

2009 Housing Element
Initial Study

and

**NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

2009 Housing Element, Hillsborough, CA

Date: June 9, 2009
Town of Hillsborough, San Mateo County

NAME OF PROJECT/DESCRIPTION

Town of Hillsborough 2009 Housing Element: The proposed 2009 Housing Element addresses housing needs and opportunities for the 2007-2014 planning period, as required by State Planning Law. The purpose of the Housing Element Update is to identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs, and to identify objectives, policies and programs which the Town intends to implement to address those needs. The Town of Hillsborough's housing allocation requires that the Town plan for 86 new units between 2007 and 2014. Of these units, 34 units would need to be within the lower income categories. A citizens' "Housing Element Steering Committee" was appointed to develop the Draft Housing Element. The Committee included citizens from different geographic areas and economic segments within the Town, financial and real estate professionals, decision-makers, etc., to identify key policies and develop strategies to maximize affordable housing opportunities for the community.

The proposed Housing Element is a policy level document. It provides policy direction for the implementation of various programs to accommodate the housing needs of projected population growth, and to encourage the production of housing units in a range of prices affordable to all income groups.

While adoption of the Housing Element Update results in no direct physical impacts on the environment, the Town has prepared an Initial study to analyze potential environmental impacts to traffic, air quality, public services, biological and cultural resources, and climate change.

PROJECT PROPONENT

Town of Hillsborough, 1600 Floribunda Avenue, Hillsborough, CA 94010

FINDING

It is hereby found that the above-named project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

INITIAL STUDY

An Initial Study of this project was undertaken and prepared in accordance with the Town's environmental guidelines for the purpose of ascertaining whether this project might have a significant effect on the environment. A copy of the Initial Study is on file with the Town of Hillsborough, 1600 Floribunda Avenue, Hillsborough, CA 94010 and by reference incorporated herein. Such Initial Study documents reasons to support the above finding.


Signature

4/9/09
Date

Director of Building and Planning
Title

Name: Elizabeth S.R. Cullinan

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Project Description, Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

Town of Hillsborough 2009 Housing Element: The proposed Housing Element Update addresses housing needs and opportunities for the 2007-2014 planning period, as required by State Planning Law. The purpose of the Housing Element Update is to identify and analyze existing and projected housing needs, and to identify objectives, policies and programs which the Town intends to implement to address those needs. The Town's of Hillsborough's housing allocation requires that the Town plan for 86 new units between 2007 and 2014. Of these units, 34 units would need to be within the lower income categories. A citizens' "Housing Element Steering Committee" was appointed to develop the Draft Housing Element. The Committee included citizens from different geographic areas and economic segments within the Town, financial and real estate professionals, decision-makers, etc., to identify key policies and develop strategies to maximize affordable housing opportunities for the community.

The proposed Housing Element is a policy level document. It provides policy direction for the implementation of various programs to accommodate the housing needs of projected population growth, and to encourage the production of housing units in a range of prices affordable to all income groups.

The Town of Hillsborough is located on the San Francisco Peninsula, in San Mateo County, and contains approximately 6.1 square miles of land. The Town is surrounded by the cities of Burlingame and San Mateo, as well as unincorporated portions of San Mateo County. The Town is characterized by steep slopes and lush vegetation. The community is unique in that it consists mainly of low density residential development, with a minimum lot size of ½ acre, with no commercial or industrial uses. The only non-residential uses within the Town are public facilities, parks and open space land, private and public schools, the Burlingame Country Club and the Hillsborough Racquet Club. Hillsborough is mainly built-out.

