

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST**
(To Be Completed by Planning Department)

1. **Project Title:** Four (4) farm labor housing units, Fifth Crow Farms at Cloverdale Ranch.
2. **County File Number:** PLN2023-00297
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Olivia Boo, Project Planner; oboo@smcgov.org
5. **Project Location:** 4309 Cloverdale Road, Pescadero
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 086-270-010, 549 acres
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Sandy Sommer, Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, 5050 El Camino Real, Los Altos, CA 94022 and Peninsula Open Space Trust, 222 High Street, Palo Alto, CA 94301
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** NA
9. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture
10. **Zoning:** Planned Agricultural District/Coastal Development (PAD/CD)
11. **Description of the Project:** Planned Agriculture District Permit (PAD), Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and Grading Permit for the construction of four (4) farm labor housing units, a new septic system, two 10,000-gallon fire water storage tanks, a fire hydrant, 8 parking spaces and conversion of an agricultural well to domestic use on a 549-acre property in Pescadero. Vehicle access improvements are proposed to provide access to the farm labor housing units and to comply with fire turnaround requirements. A total of 850 cubic yards of grading and no tree removal is proposed. The project site is located in the Cloverdale Road County Scenic Corridor. The CDP is appealable to the California Coastal Commission.
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The property is accessed by Cloverdale Road. It is developed with several barns, packing shed, storage shed, and 10 potable water storage tanks that support the farming on site. Butano Creek borders along the east property line, with a portion of the creek encroaching onto the parcel, at a location north of the proposed development. The subject parcel is covered with non-native vegetation. The surrounding parcels are made up of a mix of developed and undeveloped parcels. The developed parcels largely consist of low-density residential and/or agricultural development.
13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** N/A

14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?:** The project was sent by certified mail to the recommended list of California Native American tribes as recommended by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The notice yielded no comments from the tribes.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Aesthetics		Energy		Public Services
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Recreation
X	Air Quality		Hydrology/Water Quality		Transportation
X	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning	X	Tribal Cultural Resources
X	Climate Change		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
X	Cultural Resources		Noise		Wildfire
X	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		Mandatory Findings of Significance

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1.a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project site is located within the Pescadero Road and Cloverdale Road County scenic corridors. The project proposed will be at the southern portion of the parcel, approximately 1.5 miles south of the intersection of Cloverdale Road and Pescadero Creek Road. The parcel is bordered by Bean Hollow Road along the western property line. The subject parcel is relatively flat. The proposed fire hydrant, water tanks and farm labor housing units will be located in the eastern portion of the parcel, approximately 750 feet from Cloverdale Road (the nearest public road). A dense corridor of riparian vegetation along Butano Creek intervenes public view of the project site</p>					

<p>from Cloverdale Road. The structures will be conditioned to be painted earth tone colors to blend with the rural agriculture and open space surroundings.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Geographic Information System (GIS), Project Plans.</p>					
1.b.	Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed project will not damage or destroy scenic resources. There are no trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings within the project area. See 1.a. regarding discussion of scenic corridor impacts.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
1.c.	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, such as significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				x
<p>Discussion: The farm labor housing units and water tanks will not significantly alter the fairly flat topography of the parcel. Approximately 850 cubic yards of fill is proposed for the farm labor housing units but is not expected to impact or significantly degrade the existing visual characteristics of the site.</p> <p>The property is developed with one barn and agriculture sheds located near the northern side of the property. There is an existing dirt access road at the eastern side of the parcel near Cloverdale Road. The project site is not on a ridgeline.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
1.d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			x	

Discussion: The farm labor housing units may have exterior lighting for safety and evening visibility purposes and are not expected to produce significant glare. Local Coastal Program policy 8.18 requires exterior lighting to be limited for safety purposes and shielded to the subject parcel. No further mitigation is required.

Source: Project Plans.

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

Discussion: See staff's response to 1.a.

Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System.

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

Discussion: The project is not located within a Design Review District and does not conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions.

Source: Zoning Maps, General Plan.

1.g.	Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?				x
------	--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The parcel is located within the rural surroundings of the Pescadero area. The vicinity includes agricultural fields, residential development, heavy vegetation, Butano creek along the east property line, hills, flatlands and low-density development. Construction of the farm labor housing units, parking area and water tanks is not expected to significantly impact the rural scenic qualities found in the area. The water tanks will be ground level structures, will be conditioned to be painted earth tone colors, and will not significantly intrude on natural scenic qualities. The farm labor housing units will be two story structures, 19 feet height, and the water tanks are at a proposed 8 feet height and will be conditioned to be painted an earth tone color. No tree removal is proposed.

Source: Google Maps, Project Plans.

