.1.1 specify that trails shall be designed to minimize disturbance to streams at stream crossings through the use of culverts and bridges. Mitigation Measure 5.5.4 revises Design Guidelines 1.3.3.3 by including specific guidance.
- 5 Design Guidelines 1.3.1.2 to 1.3.1.4, and 1.3.4 call for minimizing vegetation removal, installing barriers to control trail use, and conducting biological assessments for proposed trail routes.
- 6 Although the Trails Plan has no policies or guidelines regarding removing or trimming trees, it does specify that vegetation removal shall be minimized (see Design Guidelines 1.3.1 and 1.3.2). Design Guideline 1.3.1.4 has been revised with Mitigation Measure 5.5.3 to specify that biological assessment shall include an evaluation of impacts to heritage and significant trees and recommendations to redesign the trail to avoid these resources.
- 7 Design Guideline 3.6 provides that any cut or fill slopes shall be immediately reseeded or replanted with vegetation native to the area. In addition, noxious plants would be controlled along the trail.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION IMPACTS

1. New trails may increase the demand for parking off-street or in staging areas beyond their capacity.
2. Trail routes crossing at or near roads represent a potential safety hazard because of increased traffic conflicts between trail users and motor vehicles.
3. The Trails Plan may generate enough trips to increase travel on roadways beyond their carrying capacity, thereby creating a traffic hazard.
4. New trails may attract off-road vehicles, which could endanger trail users.
5. The Trails Plan may not be consistent with General Plan Policies with respect to transportation and traffic.
6. Multiple-Use trails could cause trail user conflicts.

Finding

1. Mitigation Measure 5.6.1 requires that a design guideline shall be added to the Trails Plan that states: "Regional staging areas are to be designed to adequately accommodate and manage anticipated parking use levels to prevent overflow parking onto local neighborhood streets and, ideally, be located on or near a public transit route." Mitigation Measure 5.6.2 requires that a management guideline shall be added to the Trails Plan as follows: "After the trail has been constructed an annual survey of parking utilization shall be conducted at peak periods of use. Where parking utilization substantially exceeds the supply of parking, additional parking shall be provided or the trail shall be closed until sufficient parking is provided or demand for parking is reduced. If a trail is closed information shall be provided to indicate to those who cannot be accommodated where other trailheads are located that will accommodate them."
2. Trails Plan Policies 6.4.2, 6.4.7, 6.13.1 and Design Guidelines 2.6, 3.1.2, 4.2.2, and 4.3.3 require that the design and development of trails address safety and use concerns, including motor vehicle traffic and roadways.

- 3 Design Guideline 1 1 5 requires that trail routes be selected to minimize intersections with motorized vehicles Design Guideline 4 3 3 requires use of safety signs to alert trail users to hazardous conditions Traffic that would be generated would occur mostly outside of peak use periods and would be less than 100 trips during the peak hours for the all of the proposed trails of the Trails Plan

- 4 Trails Plan Policy 6 5 2 precludes use of motorized vehicles on trails except for emergency, maintenance or use by handicapped trail users Trails Plan Policy 6 4 2 requires that the types of use be controlled to avoid unsafe use conditions Management Guideline 1 3 1 requires that trails be designated for specific uses and that signs be installed to notify trail users Mitigation Measure 5 6 3 requires that a policy be added to the Trails Plan as follows A speed limit of 15 miles per hour (MPH) shall be placed on all trails that permit cyclists and other trail uses (e g , pedestrian, equestrian) Signs shall be located at trail entrances that indicate that a 15-MPH speed limit is in effect (The 15-MPH speed limit was selected because it is used in the State Park system on trails)

- 5 Mitigation Measure 5 6 4 will ensure that the Trails Plan is consistent with General Plan Policies 6 30, which is listed on Table 5 1 1