Required Permits

At a minimum, the following approvals will be required:

- Town of Hillsborough
- California Department of Housing and Community Development
- San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission;
- City/County Association of Governments

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: 2009 Housing Element
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Town of Hillsborough; 1600 Floribunda Avenue, Hillsborough, CA 94010
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Elizabeth S.R. Cullinan, Director of Building and Planning: 650 375 7416
4. Project Location: Town of Hillsborough, San Mateo County, California
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Town of Hillsborough; 1600 Floribunda Avenue, Hillsborough, CA 94010
6. General Plan Designation: Single Family Residential; Open Space; Public Facilities
7. Zoning: Single Family Residential
8. Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):
- Town of Hillsborough
 - California Department of Housing and Community Development
 - San Mateo County Airport Land Use Commission

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Dangerous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project WOULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

I hereby certify that this Negative Declaration, along with the attached Initial Study was released for public review beginning April 3, 2009 through May 4, 2009.



Signature

April 3, 2009

Date

Elizabeth S.R. Cullinan
Printed Name

For Town of Hillsborough

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
I. AESTHETIC – Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19,20&46
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	1,5,15,19,20&46
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19,20&46
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19,20&46
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,19&42
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,19&26
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5&19

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19&20
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19&20
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19&20
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19&20
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19&20
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services?	<input type="checkbox"/>		X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19&20
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services?	<input type="checkbox"/>		X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19&20

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetland as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,15,19&20
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident of migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19&20
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,6,19&20
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,6,19&20

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archeological resource as defined in code 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19,20 &32
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19&20
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19&20

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk or loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State of Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19, 20&30
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19, 20& 30
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19, 20&30
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19, 20&30
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,9,15,19, &20
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,9&30
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,9&30
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	N/A

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19&20
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19&20
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste time within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19,20
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19,20&41
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	14,15,19&20
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19&20
g) Impair implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,8,12,15,19 & 20
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	8,15,19&20

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	4,6,9,15,19&20
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,15,19&20
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,15,19&20
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate of amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,15,19&20
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	4,9,15,19&20
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	4,9,15,19&20
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,7,9,15,19 & 20
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,7,9,15,19 & 20
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,9,15,19 & 20

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19 &20
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,15,19 &20
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,6,15, 19&20
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,15&20
X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project?					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,15,19 & 20
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally - important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,15,19 & 20
XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,6,15, 19&20
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	6,15,19 & 20
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise level in the project vicinity above the levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,15,19 & 20
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	5,15,19 & 20
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	14,15, 19&20

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19&20
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19&20
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19&20
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19&20
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES -					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable services rations, response times or other performances objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	8,12,15,19,20&33
i) Fire Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ii) Police Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iii) Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
iv) Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
v) Other public facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
XIV. RECREATION -					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19,20&33
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19&20

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:					
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	12,15,19&20
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion/management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,15,19&20
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	15,19&20
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	9,12,15,19&20
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	12,15,19& 20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	6,12,15,19& 20
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,9,15,19, 20
XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,15,19&20
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,15,19&20
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,15,19&20

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,15,19&20
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	9,15,19&20
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	6,15,19,20 &33
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5,9,15,19,20

XVII. GLOBAL WARMING – Would the project:

a. Result in reduced energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,47,48&49
b. Create renewable energy sources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,47&48
c. Include water conservation and efficiency measures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	6,15,47&48
d. Reduce solid waste generation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	6&15
e. Include sustainable land use measures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	6&15
f. Include transportation reduction measures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or a wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19&20
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probably future projects?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	15,19&20