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

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a. For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				x
<p>Discussion: No Impact. The project is not located outside the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Geographic Information System, Project Location.</p>				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				x
<p>Discussion: The property is not located within an open space easement or under a Williamson Act contract. The subject parcel is zoned Planned Agricultural District and in the Coastal Zone. The zoning designation requires that the proposal preserves and fosters existing and potential agricultural operations. The property grows organic artichokes, parsnips, potatoes and winter squash. The conversion of the agricultural well to a domestic well will support the farm labor housing. The property has riparian waer rights to Butano and Arroyo de los Frijoles Creeks. An in-stream diversion from Butano Creeek supplies sufficient surface water for the agricultural operations. When stream flow is low and pumping from the creek is not adequate, an existing small off-stream reservoir is used. There are nine 5,000-gallon tanks on site, located in the farm area that also serve as irrigation reservoir. An existing well, approved and drilled in 2018 is currently used for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
2.c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				x
<p>Discussion: The project proposes farm labor housing units, a new septic system, two fire water storage tanks, a fire hydrant, 8 parking spaces, conversion of an ag well for domestic use, and a total of 850 c.y. of fill. The farm labor housing units are proposed on LCC Class 2 soils.</p> <p>Review of the Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey and Soil Survey San Mateo Area, the soil types are CuA and Ma. CuA is classified as Class II agricultural soil if irrigated and has a California Revised Storie Index Rating of Grade 2 – Good, which is considered prime agricultural land under the County’s definition. Ma is Grade 3 - Fair grading, which is not classified as prime agricultural land. The project will convert a small area of Class 2 soils; however, the remainder of the parcel remains available for continued farming. The property does not contain</p>				

forestland. The development is clustered and located near a property line which preserves the bulk of the land for farming.

Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System, Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Map.

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

x

Discussion: See response to 2.c.

Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System.

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

x

Discussion: See response to 2.c.

Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System.

2.f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

x

Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.

Discussion: The area proposed for development is not defined as forestland or timberland production. The parcel does not have trees. Forestland is land that can support 10 %native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for the management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. No rezoning is proposed, and the land has not been used as timber land (no timber harvesting) and is not a Timberland Preserve Zone (TPZ); the project parcel is zoned PAD/CD (Planned Agricultural District/Coastal Development). The proposed project will not conflict with any existing zoning as farm labor housing, and associated infrastructure, is allowed in the PAD Zoning District subject to a PAD Permit.

Source: County Zoning Map and Regulations.

<p>3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
3.a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	x		

Discussion: The project involves no tree removal, moderate grading, and typical construction activities associated with the proposed residential units.

The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD’s) 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP). The project and its operation involve minimal hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide, CO2) air emissions during construction, whose source would be exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal cars of construction workers) as the primary fuel source is gasoline. Due to the site’s rural location, potential project air emission levels from construction would be increased from general levels. However, any such construction-related emissions would be temporary and localized and would not conflict with or obstruct the Bay Area Air Quality Plan. Similarly, once construction for the farm labor housing and associated infrastructure is completed, the project would have minimal impacts to air quality standards. The BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions as defined in the BAAQMD’s 2017 CEQA Guidelines but does not require quantification of construction emission due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. The BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all feasible construction best management practice measures to minimize emissions from construction activities. The BAAQMD provides a list of construction-related control measures that they have determined, when fully implemented, would significantly reduce construction-related air emissions to a less than significant level. These control measures have been included in Mitigation Measure 1.

Mitigation Measure 1: Upon the start of excavation activities and through to the completion of the project, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that the following dust control guidelines are implemented:

- a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
- b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
- c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.

- e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- f. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
- g. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
- h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.
- i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously).

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District 2017 Clean Air Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines May 2017.

3.b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?			x	

Discussion: The San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is a State designated non-attainment area for Ozone, Particulate Matter (PM10) and Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5). Non-attainment area is an area considered to have air quality worse than the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as defined in the Clean Air Act Amendment of 1970. On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attained the 24-hour PM-2.5 national standard. However, the Bay Area will continue to be designated as "non-attainment" for the national 24-hour PM-2.5 standard until the BAAQMD submits a "re-designation request" and a "maintenance plan" to the EPA and the proposed re-designation is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. A temporary increase in PM-2.5 in the project area is anticipated to occur during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. Therefore, any construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations will reduce the potential effects of increased PM-2.5 to a less than significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 would minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level. No further mitigation is necessary.

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?			x	
--	--	--	---	--

Discussion: Sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, hospitals, schools, daycare facilities, elderly housing and convalescent facilities. Pescadero High School is over 4,000 feet northeast of the project site. Pollutants are limited to that of construction vehicles, activities associated with the farm labor housing and are not expected to continue once the infrastructure and construction is completed. Though pollutant emissions generated from the construction of the proposed project will be temporary in nature, they have the potential to negatively impact nearby sensitive receptors. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 would minimize negative impacts to a less than significant level. No further mitigation is necessary. Also see discussion under 3.a.

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			x	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The project would result in short-term grading related emissions, such as fugitive dust and exhaust from construction vehicles. However, the project site is located in a remote, rural area where the closest residence is located over 500 feet away. No objectionable odors are expected once the farm labor housing infrastructure is installed. Odors resulting from construction vehicles may occur (e.g., gasoline and diesel-fueled construction equipment), however these odors would be temporary in nature.

Source: Project Scope.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
4.a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service?		x		
<p>Discussion: A biological report prepared by Sol Ecology, biological consultant, cites eleven (11) special status plants documented within five miles of the Project Study Area. Of these 11 species, none are present or have the potential to occur in the Project Study Area due to past disturbance and historic tilling of the project area.</p>				

The Project Study Area does not have trees and is comprised of a fallow agricultural field covered in non-native species. Grasses observed included soft chess, rattail six weeks grass, foxtail barley, and annual bluegrass.