- 6 Trails Plan Policy 6 4 2 requires that the levels of use and types of use on trails be controlled to avoid unsafe use conditions Management Guideline 1 3 1 states that in cases where a trail is restricted to a particular type of user(s), the trail shall be clearly designated as such and shall be equipped with use signs and appropriate barriers to discourage unauthorized use Design Guideline 4 3.2 requires that trail signs portray which types of trail use is appropriate, permitted or prohibited on the trail. Design Guideline 1 1 6 also states that at intersections of Multiple-Use trails or where off-street bicycle trails intersect with on-street bicycle routes not at a road intersection, there should ideally be a 15' turning radius and 25' sight clearance between the two trail routes Mitigation Measure 5 6 3 above provides a speed limit of 15 miles per hour for cyclists when other trail uses (e g , pedestrian, and equestrian) are permitted on the trail

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures

NOISE IMPACTS

- 1 Trail construction could generate unusual amounts of noise

2. Trail users could generate unusual amounts of noise
3. Trail users could be exposed to unusual amounts of noise

Finding

1. Trails Policy 6.4.4 requires that all trails be evaluated for their potential environmental impacts under CEQA. This would include an evaluation of trail construction on local noise levels. Design Guidelines 1.1.2 and 1.2.1 will further reduce the potential effect of noise generated by trail construction on sensitive receptors.
2. Design Guidelines 1.1.2 and 1.2.1 require that trails be sited away from potentially sensitive noise receptors.
3. Design Guidelines 1.1.2 and 1.2.1 address this issue by requiring that trails be sited away from some potential sources of noise.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS

1. Construction of trails can generate dust, which may adversely impact nearby sensitive receptors.

Finding

2. Design Guidelines 1.1.2 and 3.8, combined with existing County grading and zoning ordinances identified in Section 5.8.2, will mitigate potential dust impacts.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

VISUAL RESOURCES IMPACTS

- 1 Construction of trails on steep slopes or near ridgelines may cause permanent, vivid changes to the character and quality of the surrounding scenic landscape
- 2 Location, construction, and maintenance of trails on hillsides composed of highly erodable soils may exacerbate erosion that may, in itself, create a vivid contrast in the surrounding landscape
- 3 Construction of facilities in regional staging areas (an area at a trailhead, which provides an area to meet and park vehicles) in landscapes that are open and visually accessible from surrounding areas could result in a vivid change in landscape character.
- 4 The Trails Plan may not be consistent with General Plan Policies with respect to visual resources

Finding

- 1 Design Guidelines 1 4, 2 3, 3 4 2, 3 6, and Management Guideline 4 0 will mitigate the potential for adverse visual effects
- 2 Design Guidelines 3 4 2, 3 5 1 through 3 5 4, and 4 1.1 provide design recommendations for minimizing earthwork and potential erosion under normal circumstances Design Guideline 3 5 5 calls for development of an erosion control plan by a qualified professional as part of the trail construction documentation Management Guideline 3 5 states that corrective work for damage or erosion problems shall be performed within a reasonable period of time, and where necessary, barriers to prevent further erosion shall be erected until problems are corrected
- 3 Mitigation Measure 5 9 1A Modify Design Guideline 1 2 1 to read Space shall be provided for berms and landscaping that shall be used where necessary to reduce noise from reaching sensitive receptors such as residences and to screen views to the staging area from surrounding areas
- 4 Mitigation Measure 5 9 1B Add Design Guideline 4 11 titled Visual Screening to read Screening berms, perimeter planting, and parking area trees that provide a canopy shall be used at regional staging areas to visually buffer views into the staging area from sensitive view points, or to block views of incompatible surrounding land uses as seen from inside the staging area
- 5 Mitigation Measures 5 9 2, 5 9 3, and 5 9 4 will ensure that the Trails Plan is consistent with General Plan Policies 4.21, 4 23, 4 47, 4 59, 4 63, and 4 64

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

CULTURAL RESOURCES IMPACTS

Trails may lead to the loss or disturbance of cultural resources if routed through or near cultural resource sites.

Finding

- 1 Design Guidelines 1.3.1.1 and 3.7, Mitigation Measures 5.10.1, 5.10.2, and 5.10.3, and the County policies and review requirements established in the 1986 General Plan will minimize potential impacts to cultural resources. Mitigation Measure 5.10.1 requires that Design Guideline 3.7 be modified as follows: Trail design shall avoid adverse impacts to cultural resources.