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? X 15,19& 20

SOURCES -

1. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
2. State Planning and Zoning Law
3. Subdivision Map Act
4. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit
5. General Plan
6. Municipal Code
7. Composite Flood Hazard Areas - HUD National Flood Insurance Program
8. Fire Authority
9. City Engineer
10. Planning Director
11. Geologic Consultant
12. Police Department
13. School District
14. Airport Land Use Committee Plans
15. Project Plans and Reports
16. Soils Report
17. Environmental Impact Report
18. Environmental Checklist
19. Field Inspection
20. Experience with other projects of this size and nature
21. Aerial Photography
22. USGS Data Contribution
23. California Natural Diversity Database
24. Federal Environmental Standards
 - a) Water Quality Standards 40 CFR 120
 - b) Low-Noise Emission Standards 40 CFR 203
 - c) General Effluent Guidelines & Standards 40 CFR 401
 - d) National Primary & Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards 40 CFR 50
25. State/Federal Environmental Standards
 - a) Ambient Air Quality Standards
 - b) Noise Levels for Construction Equipment
26. Williamson Act Maps
27. Bay Area Air Pollution Control District Air Pollution Isopleth Maps
28. California Natural Areas Coordinating Council Maps
29. Census
30. Town Geological Map
31. California Water Service
32. Historical Resource Inventory
33. Public Works Director
34. ABAG Projections
38. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans
39. San Mateo County Congestion Management Program
40. South Bayside System Authority (SBSA)
41. San Mateo County Hazardous Materials Site Map
42. Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency
43. Building Official
44. Department of Fish & Game
45. US Army Corps of Engineers
46. Town of Hillsborough Design Guidelines
47. Sustainable Hillsborough Resolution
48. Green Building Ordinance
49. Town of Hillsborough Greenhouse Gas Emissions Report Prepared by CSG Consultants Dated May 5, 2009

SECTION II – EXPLANATION OF “LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT” AND “POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATED” ANSWERS

I. AESTHETIC:

Although the project does not involve a specific proposal and is a policy level document, residential improvements present a potential new source of light, changes to historical resources, changes to existing architecture and neighborhood design patterns, and changes to landscape. However, the Town of Hillsborough has adopted Design Guidelines and an appointed Architecture and Design Review Board who reviews aesthetic impacts in detail. Additionally, the Town has a historic resources inventory and follows the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to process potential historic resources. Therefore, the 2009 Housing Element presents a less than significant aesthetic impact.

III. AIR QUALITY:

Increased construction and density can result in increased traffic and consequent impacts to air quality. However, the draft Housing Element contains policies and programs rather than or specific projects. The policies and programs contained in the Housing Element related to the relaxation of processing second units could increase the number of accessory living units within the Town. While the Regional Housing Needs Allocation of 86 new units represents an approximate 2% increase in the number of total dwelling units in Hillsborough, the program objectives result in the potential for the creation of 206 new units or an approximate 5% increase over a seven year period. However, 82 of these units are incidental/secondary dwelling units, resulting in the potential for 124 new primary residences (including 15 multi-family units on institutional lands) and 36 units (9 primary residences and 27 second units) have already been constructed. Therefore, there does not appear to be a significant adverse impact to traffic or air quality. Construction requirements currently in place would successfully mitigate construction-related air quality impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, the City Council recently introduced a Green Building Ordinance requiring the incorporation of sustainable building measures into new construction, thereby reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Town of Hillsborough provides habitat to a number of threatened, endangered and species of special concern, creeks and oak woodland. However, the specific location and design of future development projects that implement proposed Housing Element programs will not be known until project-specific land use/development plans are formulated. There is the potential for these plans to result in significant impacts to biological resources on a project-specific basis. Implementation of these plans will require subsequent discretionary approval and associated environmental review pursuant to CEQA, at which time project-specific impacts related to biological resources can be more specifically defined and site-specific mitigation measures can be identified to reduce those impacts, where appropriate.

The type of development supported by the proposed Housing Element programs involves growth within developed urban areas of densities that are respectful of environmental resources. Additionally, the Open Space and Conservation Element of the General Plan includes a goal to ensure the continued preservation, protection and restoration of the natural features and resources of the Town. The Town has dedicated approximately 260 acres to permanent open space, thereby preserving significant amounts of land in its natural state and preventing significant impacts to natural resources.

Because the proposal is a policy level document and future discretionary projects would be reviewed on a project-specific basis consistent with CEQA and the Town's General Plan, the 2009 Housing Element would not have a significant environmental impact to biological resources within the community.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Incorporated in 1910, the Town of Hillsborough's long history is exemplified in its existing architecture and historic features. There is also evidence of pre-European activities within the Town limits, and environmental studies have identified prehistoric sites. During 1989 and 1990, the Town of Hillsborough was comprehensively surveyed for historic buildings. The goal of the survey was to identify buildings that have historical significance and/or are architecturally unique, versus those buildings that, while old, provide little historical or local significance. As a result of the survey, private and public potentially historic resources were identified, representing various periods of the community's history, including the Early Subdivisions (1885-1915), the Great Estates (1900-1930) and the Later Subdivisions (1916-1940).