Other herbaceous species included mustard, field bindweed, scarlet pimpernel, California burclover, wild radish, common groundsel, fava bean, spring vetch, and bird's eye speedwell. One native species, pineapple weed, was observed.

Riverine

More than 100 feet away from the proposed Project footprint to the northeast is Butano Creek which flows along the west to northwestern boundary of the Project Study Area. Butano Creek is a perennial creek that is within the Pescadero Creek Watershed. The creek channel is very wide, averaging about 20 feet. The banks are very steep with a lot of erosion on both banks. At the time of the April 2023 biological survey, flows within the creek were about 3 to 4 feet deep. No aquatic vegetation was present in the creek due to recent rain. The creek is designated critical habitat for coho salmon (central California coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU), and steelhead Distinct Population Segment (DPS)).

Riparian

The riparian corridor associated with Butano Creek consists of dense vegetation dominated by a contiguous canopy consisting of red willow and arroyo willow; this habitat is located more than 50 feet to the northeast of the proposed project footprint. Plant species observed in the understory consisted of blue elderberry, California blackberry, and annual stinging nettle. Abundant wildlife was present in the riparian corridor. Birds observed included song sparrow and Allen's hummingbird. Mammals included brush rabbit, and a large San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (SFDFW) nest complex. Both Allen's hummingbird and SFDFW are considered special status species.

Special Status Species

Special-status species include plants and wildlife species that have been formally listed, are proposed as endangered or threatened, or are candidates for such listing under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). These acts protect both listed species and those that are formal candidates for listing.

Plant species on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Rare and Endangered Plant Inventory (Inventory) with California Rare Plant Ranks (Rank) of 1 and 2 are also considered special-status plant species. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern, CDFW California Fully Protected species, USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern, and CDFW Special-status Invertebrates are all considered special-status species. Furthermore, CDFW Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) prohibits the take of actively nesting birds as well as common bats and their roosts (CDFW Code only). Lastly, special-status species include all rare or unique species listed in the Local Coastal Program (LCP).

Eleven special-status plants have been documented within five miles of the Project Study Area. Of these, no special status plants are present or have potential to occur in the Project Study Area due to past disturbance and historic tilling. One species, Choris' popcornflower, is documented to occur in annual grassland and chaparral habitat located south of the Project footprint. No indirect effects to this community are likely to occur due to the aspect of the southerly slope to the site and proximity to existing disturbed areas.

Eighteen special-status wildlife species have been documented within five miles of the Project Study Area. Given the proximity of the project site to a) Butano Creek and b) associated (Butano Creek) riparian habitat to the northeast, and chaparral habitat to the south, two federal listed species and two special-status species and other migratory bird species protected under the MBTA may be present in the surrounding habitat outside the project footprint.

The San Francisco Garter Snake (SFGS) has multiple occurrences within five miles. The nearest garter snake, which was found 0.2 miles north of the project study area, was found dead on Cloverdale Road. Butano Creek is documented to provide foraging and dispersal habitat for the San Francisco Garter Snake. The San Francisco Garter Snake is not likely to be present in the project area due to the lack of available cover and limited refugia close to water. The San Francisco Garter Snake is also not likely to be present outside nearby riparian habitat since the site is not within any dispersal corridor and lacks necessary cover.

The California Red-Legged Frog (CRLF) has moderate occurrences within five miles; the nearest is within one mile of the project study area. Butano Creek provides foraging and dispersal habitat for this species. Rodent burrows on the site provide marginal suitable refugia for dispersing frogs, however upland habitat is not present due to lack of suitable breeding habitat within 300 feet. Additionally, the site is outside the designated critical habitat. The California Red-Legged Frog may disperse into the project footprint, but a lack of suitable upland features nor breeding habitat indicates the project study area would not include the California Red-Legged Frog.

Allen's hummingbird has low potential for occurrence; however, the species was observed in Butano Creek riparian corridor adjacent to the project footprint during the April 14, 2023, biological survey. Suitable nesting habitat is present in the adjacent riparian corridor and in the chaparral habitat upslope to the project study area. There is no suitable nesting substrate in the project footprint for Allen's hummingbird.

San Francisco Dusky-Footed Woodrat (SFDFW) has low potential to occur due to the lack of cover within the project footprint. The San Francisco Dusky-Footed Woodrat may rarely disperse through the footprint.

Other identified species are not likely to occur due to the absence of suitable habitat elements or vegetation communities (which include coastal prairie, dune habitat, pond habitat, refugia, logs, rock outcrops, large burrows, suitable bat roosts, friable soils, appropriate elevations, etc.). The project study area's disturbed nature and regular tilling likely preclude most native flora and fauna.

Based on the results of the biological assessment, no Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) have been identified in the study area, including no coastal wetlands nor unique or occupied habitats. Much of the site is dominated by invasive or ornamental plants or areas that have been disturbed, tilled or farmed. Butano Creek riparian habitat is located more than 50 feet away from the proposed project and will not be affected by the project scope. Additionally, habitat to the south of the existing access road will also be completely avoided. The California Red-Legged Frog may have movement during periods of wet weather and best management practice are provided and recommended to ensure avoidance of any dispersing individuals. If Allen hummingbird does nest in surrounding habitat, the species could be affected during the nesting season. The following avoidance measures are recommended:

Mitigation Measure 2: Environmental Awareness Training: Prior to the start of work, environmental awareness training should be provided to all construction crew. Training will include a description of all biological resources that may be found on or near the Project Study Area, the laws and regulations that protect those resources, the consequences of non-compliance with those laws and regulations, instructions for inspecting equipment each morning prior to activities, and a contact person if protected biological resources are discovered in the Project Study Area.