If avoidance is not possible, avoiding areas where resources are known to exist should minimize impacts. Mitigation Measure 5.10.2 requires that during excavation of each individual trail, construction shall cease if cultural resources are discovered until a qualified archaeologist has studied the resources. The archaeologist shall identify the proper course of action to reduce project impacts on cultural resources. This shall include studying and reporting on the site to ensure that data is available to future researchers. Material recovered shall be donated to an appropriate repository for future study. Mitigation Measure 5.10.3 requires that, if prehistoric archaeological deposits that include human remains or objects considered "cultural items" according to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act are discovered during construction, the County Coroner and a qualified archaeologist shall be notified immediately and NAGPRA regulations shall be followed.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

PUBLIC SERVICES IMPACTS

- 1 Trail alignments in areas of flammable vegetation may increase the threat of wildland fire
- 2 The Trails Plan may result in a significant safety hazard related to wildland fire by proposing trails in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones This would increase the potential for wildland fires to occur by increasing human access in these zones
- 3 New public trails and staging areas could result in an increased potential for crime, vandalism, or other nuisances affecting both the trail user and adjacent properties
- 4 The development of public trails will encourage more trail use and could result in an increased rate of accidents, thereby placing an additional burden on police and emergency services
- 5 In rural unincorporated areas of the County, the development of public trails could increase police and emergency response times
- 6 If not properly maintained, trails could cause significant impacts to adjacent land uses, soils, biological resources, public safety, or aesthetic resources
- 7 Trail users will not have sufficient restroom facilities and may therefore create a health hazard
- 8 The Trails Plan may not be consistent with General Plan Policies with respect to public services

Finding

- 1 Design Guideline 1 3 6 titled Wildland Fire provides siting criteria that minimizes this potential impact
- 2 Design Guideline 4 9 addresses the potential increase in wildland fire threat by requiring water sources for fire fighting and use of fire resistant vegetation In addition to this Guideline, Management Guidelines 1 4 1 and 1 4 6 allow trail closure during the high fire season Mitigation Measure 5 11 1 requires that when individual trails are being designed, the CDF Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps shall be reviewed as well as the Hazards Map in the County of San Mateo General Plan Areas of high fire hazard shall be avoided or trail closure shall occur when fire hazard is deemed high
- 3 Trails Plan Policies 6 13 1 and 6 13 3 provide that design and development plans will be prepared prior to any development of new trail segments to address issues of safety, as well as other matters Trails Plan Policy 6 29 1 provides for the preparation of management plans prior to the development of any new trail routes to provide operation and maintenance services necessary to provide for the safety and support of

trail users. These plans will include provisions to ensure that adequate patrols are provided. Management Guidelines 5.8.1 and 5.2 would mitigate potential impacts on security and other nuisance factors by requiring the County to patrol trails in the County jurisdiction and cooperative agreements for patrolling other trails.

4. Trails Plan Policies 6.13.1 and 6.13.3 provide that design and development plans will be prepared prior to any development of new trail segments to address issues of safety. This will ensure that adequate security is available. In addition, Design Guideline 1.6 provides that during trail implementation, trail planners will locate trail alignments and access points to allow the trails to also serve as emergency access routes.
5. Trails Plan Policies 6.13.1 and 6.13.3, require design and development plans to be prepared prior to development of new trail segments to address safety issues. This will ensure that adequate police protection is provided. Design Guideline 1.6 provides that for remote trails, emergency access points will be located approximately every two miles along the trail, and should provide either ground vehicle access, or helicopter landing sites.
6. Trails Plan Policies 6.29.1, 6.29.3 through 6.29.6, and Use and Management Guidelines 3.1 through 3.9 ensure that trails will be maintained properly, avoiding potential impacts.
7. Mitigation Measure 5.11.2 requires that a policy shall be added to the Trails Plan that requires toilets to be provided at regional staging areas.
8. Mitigation Measure 5.11.3 will ensure that the Trails Plan is consistent with General Plan Policy 15.26.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

SOLID WASTE IMPACTS

1. The Trails Plan may not comply with San Mateo County's Integrated Waste Management Plan Source Reduction and Recycling Element.
2. Litter along trails and at staging areas may adversely impact trail users or adjacent landowners if not adequately controlled.