In response to past threats of demolition of important historic structures, the Town adopted a Historic Preservation Ordinance that provides Town discretion over the demolition of all or part of identified historic structures. Additionally, the Town uses CEQA to identify and process alterations to other potential historic resources.

The Town will continue to enforce its adopted Historic Preservation Ordinance, as well as require development proposals subject to environmental review to survey for important historic and prehistoric resources. Since the proposed Housing Element programs do not involve the adoption of site specific land use/development plans, the Housing Element would not result in direct impacts to cultural resources. Additionally, *net* new construction goals of the Housing Element would not substantially impact historic resources since, with the exception of second dwelling units, they would be constructed on vacant land rather than involve the tear down or substantial remodel of an existing residence. Second units on historic properties would be required to meet the Secretary of Interior Standards or undergo CEQA. Additionally, site specific land use/development plans are subject to further discretionary approval and environmental review, at which time any potential site-specific impacts on cultural resources would be identified, and any necessary avoidance or mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts would be recommended, as appropriate.

Because the proposal is a policy level document and future discretionary projects would be reviewed on a project-specific basis consistent with CEQA and the Town's General Plan and Municipal Code, the 2009 Housing Element would not have a significant environmental impact to cultural resources within the community.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

As reflected in its name, Hillsborough is hilly, with areas of steep slopes, especially along its creeks and canyons. The steeper slopes have the potential for erosion, slippage and landslides. The majority of the Town is underlain by disturbed soil, identified as urban land or orthents. The rest is comprised of Fagan Loam, Los Gatos Loam, Maymen Gravelly Loam and Obispo Clay, all of which are on slopes of 15 percent or more. The Barnabe-Rock Outcrop Complex, Fagan Loam, Los Gatos Loam and Maymen Gravelly Loam have a high to very high potential for erosion, however, many of the areas with these soils types are protected within open space areas. The Obispo Clay has a lower potential for erosion.

Because of the excess of steep terrain, the Town currently allows limited new development to occur on some of the steeper slopes. To address the concern of potential slope failure, the Town requires development to meet current engineering standards. Also, the Town has an ordinance requiring any new subdivisions on slopes over 10 percent to provide larger lots, thereby allowing development on less environmentally constrained areas of a lot. Additionally, land divisions involving slopes of greater than 20% would be subject to environmental review.

Hillsborough is located within the seismically active San Francisco Bay region, one of the most seismically active zones in the United States. The faults in the region are capable of generating earthquakes of at least 8.0 in magnitude on the Richter Scale, producing very strong ground shaking in Hillsborough. The closest fault line to Hillsborough is the San Andreas Fault, which runs along the western boundary of the Town. There are no fault lines identified within the Town limits and the Town is not within an Alquist-Priolo designated zone, so the risk of seismically induced ground rupture is low. Earthquake hazards in Hillsborough also include secondary effects, such as earthquake induced land sliding, subsidence, liquefaction, tsunami and seiche. Due to the Town's inland location, there is a low potential for tsunamis to affect the community. Areas in Hillsborough with the most potential for seiche include Crocker and Spencer Lakes, water towers and, to a lesser extent, private pools.