Mitigation Measure 3: Wildlife Exclusion Fencing (WEF): At least 14 days prior to the commencement of construction-related activities, California Red-Legged Frog (CRLF) exclusion fencing with exit funnels shall be installed between the riparian corridor and the Project footprint under the direction of a qualified biologist. Following installation, the fence should be inspected

weekly by trained construction personnel to monitor and maintain the fence throughout the duration of the Project's ground-disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure 4: Erosion Control Materials: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic mono-filament netting (erosion control matting) rolled erosion control products, or similar material shall not be used.

Mitigation Measure 5: Pre-Construction Wildlife Surveys: Pre-construction surveys for CRLF shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities and within 48 hours of the start of ground disturbance activities. After the Wildlife Exclusion Fence has been properly erected, scoping of any burrows on the site to ascertain the absence of CRLF is recommended in lieu of daily biological monitoring. Surveys are to be conducted by a qualified biologist. If CRLF is detected during the survey, the animal should be allowed to leave the area on its own accord.

Mitigation Measure 6: Nesting Bird Seasonal Work Window or Surveys: Tree and vegetation removal activities should be initiated during the non-nesting season from September 1 to January 31 to the extent feasible. If work cannot be initiated during this period, then nesting bird surveys shall be performed in suitable nesting habitat within 250 feet of the project footprint. If nests are found, a no-disturbance buffer should be placed around the nest until young have fledged or the nest is determined to be no longer active by the biologist. The size of the buffer may be determined by the biologist based on species and proximity to activities but should generally be between 50 feet for songbirds and up to 250 feet for nesting raptors.

Source: Project Plans, Sol Ecology Biological Resources Evaluation, dated May 31, 2023.

4.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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service?		x		
---	--	---	--	--

Discussion: See response to 4.a.

Source: Project Plans, Sol Ecology Biological Resources Evaluation, dated May 31, 2023.

4.c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				x
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: No wetlands were identified in the Project Study Area.

Source: Project Plans, Sol Ecology Biological Resources Evaluation, dated May 31, 2023.

4.d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		x		
<p>Discussion: See response to 4.a.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Sol Ecology Biological Resources Evaluation, dated May 31, 2023.</p>				
4.e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?				x
<p>Discussion: There are no trees in the project study area, therefore, no trees will be impacted by this project.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
4.f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				x
<p>Discussion: The project area is not subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved conservation plan.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Sol Ecology Biological Resources Evaluation, dated May 31, 2023.</p>				
4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				x
<p>Discussion: The project area is not within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Sol Ecology Biological Resources Evaluation, dated May 31, 2023., California Department of Fish and Game Marine Protected Areas Map.</p>				
4.h. Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				x
<p>Discussion: The parcel and project study area do not contain oak woodlands; thus these would not be impacted by the project.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, GIS.</p>				

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		x		

Discussion: The California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) recommended notifying specific Native American tribes that may be affiliated with the project area. Staff sent notification by certified mail to the recommended tribe list and did not receive comment from any tribes. A referral to Sonoma State recommended an archeological study. The applicant submitted an archaeological study dated March 2024 prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants.

An archaeological study dated March 2024 prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants confirmed no previously recorded cultural resources were identified within the project area or the 0.25-mile records search radius, and no new cultural resources were identified during the pedestrian survey.

Review of cultural resources data and environmental conditions note there is a moderate or high potential to encounter previously unrecorded, intact buried archaeological deposits within the project area. Should the project excavation approach or exceed one meter in depth, SWCA recommends a limited exploratory test using a backhoe or archaeological monitoring during construction within these areas

Most of the area is covered by the Corralitos soil that are associated with alluvial deposits along Butano Creek. Since the alluvium was deposited over the past several hundred years or less, some prehistoric archaeological materials or sites may have been buried that cannot be detected by surface survey in the project area. It is possible that intact subsurface archaeological deposits could be encountered if deep (meets or exceeds one meter in depth) and/or extensive earth disturbing activities occur within the alluvial floodplain portion of the project area.

Excavations for the septic tank will exceed 1 meter in depth and a limited testing program or monitoring would be strongly recommended in these specific areas to determine if buried archaeological remains are present or absent within the area where earth disturbance will occur. Limited testing would likely entail a single-day of exploratory trenching using a tractor-mounted backhoe or similar type of equipment. It is anticipated that 2 to 3 trenches would be excavated to a depth of about 8 feet below surface in the footprint of the septic tank, and another 2 to 3 trenches could be placed within the proposed leach field to confirm whether cultural materials are present or absent in both areas. The nature and extent of the trenches would be documented in the field and the results and findings provided in a brief technical report.

Based on the information and findings outlined, and with the implementation of the recommendations and the inadvertent discovery procedures outlined, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact to archaeological resources under CEQA with the implementation of regulatory compliance measures related to the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources and human remains.