Finding

- 1 Mitigation Measure 5 12 1 shall be added as a design guideline and states that recycling receptacles, which accept glass, metal, and plastic, shall be included at staging areas Recycled materials shall be picked up as part of the routine maintenance of the trails and brought to a recycling facility
- 2 Trails Plan Policies 6 29 3 and 6 29 4 assign the County Parks and Recreation Division with the responsibility of providing adequate ongoing maintenance of its trail system unless other trail managing organizations agree to assume the responsibility for maintenance consistent with County policies and guidelines Design Guideline 4 3 2 requires that information about litter control shall be included in use signs located at trail access points Management Guidelines 5 8 1 and 5 8 2 call for minimum patrols on trails and use of volunteers for some trail maintenance, including litter control Mitigation Measure 5 12 2 shall be added as a design guideline It states that trash receptacles shall be included at staging areas, slightly beyond the beginning point of a trail where it is accessible to maintenance vehicles but not accessible to public vehicular access

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IMPACTS

- 1 Trail users may be exposed to hazardous materials if trails and their staging areas are constructed on or near hazardous materials sites
- 2 Herbicides may be used during the maintenance of trails to remove weeds in the trail path Improper use of herbicides may harm public health and the environment
- 3 Trails may be located adjacent to land uses, such as agriculture, where hazardous materials are used and may be harmful to trail users

Finding

- 1 Trails Plan Policy 6 4 7 recommends that trails are located to recognize the resources and hazards of the areas they traverse Mitigation Measure 5 13 1 requires the research of local, state, or federal government hazardous sites lists prior to the siting of trails and staging areas to determine if the area is a hazardous materials site

- 2 Mitigation Measure 5.13.2 requires that mechanical removal of undesirable vegetation (which may include grazing) from the trail path shall be employed whenever possible. If herbicides must be used, they shall be applied, handled, and disposed of according to applicable regulations and manufacturers instructions. An individual who is properly trained in their application shall apply these chemicals.
- 3 Trails Plan Policy 6.32.1 requires that trails shall be temporarily closed when conditions become unsafe. Design Guideline 1.1.3 requires that trail structures such as fences, barriers and signing shall be used to deter trail users from leaving the trail and encountering unsafe conditions in areas where trails would pass adjacent land uses. In addition, when requested by the adjacent property owner, temporary closures shall be employed during intermittent operations, such as agricultural spraying, that would jeopardize the safety of an otherwise safe trail.

Statement in Support of Finding

No impacts are expected to occur as a result of the adoption of the Trail Plan. Impacts could occur as the result of the construction or improvement of specific trails. When specific projects are proposed they will be evaluated for CEQA compliance, and any potential impacts identified will be reduced to a level of insignificance as the result of the recommended mitigation measures.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Introduction

All County of San Mateo departments shall consider using the San Mateo County Trails Plan in the design and implementation of trails in the County. Those agencies that recommended mitigation measures for the Trails Plan should consider using the Trails Plan in developing trails in San Mateo County. The lead County department or other lead agency proposing trail development and performing California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review would be responsible for implementing the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

MMRP

If San Mateo County adopts the Trails Plan and any of the mitigation measures from its Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the County must also adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the measures intended to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6, subdivision (a). Subdivision (b) of this Public Resources Code section states that, "Conditions of project approval may be set forth in referenced documents which address required mitigation measures or, in the case of the adoption of a plan, policy, regulation, or other public project, by incorporating the mitigation measures into the plan, policy, regulation or project design." (Emphasis added)