The Town requires new construction to be built using the most recent building codes to minimize potential damage to structures as a result of an earthquake. The proposed programs do not alter geotechnical requirements or permit additional construction in geologically hazardous areas. No significant geotechnical impacts are expected in association with the proposed Housing Element.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

The residents of Hillsborough and students/employees within the private and public schools are at risk of man-made hazards, such as criminal activity, improper disposal of and exposure to hazardous materials, air pollution and fire. However, Hillsborough currently has the lowest crime rate in the Bay Area. Additionally, as a primarily residential community, Hillsborough does not contain large amounts of hazardous materials, nor does it experience higher than normal transportation of hazardous materials on its circulation system since there are limited appropriate cross-town routes. Personal use of household hazardous materials, such as pesticides and fertilizer, is the most common occurrence of hazardous materials within the community. The California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is authorized by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to enforce and implement federal hazardous materials laws and regulations, including disposal and transportation of hazardous materials.

There is one identified underground storage tank (UST) within the community that is used for fuel storage, as well as several above-ground storage tanks. All of the storage tanks have been constructed or retrofitted to meet safety regulations. There is one UST in the Burlingame County Club maintenance area, one above-ground fuel container at the Corporation Yard, two diesel above-ground tanks at fire stations and an additional storage tank at the Police Department. The County is responsible for the regulation of USTs. In addition to the known storage tanks, old, unused heating oil storage tanks are still occasionally found on residential property. These tanks are typically found when a property is being renovated and do not pose a health risk to the community.

There are portions of Hillsborough within a State designated "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones". New construction in these areas, as well as areas near Open Space, is required to meet Wildland Urban Interface codes. To ensure that there is adequate fire protection throughout San Mateo County, fire departments in the County cooperate on a county-level planning approach. The county fire protection system, which includes Hillsborough, is designed to provide an adequate level of service for urban areas with a minimum of 39 stations. A County Joint Powers Authority oversees the Advanced Life Support (ALS) program (paramedic program) and sets response standards for both the fire service agencies, which provide a highly trained paramedic as the first responder to a call, and American Medical Response (AMR) which provides the ambulance transportation.

Since there are limited potential hazardous materials generators in Hillsborough, hazardous materials are regulated by the San Mateo County Health Department, the EPA and the DTSC, and because the proposal is a policy level document, the 2009 Housing Element would not have a significant hazards or hazardous materials impact on the community.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Town uses a stormwater collection system, in conjunction with the natural creek drainage system, to manage run-off. The Town has influence over the quality of water in the four watersheds within which it is located, which also contain several small creeks and two lakes, Crocker and Spencer. The watersheds, from north to south, include Mills Watershed, Sanchez Watershed, San Mateo Watershed and Pulgas Watershed. Water quality in Hillsborough's watersheds is potentially threatened by common urban pollutants in stormwater runoff. However, new construction is required to comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. Additionally, the Conservation and Open Space Element has policies to reduce potential pollution associated with run-off and preserve the water quality of the creeks and the watershed as a whole.

Beginning in February 2004, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) implemented a system-wide change to use chloramine as the residual disinfectant to meet current and future water quality regulations. While the Town of Hillsborough has limited direct control over protecting the quality of its drinking water before it is received from the SFPUC, Hillsborough does have direct influence over the maintenance of its water supply infrastructure system. The Town monitors the water it distributes to residents in Hillsborough and maintains the distribution system to ensure a high quality supply. Additionally, the Town has been actively improving its water and sewer systems by replacing water storage tanks, pump stations, fire hydrants and main distribution lines. The Town is near build-out and the existing water system can accommodate existing and proposed development conditions.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps areas subject to 100-year floods as part of its National Flood Insurance Program. For Hillsborough, the only area that FEMA has identified as being within the 100-year flood plain is along the San Mateo Creek, in the southern portion of the Town. Another source of potential flooding is related to dam inundation from the Lower Crystal Springs Dam on San Mateo Creek, and to a smaller extent from the dams that were built to create Crocker and Spencer Lakes. Flooding would only occur in the unlikely event that the dams failed, and would affect those areas downstream from the dams.

Because of mandatory NPDES requirements, federal and state water quality requirements, Town improvement efforts, and because the proposal is a policy level document, the 2009 Housing Element would not have a significant hydrological or water quality impact to the community.