The following mitigation measures will ensure project impacts, should cultural resources be found, be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 7: In the event that unanticipated cultural resources are exposed during disturbance activities, work within 15 meters (50 feet) of the find must stop and a Secretary of the Interior (SOI)-qualified archaeologist (the SWCA Project Manager must be notified immediately). Work may not resume until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find; however, disturbance activities may continue in other areas. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or consultation with stakeholders may be warranted.

Mitigation Measure 8: The discovery of human remains during the course of the project is a possibility. If human remains are encountered, then the procedures outlined by the NAHC, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and PRC Section 5097.98, would be followed. If the monitor determines that a discovery includes human remains:

1. All ground-disturbing work within the immediate vicinity (25 feet) of the find would halt.
2. The archaeologist would contact the San Mateo County Coroner: San Mateo County Coroner 50 Tower Road, San Mateo, CA 94402 Phone: 650/ 312-5562
3. As a courtesy, the County Coroner would also notify the NAHC: Native American Heritage Commission 915 Capitol Mall, Room 364 Sacramento, California 95814
Phone: 916/ 373-3710, Email: nahc@nahc.ca.gov

The County Coroner would have two (2) working days to examine the remains after being notified in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the San Mateo County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American and are not subject to the County Coroner's authority, the County Coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC of the discovery. The NAHC would immediately designate and notify the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who will have 48 hours after being granted access to the location of the remains to inspect them and provide recommendations for the treatment of them.

Mitigation Measure 9: In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Director of Planning and Building of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archaeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit to the Director of Planning and Building for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. In addition, an archaeological report meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards detailing the findings of the monitoring will be submitted to the Northwest Information Center after monitoring has ceased. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred.

Mitigation Measure 10: If a newly discovered resource is, or is suspected to be, Native American in origin, the resource shall be treated as a significant Tribal Cultural Resource, pursuant to Public Resources Code 21074, until the County has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative.

Source: Project Plans, SWCA Archaeological Report, dated March 2024.

5.b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?		X		
<p>Discussion: See discussion under 5.a.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, SWCA Archaeological Report, dated March 2024.</p>					
5.c.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		x		
<p>Discussion: See discussion under 5.a.</p> <p>Source: SWCA Archaeological Report, dated March 2024.</p>					

6. ENERGY. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a.	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			x	
<p>Discussion: Energy consumption associated with the project would be limited to construction (i.e., construction vehicles) which would be limited and temporary for the implementation of the project. Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow for consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.</p> <p>At the time of building permit application, the project would be required to demonstrate compliance with the current Building Energy Efficiency Standards which would be verified by the San Mateo County Building Department prior to the issuance of the building permit. The project would also be required to adhere to the provisions of CALGreen and GreenPoints, which establishes planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants. No further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
6.b.	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.				x

Discussion: The proposed project will be required to comply with any applicable 2019 Building Energy Efficient Standards which will be verified by the San Mateo County Building Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. The project may also be required to adhere to the provisions of CALGreen which established planning and design standards for sustainable site development and energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), among other standards.

The construction for the farm labor housing, water storage tanks, septic system, and converted domestic well would require the consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuel (e.g., fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for construction vehicles and equipment. Transportation energy use during construction would come from the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would fluctuate according to the phase of construction, would be temporary, and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure. Most construction equipment would be gas-powered or diesel-powered.

Source: Project Plans.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>			x	
<p>Discussion: The project geotechnical report prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences Inc. confirms the site is suitable for the project. The site is not located in an Alquist Priolo special study area or zone. Active faults are not believed to exist beneath the site and the potential for fault rupture to occur at the site is low.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System, Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			x	

<p>Discussion: Per the Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc. geotechnical report, the site is located in an active seismic area. Moderate to large earthquakes are probable along several active faults over a 30–50-year design life. Strong shaking should be expected during the lifetime of the proposed structure. The project shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the current earthquake resistance standards pursuant to Building Code requirements. No further mitigation is required.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System, Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?			x	
<p>Discussion: Per the geotechnical report, due to the medium stiff clay and minor amounts of loose sand existing on the parcel, a small amount of differential compaction may occur and therefore likelihood of significant damage from differential compaction is low.</p> <p>Loose silty sand below the water table were encountered but are limited. The likelihood of liquefaction occurring on site is moderate. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System, Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc.</p>				
iv. Landslides?				x
<p>Discussion: The San Mateo County Geographic Information System shows the parcel is located in an area that is not evaluated for landslide. The likelihood of landslide is low.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System.</p>				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?				x
<p><i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i></p>				
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located on a cliff or bluff.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Geographic Information System.</p>				
7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		x		
<p>Discussion: The property is relatively flat. There is very minor erosion expected to occur for the project. The project is conditioned to install erosion control measures prior to building permit issuance.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure is proposed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 11 (formerly 13): Prior to commencement of the project, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval, an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutant from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of</p>				

sediment capturing devices. The plan shall limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plans shall adhere to the San Mateo County Wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Guidelines," including:

- a. Delineation with field markers of clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.
- b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.
- c. Performing clearing and earthmoving activities only during dry weather.
- d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30.
- e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.
- f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.
- g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.
- h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.
- i. Limiting and timing application of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.
- j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.
- k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.
- l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.
- m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving the site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.
- n. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until the corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time.

Source: Project Plans.