The County will satisfy this reporting requirement by adopting the incorporated mitigation measures as policies into the San Mateo Trails Plan and the related General Plan Amendment. Therefore, no actions under the adopted Trails Plan in the future would be allowed unless the mitigation measures are implemented. Mitigation measures would be implemented at the appropriate time as specified in the Trails Plan on a case-by-case basis when specific trail projects are carried out. Agencies and governing bodies responsible for implementing and

monitoring the mitigation measures are indicated in conjunction with each mitigation in the EIR and include

- County Parks and Recreation Division
- County Parks and Recreation Commission
- County Planning Department
- County Planning Commission
- County Department of Public Works
- County Public Works Commission
- County Board of Supervisors

A more specific description of mitigation measures and agencies responsible for implementing and monitoring the mitigation measures is included in the document entitled Impacts and Mitigations as Identified in the Program EIR, which is attached as Exhibit 1 to Attachment B (resolution recommending certification of TEIR

RESOLUTION NO. _____

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION AMENDING POLICIES 6.37 AND 6.38 TO THE PARKS AND RECREATION RESOURCES CHAPTER OF THE SAN MATEO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN TO (1) SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL AND (2) TO ESTABLISH THE SAN MATEO COUNTY TRAILS PLAN AS A GENERAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM.

RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California, that

WHEREAS, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has requested that the County amend its General Plan to state its explicit support for the development of the San Francisco Bay Trail, and

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Commission has asked that the County amend its General Plan to establish the San Mateo County Trails Plan as an implementation program for the General Plan,

WHEREAS, public notice of all hearings before the Planning Commission to consider these requests was made to ensure maximum public participation and all interested parties were afforded the opportunity to be heard on these proposed amendments

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED AND ORDERED

that the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo hereby adopts the General Plan amendments as shown in Exhibit A to amend Policy 6.37 and to add Policy 6 38 to the Parks and Receptions Resources Chapter of the San Mateo County General Plan

EXHIBIT A

General Plan Amendments

6 37 Bayfront Park and Recreation Facilities

- a Support, encourage, and participate in the development of a coordinated and linked system of park and recreation facilities and public access along San Francisco Bay
- b Specifically, support and encourage the development of the San Francisco Bay Trail, a regional trail that will eventually ring the San Francisco Bay

6 38 San Mateo County Trails Plan

- a Support, encourage and participate in the development of a system of trails that link existing and proposed park and recreation facilities within this County and adjacent Counties
- b Particularly encourage the development of trails that link park and recreation facilities on San Francisco Bay to those on the Pacific Coast, multi-use trails where appropriate and trails in County lands under management by other public agencies. Ensure that these trails do not adversely affect adjacent land uses
- c Develop and adopt a San Mateo County Trails Plan as an implementation program of the General Plan. Amend and update the San Mateo County Trails Plan from time to time to respond to changing needs and conditions.

RESOLUTION NO. _____

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 1999 TRAILS PLAN, AS AMENDED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO REPLACE THE 1990 TRAILS PLAN AS AN IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM OF THE GENERAL PLAN

RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California, that

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Commission has asked that the County amend its General Plan to establish the San Mateo County Trails Plan as an Implementation Program for the General Plan,

WHEREAS, public notice of all hearings before the Planning Commission to consider these requests was made to ensure maximum public participation and all interested parties were afforded the opportunity to be heard on these proposed amendments,

WHEREAS, this Board finds that the 1999 Trails Plan, as amended by the Planning Commission, is consistent with the General Plan,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 1999 Trails Plan, as amended by the Planning Commission (see Attachment F) is hereby adopted to replace the 1990 Trails Plan as an Implementation Program of the General Plan

MEMORANDUM

SAN MATEO COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES AGENCY

DATE: February 5 2001

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Marcia Raines, Director *M. Raines*

SUBJECT: Board of Supervisors consideration of Trails Plan Program EIR at the February 13 2001 meeting

Copies of the Draft Trails Plan Program EIR (Attachment D) and Final Trails Plan Program EIR (Attachment E) are available for viewing at the County Managers Office. Copies of the reports can be attained by sending a request to the County Parks and Recreation Division 455 County Center, 4th Floor Redwood City CA 94063 or by calling (650) 363-4020