XI. NOISE

Increased density and construction can result in increased traffic and consequent impacts to noise levels. However, the draft Housing Element contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. The policies and programs contained in the Housing Element related to the relaxation of second units could increase the number of accessory living units within the Town. Since the 2009 Housing Element represents an approximate 3% increase in the number of primary dwelling units in Hillsborough, there does not appear to be a significant adverse impact in relation to traffic or noise. Also, future projects would need to be consistent with the General Plan and Municipal Code noise standards and thresholds for both temporary construction noise and project long term noise impacts.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The population of Hillsborough was 10,894 in the year 2008, according to Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2007. Hillsborough's population is projected by ABAG to increase by 506 people (less than 5%) between the years of 2008 and 2015. These projections indicate that it is the population driving the housing needs rather than new development driving population. The Housing Element would then serve as meeting a future unmet need and reducing impacts associated with a lack of housing/affordable housing. Therefore, the Housing Element would not substantially affect population growth or exceed regional or local population projections.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Increased population can result in the need for increased public services. However, the draft Housing Element contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. Since the 2009 Housing Element represents an approximate 3% increase in the number of primary dwelling units in Hillsborough, there does not appear to be a significant adverse impact in relation to public services. Additionally, Hillsborough has park-in-lieu and school impact fees for new development, as well as a public safety tax assessment applied per household to accommodate increased population and corresponding public service needs/impacts.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Increased construction and density can result in increased traffic. However, the draft Housing Element contains policies and programs rather than specific projects. Specific projects will be reviewed for their cumulative impact on the Town's circulation system. Since the 2009 Housing Element represents an approximate 3% increase in the number of primary dwelling units in Hillsborough, there does not appear to be a significant adverse impact to traffic. Construction requirements currently in place would successfully mitigate construction-related traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The proposed policies and programs would not result in a need for new systems or supplies or substantial alterations to power and natural gas, communications, water treatment or distribution facilities, sewer, storm water drainage, solid waste disposal or water supplies, which will continue to be provided by the existing service providers. There will be no conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. However, future specific projects will be reviewed for potential impacts to utilities and service systems, with particular attention to limited resources such as energy and water.

While new home construction creates a greater need for utilities, the Town has recently introduced a Green Building Ordinance requiring sustainable building measures to be incorporated into residential improvements. Additionally, the Sustainable Hillsborough Task Force implemented a Solar Program aimed at creating incentives for installation of solar panels and, therefore, renewable energy sources. The Town has an existing water efficient landscape regulation and is working on sub-regional level to address further water efficient landscape requirements effective in 2010. The Town has an existing recycling regulation which requires the recycling of construction materials. Hillsborough's recycling ordinance has resulted in a substantial (approximately 50%) reduction in solid waste generation.

XVIII. GLOBAL WARMING

There is a general scientific consensus that worldwide climate change is occurring, caused in whole or in part, by increased emissions of greenhouse gases that keep the Earth's surface warm by trapping heat in the Earth's atmosphere. Studies have shown that climate change effects in California may include changes in air quality, water supply, hydrology (including sea level rise), agriculture, and ecosystems/wildlife. Climate change is a global issue caused by the cumulative effects of millions of individual decisions. Development projects may contribute incrementally to climate change, but with no measurable direct impacts. This section addresses greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that can reasonably be associated with construction and operation of the proposed project and the potential for those emissions to contribute individually or cumulatively to global climate change.

California is a substantial contributor of GHG emissions as the second largest contributor in the U.S. and the sixteenth largest in the world. In 2004, California produced 492 Tg CO₂e, which is approximately seven percent of the total nationwide GHG emissions. On the other hand, among the states, California has the 4th lowest per capita rate of GHG emissions, due to its temperate climate and to its enhanced energy regulations. The major source of GHG in California is transportation, contributing 41 percent of the State's total GHG emissions. Electricity generation is the second largest source, contributing 22 percent of the State's GHG emissions.