7.c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?		x		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>Discussion: Per discussion under 7.a. through 7.c., the project site does not contain a geological unit or soil that is presently unstable and is located in an area not evaluated for landslide, the likelihood of landslide is expected to be low. There will be erosion resulting from construction and grading which will be mitigated through Mitigation Measure 11. The Sigma Prime Geotechnical Report does not indicate the project site is subject to lateral spreading, subsidence or collapse.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc.</p>					
7.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			x	
<p>Discussion: There are no known expansive soils on the project site. The site is noted as having Ma and CuA soils per the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) map. Ma is Grade 3 (fair rating) and not generally classified as prime agricultural land and CuA is Grade 2 (good). There is no expectation of encountering expansive soils which would result in a risk to life and/or property.</p> <p>The Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc. report states the site is suitable for the proposed construction, provided the recommendations presented in the report are followed during design and construction. The report does not cite the project site having expansive soil.</p> <p>Source: Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., Project Plans.</p>					
7.e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				x
<p>Discussion: The project proposes a septic system and converting an agricultural well to domestic use; both components have received preliminary approval by Environmental Health Services.</p> <p>Each four-bedroom premanufactured structure will utilize a 1,500-gallon septic tank for primary treatment, for a total of 3,000-gallon septic tank. Each structure is required to have four leach lines, with each leach line required to have 180 linear feet of leach trench. The two leach systems a combined into one system. Each leach field will have 360 linear feet of leach trench.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Environmental Health Services.</p>					
7.f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		x		
<p>Discussion: No known unique geologic features are present within the project area. There is a low probability that the project would destroy or cause impact to a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature. Should any paleontological evidence be discovered, Mitigation Measure 9 shall be implemented.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, SWCA Archaeologic Report, dated March 2024.</p>					

8. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a. Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		x		
<p>Discussion: A minor temporary increase in greenhouse gases may occur during the construction phase. Vehicles and equipment associated with the construction phase of the project are subject to California Air Resources Board emission standards. Although the project scope is not likely to significantly generate greenhouse gases, see mitigation measure 1.</p> <p>Source: California Air Resources Board, San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.</p>				
8.b. Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				x
<p>Discussion: The project does not conflict with the San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan provided that the mitigation measure 1 is implemented.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.</p>				
8.c. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				x
<p>Discussion: The subject parcel does not have trees and is not considered forestland.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, Project Plans.</p>				
8.d. Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				x
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located on a coastal cliff or bluff. According to the San Mateo County (Bay and Coastal Areas) Sea Level Rise map, the project site is not located in a vulnerable area.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, San Mateo County (Bay and Coastal Areas) Sea Level Rise map.</p>				
8.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				x

Discussion: The project is located approximately three quarters of a mile from the ocean. Given the topography and distance sea level rise is not expected to impact this parcel. According to the San Mateo County (Bay and Coastal Areas) Sea Level Rise map, the project site is not located in a vulnerable area.

Source: Project Location, San Mateo County (Bay and Coastal Areas) Sea Level Rise map.

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

Discussion: The project parcel is located in Zone X (areas of minimal flood hazard) and Zone A (special flood hazard area without an established base flood elevation). The proposed development is all located outside of the flood plain.

Source: Project Location, Project Plans, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Panel 06081C0432E, Effective Date: October 16, 2012.

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

Discussion: See discussion under 8.f., above.

Source: Project Location, Project Plans, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Panel 06081C0432E, Effective Date: October 16, 2012.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				x

Discussion: Project construction includes some storage and use of hazardous materials. As required by the standard requirements of Mitigation Measure 12 above, the project is required to store, handle, and dispose of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater, and control and prevent the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses. As required by the State Municipal Regional Permit, the County is required to inspect the site for compliance with

<p>stormwater pollution prevention measures on a monthly basis during the wet season (April 1 – May 30) throughout project grading and construction.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
9.b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			x	
<p>Discussion: See discussion under 9.a. Source: Project Plans.</p>					
9.c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				x
<p>Discussion: The project site is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project does not involve elements which would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>					
9.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?				x
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, California Department of Toxic Substances Control.</p>					
9.e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				x
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>					

9.f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				x
<p>Discussion: The proposed project elements are proposed completely and entirely within the parcel boundaries. The project includes four farm labor housing units, driveway turnouts, septic system, parking area and water storage tanks for fire suppression. There is no expected impact to any emergency response or evacuation plan. The project would not permanently or significantly impede access on existing public roads. Furthermore, the project has been reviewed and approved with conditions by the County Public Works Department and the San Mateo County Fire Department.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
9.g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			x	
<p>Discussion: The subject parcel is located in a State Responsibility Area mapped as moderate risk for wildland fires. The proposed project includes approved fire ingress/egress to the site and onsite water storage tanks for fire suppression. The parcel is currently developed, and new structures will be constructed to the applicable fire code. A review of the project was completed by the San Mateo County Fire Department and was conditionally approved.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, San Mateo County Fire Department, California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map.</p>				
9.h. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				x
<p>Discussion: The proposed project site is located outside of the 100-year flood hazard boundary.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, Project Plans, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Panel 06081C0432E, Effective Date: October 16, 2012.</p>				
9.i. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				x
<p>Discussion: See discussion under 8.f. and 9.h., above.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Panel No. 06081C0432E, Effective Date: October 16, 2012.</p>				
9.j. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				x

Discussion: The development is proposed to be located outside of the flood plain. The project site is not located in the vicinity of a levee or dam inundation area.