Planning and Building Division

County of San Mateo

Mail Drop PLN122 · 455 County Center 2nd Floor Redwood City
California 94063 · Telephone 650/363-4161 · Fax 650/363-4849

Board of Supervisors

Rose Jacobs Gibson
Richard S. Gordon
Mary Griffin
Jerry Hill
Michael D. Nevin

Planning Administrator
Terry L. Burnes

Attachment F

Please reply to: Sam Herzberg
(650) 363-1823

December 20, 2000

Subject: Countywide Trails Plan/Program EIR

On November 22, 2000, the Planning Commission took public testimony, reviewed the Park Department's Countywide Trails Plan/Program EIR and made recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding certification of the Environmental Impact Report, consistency with the General Plan and replacement of the Trail Plan adopted in 1991, as follows:

A. Adopted Resolution Number 3157 recommending that the Board of Supervisors certify the Program Environmental Impact Report, with the following revisions:

Mitigation Measure 5.2.1 on page 5.2.4 should be revised to read:

Proposed trails shall either be located to avoid prime agricultural lands and lands designated as suitable for agriculture or traverse such lands in a manner that does not result in interference with agricultural activities or substantially reduce the agricultural potential of those lands—~~farmland where possible or to traverse prime farmland in a manner that will not result in interference with agricultural activities.~~ Operators of active agricultural activities shall be consulted to identify appropriate routes on lands they cultivate. The agricultural activities and the agricultural potential of traversed lands shall be protected and buffered from trail user impacts by means of distance, physical barriers (i.e. sturdy fences), or other non-disruptive methods.

Mitigation Measure 5.5.3 on page 5.5.14, which establishes Design Guideline 1.3.1.4, should be revised to read:

Biological resource assessment shall be conducted as specific trail routes outside of urban areas are implemented. Assessments shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and will include surveys for sensitive habitats and special status species in the appropriate seasons. These assessments will include recommendations to align the trail to avoid impact to sensitive habitats, special status species, and heritage and significant trees. If avoidance

~~is not possible, the assessment will propose mitigation to reduce impacts to these resources to a level below significance.~~ If any trail alignment may affect such resources, the County will consult with the appropriate agencies (i.e. the California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, **and National Marine Fisheries Service**) to ensure that impacts will be avoided or mitigated as adequate. The report will also discuss the trail's consistency with relevant local and regional conservation and recovery plans, ~~including~~ (i.e. the Recovery Plan for Serpentine Species (1998) and the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan). **If mitigation is not feasible to a level of insignificance the trail should not be constructed at that location. Conflicts between trail alignment and resource protection shall be decided in favor of resource protection.**

- B Adopted Resolution Number 3158 recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- C Adopted Resolution Number 3159 recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve a General Plan Amendment amending Policies 6.37 and 6.38 of the Parks and Recreation Chapter of the General Plan, respectively, to (1) support and encourage the development of the San Francisco Bay Trail, and (2) establish the San Mateo County Trails Plan as a General Plan Implementation Program
- D Recommended that the Board of Supervisors find that the 1999 Trails Plan is consistent with the County General Plan
- E Recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt the 1999 Trails Plan to replace the Trails Plan adopted in 1990 as an Implementation Program of the General Plan, with the following revision:

Policy 6.4.1 on page 3.0.16 should be revised to read:

“Locate, design and develop trail routes with sensitivity to their potential environmental, recreation, and other impacts on adjacent lands, private property, and utilities. If the location of a trail is proposed in a sensitive habitat or wetland and trail use is not allowed by the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program or State Coastal Act, then an alternative trail route ~~should~~ **must** be considered.”

Sam Herzberg
December 20, 2000
Page 3

For information and questions regarding the Countywide Trails Plan/Program EIR, please contact Sam Herzberg at 650/363-1823.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kan Dee Rud". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kan" being the most prominent.

Kan Dee Rud
Planning Commission Secretary
Pcd1122k.kr doc

cc Public Works
Building Inspection
Environmental Health
Assessor
George Cattermole
Ron Sturgeon
Iean Rusmore