Notwithstanding the level of scientific attention that has been devoted to global warming, no accepted analytical methodology currently exists to determine the significance of a project's impact on global climate change either on a stand-alone basis or cumulatively. For example, the Intercontinental Panel on Climate Change has stated that difficulties remain in attributing temperature changes on smaller than continental scales and over time scales of less than 50 years. Although this section attempts to quantify the likely GHG emissions of the project, it is generally agreed that climate change is caused by the cumulative impact of many projects over time and that the emissions of any one project cannot be demonstrated to be substantial enough to have any material impact on global climate change. Additionally, while it is possible to project the gross level of GHG emissions associated with a particular project, it is not possible to determine whether its level of emissions is individually significant. In the absence of a generally recognized analytical protocol, CEQA does not require speculation. Therefore, this section does not identify a threshold of significance or make a significance determination as to the project's individual or cumulative contribution to global climate change.

The difficulty in assessing the impact of the project is magnified by the fact that issues of GHG emissions and climate change are fundamentally different from other areas of an air quality impact analysis, which are linked to some region or specific area in which the impact is significant. In the context of global warming, the majority of emissions that could be generated by a land development project would not necessarily qualify as "new" emissions that are specifically attributable to the proposed project in question. The approval of a new development project does not, for example, necessarily create new or additional vehicle miles travelled (VMT), which is the primary source of project emissions, in the global context. People moving to a particular California jurisdiction or county are in some cases switching their individual VMT and resultant GHG emissions from one place to another, rather than creating a new emission. This conclusion holds true, regardless of whether the relocating citizen is from within or outside of the State of California. The Town, as the entity with land use control, has only limited control over VMT through its land use and siting decisions. Emissions associated with VMT cannot be avoided, since the proposed project is accommodating growth and it can reasonably be assumed that VMT associated with such growth would occur somewhere, resulting in GHG emissions contributing to global climate change. The Town can influence VMT to only a limited extent through implementation of Smart Growth measures incorporated into the project as project design features.

The Town also recognizes the limitations inherent in quantifying any nexus between the calculated GHG emissions of individual projects and the predicted environmental changes that could be caused by global temperature increases. Absent such quantification, the Town has no authority, pursuant to CEQA or otherwise, to impose mitigation measures on the project to address speculative project impacts on global climate change (see, CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(4)).

Most human activities, including construction and occupation of residential and commercial/retail developments, result in GHG emissions. Greenhouse gas emissions occur in connection with many activities associated with development, including emissions related to construction equipment, building materials, vegetation clearing, natural gas usage, electrical usage (since electricity generation by conventional means is a major contributor to GHG emissions) and transportation. This section focuses on the larger sources of anthropogenic (human caused) GHG emissions, such as transportation related emissions, energy consumption emissions, and solid waste emissions which are the major sources of GHG emissions including carbon dioxide (CO₂), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and methane (CH₄).

However, in order to disclose potential impacts of the project on climate change, the Town has studied the potential greenhouse emissions resulting from the 2009 Housing Element projections. The increased development necessary to accommodate Hillsborough's projected housing needs can result in increased greenhouse gas emissions. While the Regional Housing Needs Allocation of 86 new units represents an approximate 2% increase in the number of total dwelling units in Hillsborough, the program objectives result in the potential for the creation of 206 new units or a 5% increase over a seven year period. However, 82 of these units are incidental/secondary dwelling units, resulting in the potential for 124 new primary residences (including 15 multi-family units on institutional lands) and 36 units (9 primary residences and 27 second units) have already been constructed. This results in a growth potential of primary residences of approximately 3%. Therefore, adoption of the 2009 Housing Element does not appear to be a significant adverse impact to global warming.