Source: Project Location, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map Service Center.

9.k. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

x

Discussion: No, the project site is not located within a tsunami or seiche inundation area. The project site area is relatively flat and therefore not susceptible to mudflow.

Source: San Mateo County Geographic Information System.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10.a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?			x	

Discussion: The project has the potential to generate polluted stormwater runoff during site grading and construction-related activities. However, these impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of Mitigation Measure 12 (see above).

The project will be required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy requiring post-construction stormwater flows to be at, or below, pre-construction flow rates. Additionally, the project must include Low Impact Development (LID) site design measures in compliance with Provision C.3.i. of the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit as the project will introduce 3,953 sq. ft. of new impervious surface. These standards will ensure that post-construction water runoff does not violate any water quality standard as the project proposes to direct roof and driveway runoff to vegetated areas. The proposed project was reviewed and conditionally approved by the Building Inspection Section's Civil Section for compliance with County drainage standards. Furthermore, the proposed septic system has been preliminarily reviewed and conditionally approved by the County Environmental Health Services. As such, the project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Source: Project Plans, C.3/C.6 Development Review Checklist, County of San Mateo Drainage Policy, County of San Mateo Environmental Health Services.

10.b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposes conversion of an existing agriculture well to a domestic well; the Environmental Health Services has issued conditional approval. The project is not expected to have a significant impact to the groundwater supply.</p> <p>Source: Environmental Health Services.</p>				
10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
<p>Discussion: The project does not involve the alteration of a course of a stream or river. The property has adjudication rights to draw agricultural water from Butano Creek and Arroyo de los Frijoles Creek. New buildings that are proposed are four new farm labor housing units and two water tanks for fire suppression. Minor changes to on-site drainage patterns resulting from the structures and site improvements will be reviewed and addressed at the building permit stage per the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit and County Drainage Policy. No other changes to the site's existing drainage patterns are proposed.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposes to introduce 3,953 sq. ft. of new impervious surface to the project site. Given the overall parcel size the proposed additional impervious surface is minor. The project is subject to compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i. of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Permit which requires that the design of a project include measures to maintain the surface runoff at its current levels.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, C3/C6 Development Review Checklist.</p>				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				X

Discussion: See discussion under Question 10(c)(ii).				
Source: Project Plans.				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				x
Discussion: See discussion under Question 10(c)(ii).				
Source: Project Plans.				
10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				x
Discussion: The areas proposed for development are located outside of FEMA Flood Zone A and are not within a tsunami or seiche zone.				
Source: Project Plans.				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				x
Discussion: The project will into conflict with or obstruct any water quality control plan as discussed above in Question 10.a. The proposal to convert an existing agricultural well to a domestic well has received preliminary approval from Environmental Health Services. The well conversion is not expected to conflict with a water quality control plan or interfere with a groundwater management plan. The domestic well is required to be certified by Environmental Health Services.				
Source: Environmental Health Services.				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?				x
Discussion: See discussion under 10.a. and 10.b., above.				
Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?				x
Discussion: See discussion under Question 10(c)(ii)				
Source: Project Plans.				

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a. Physically divide an established community?				x
<p>Discussion: The project development is contained entirely on the project parcel. The project does not involve elements that would result in the physical division of an established community.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				x
<p>Discussion: The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, San Mateo County General Plan, San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.</p>				
11.c. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?				x
<p>Discussion: The improvements associated with the project are limited to the project site and are limited to those necessary to serve the proposed project.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				x

<p>Discussion: There are no known mineral resources that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state on the subject parcel.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan Mineral Resource Map.</p>				
12.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				x
<p>Discussion: There are no locally important mineral resource recovery site(s) delineated on the County's General Plan, any specific plan, or any other land use plan for the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.</p>				

<p>13. NOISE. Would the project result in:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				x
<p>Discussion: During project construction, excessive noise could be generated, particularly during grading and excavation activities. However, the project is subject to the County's Noise Ordinance which limits the days and hours of construction related activities. Once construction is complete, the project site is not expected to generate noise which would violate the San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				x
<p>Discussion: There are no aspects of the project that would include generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels beyond construction, which would be limited and temporary.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				

13.c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				x
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, an airport land use plan area, or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Source: Project Location, Google Maps.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned 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)?				x

Discussion: The proposed development is limited to the project parcel. The project includes four farm labor housing unit, and the extent of associated improvements are limited to serving the project. No additional homes or businesses are proposed as part of the project.

Source: Project Plans.

14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				x
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The proposed project does not include the displacement of any people or housing. The project will provide needed on site housing for farm labor workers.

Source: Project Plans.