In the study base year of 2005, the Town of Hillsborough released 92,116 metric tons of CO₂e through its residential, commercial, transportation and waste operations. The 88 primary dwelling units and 82 second dwelling units projected in the 2009 Housing Element are projected to release an additional 5,329 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (CO₂e: one metric ton of methane emissions equals 21 metric tons of CO₂e). With the Town's sustainable programs, this amount would be reduced by 1,100 metric tons, resulting in an estimated release of 4,229 metric tons per year over the planning period. This would be less than a 5% increase from the 2005 base level year studied. However, the 1,100 metric ton reduction only takes into account the Town's recently adopted Green Building Ordinance, and does not take the solar education and energy efficiency (or other future and existing state) programs into consideration for both existing and

projected dwelling units. Therefore, the resulting greenhouse gas emissions are likely to be less than a 5% increase over the planning period.

The Town of Hillsborough has acknowledged the importance of the reduction of GHG emissions and has acted upon those concerns in a variety of ways including adoption of the plans and programs associated with Smart Growth Principles, which are features of the Project, described below:

- ❖ Hillsborough's General Plan contains existing policies endorsing water efficiency, the preservation of open space and natural resources, energy conservation and recycling, safe pedestrian and bicycle routes, and the reduction of traffic congestion.
- ❖ The Town of Hillsborough has adopted a Green Building Ordinance requiring a tiered minimum level of green building measures in new construction.
- ❖ In 2007 and 2008 the Town adopted a Resolution endorsing the U.S. Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement and adopted a Sustainable Hillsborough Task Force to address global warming impacts.
- ❖ In 2009 the Town implemented a Solar Program aimed at creating incentives for installation of solar panels and, therefore, renewable energy sources.
- ❖ The Town has commenced work on a Climate Action Plan.
- ❖ The Town is near completion of a greenhouse gas inventory.
- ❖ The Town is considering adoption of enhanced Sustainable Land Use policies within the General Plan.
- ❖ The Town has an existing water efficient landscape regulation and is working on sub-regional level to address further water efficient landscape requirements effective in 2010.
- ❖ The Town has an existing recycling regulation which requires the recycling of construction materials. Hillsborough's recycling ordinance has resulted in a substantial (approximately 50%) reduction in solid waste generation.
- ❖ The Town has recently relaxed and proposes to further relax its second dwelling unit requirements. Second dwelling units are a method of providing affordable, sustainable housing that allows the elderly to age in place. The legislative intent of allowing second units without governmental constraints is a method of providing "housing for family members, students, the elderly, in-home health care providers, the disabled, and others at below market prices within existing neighborhoods". Additionally, Second units ease a rental housing deficit, ease impact on infrastructure and assist low and moderate income property owners with supplemental income. Hillsborough has generated 49 units during the prior planning period and is projecting the creation of 82 new second units during the current planning period.
- ❖ The Town of Hillsborough participates in the pre-tax public transportation program, allows telecommuting and has recently installed a bike rack at Town Hall.
- ❖ Hillsborough has participated in the Grand Boulevard Initiative and endorsed the project by Resolution.
- ❖ The Town of Hillsborough actively participates in the City/County Association of Bay Area Governments (C/CAG) on a sub-regional basis to resolve traffic impacts throughout San Mateo County.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

While the Regional Housing Needs Allocation of 86 new units represents an approximate 2% increase in the number of total dwelling units in Hillsborough, the program objectives result in the potential for the creation of 206 new units or a 5% increase over a seven year period. However, 82 of these units are incidental/secondary dwelling units, resulting in the potential for 124 new primary residences (including 15 multi-family units on institutional lands) and 36 units (9 primary residences and 27 second units) have already been constructed, yielding an approximate 3% growth in primary residences. Therefore, project impacts are less than significant.

Additionally, cumulative effects of the project do not present a considerable contribution to environmental impacts. The Housing Element policies and programs do not have environmental impacts that are cumulatively significant. The Housing Element includes methods of meeting state mandated housing numbers, but does not include or imply approval of any specific project. Town Staff will undertake individual and cumulative environmental analyses of specific projects consistent with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Housing Element will assist Staff in such cumulative analyses by outlining Town-wide development possibilities and providing a preliminary general overview of potential development impacts to resources, services and transportation systems. The California Environmental Quality Act generally exempts individual, small in-fill development projects and second dwelling units.