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

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?			X	
15.b. Police protection?			X	
15.c. Schools?			X	
15.d. Parks?			X	
15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?			X	
<p>Discussion: There are no anticipated substantial impacts to public services as a result of the project. While the project scope includes providing on site housing for farm laborers, the proposed increase in intensity of use at the property is not expected to generate a significant increased demand for fire, police, schools, parks, and/or other public services and facilities.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				

16. RECREATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project would introduce residential housing to the property which could result in increased use of recreational facilities in the area, however, any increase in use from residents at the site is not expected to be significant to result in physical deterioration of any such facility as a result of the project.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: Although the project does introduce residential use on the property, the project does not result in the need to expand or construct any recreational facilities.</p>				

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?				X
<p>Discussion: The project introduces low-density residential use on a rural property in the way of housing for farm workers; therefore, the project is not expected to generate substantial traffic to the area and does not conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy which involves transit, roadways, parking, or bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts?</i> <i>Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.</i>			X	
<p>Discussion: California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA) Section 15064.3 establishes a method for analyzing certain transportation impacts created by a proposed project. Under the requirements, transportation impacts must be analyzed based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). For a land use project, if the estimated VMT exceeds an established threshold of significance, then the project could be a significant impact.</p> <p>Based on the County Department of Public Works' Inter-Departmental Correspondence on VMT for determining transportation impacts under CEQA analysis, the significance of VMT impacts in rural areas are set on a case-by-case basis. The proposed four farm labor housing unit project is considered a lower density use that is expected to generate a non-substantial increase in traffic to the roadway system; residents housed by the project will working onsite. Thus, the project has been determined to screen out of the need for a VMT study as a "small project" generating fewer than 110 daily trips, is consistent with the General Plan, and presents no evidence indicating a potentially significant level of VMT would result from the project.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Department of Public Works Inter-Departmental Correspondence for Change to Vehicle Miles Traveled as Metric to Determine Transportation Impacts under CEQA Analysis, dated September 23, 2020.</p>				

17.c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				x
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose changes to existing public roads, Pescadero Creek Road or Cloverdale Road, or the access road to the property.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				x
<p>Discussion: The project has received conditional approval from the San Mateo County Fire Department who among other things, reviewed the project for adequate emergency access.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, San Mateo County Fire Department.</p>				

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)			X	
<p>Discussion: See discussion under question 5.a., above.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, SWCA Archaeologic Report, dated March 2024.</p>				
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public			X	

Resources Code Section 5024.1. (In applying the criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)				
Discussion: See discussion under question 5.a., above.				
Source: Project Location, SWCA Archaeologic Report, dated March 2024.				

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				x
<p>Discussion: The project includes a new septic system to serve the four farm labor housing units. The plans show the septic system and leach field are proposed outside of the 50-foot riparian buffer zone. Each four-bedroom pre-manufactured building (2 total) will utilize a 1,500-gallon septic tank for primary treatment. Each structure is required to have four leach fields, with each leach field required to consist of 180 linear feet of leach trench. The two leach systems are proposed to be combined into one system such that each leach field will have 360 linear feet of leach trench. The Sol Ecology biologist report incorporates avoidance measures, Mitigation Measures 2 through 6, to ensure species are completely avoided. The project includes conversion of an existing agricultural well to domestic use. The well has been reviewed by Environmental Health Services and received conditional approval. There is no expectation that the improved conversion to a domestic well will result in significant environmental effects. The structures are not expected to alter topography significantly. Drainage from the proposed buildings will be directed to a pop-up emitter for dispersal located away from the foundation. Other runoff will continue to drain and absorb into adjacent permeable alluvial soil. No changes to on site hydrology will occur as a result of the project. Exposed disturbed soils will be seeded and mulched or planted to control site erosion and prevent sediment transport off -site. The farm labor housing units and water storage tanks will have electricity as required by Building Code.</p> <p>The Source: Project Location, t Project Plan.</p>				
19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				x

<p>Discussion: Water for the farm labor housing will be supplied by converting the existing agriculture well to domestic water supply for the onsite residential units and is expected to remain consistent throughout the year. The total daily demand is estimated at 1,500 gallons-per-day (GPD), which is equivalent to a supply (pumping rate) of approximately 1.04 gallons-per-minute (GPM). Given that the well yields over 10 GPM, it is reasonable to conclude that the water supply is sufficient to meet the proposed residential water demand, while also continuing to supply ongoing agricultural water needs.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, Project Plans.</p>					
19.c.	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?				x
<p>Discussion: The project site is not served by a municipal wastewater treatment provider. See discussion under 19.a. regarding the proposed septic system.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>					
19.d.	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				x
<p>Discussion: The project as proposed does not include a use that would result in solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. Solid waste generated from the permanent residential units is not expected to be significant. Furthermore, construction is required to comply with the County's Construction and Demolition Recycling requirements for waste and debris at the time of building permit.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans.</p>					
19.e.	Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				x
<p>Discussion: See discussion under 19.d.</p> <p>Source: Project Location, Project Plans.</p>					

20. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				x
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in an area designated as a “Moderate Fire Hazard Risk” on the State’s Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps. The project site is accessed via existing roadways and existing gravel roadways.</p> <p>The project includes improvements to the driveway for adequate fire turnaround, adding water storage for fire suppression, and a new hydrant. All new structures will utilize the appropriate fire rated materials. The project scope is limited to the project parcel and does not require the closure of any public roads which could impact an emergency response or evacuation plan.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			x	
<p>Discussion: The project site is in an area defined as being at moderate risk for fire danger. As discussed, the project site is relatively flat and developed with a few barns, packing shed, storage shed and 10 potable water storage tanks. The proposed project includes elements to improve fire safety by adding fire turnarounds to an existing access road adding an onsite hydrant and on site water tanks for fire suppression at the project site area. Therefore, physical or natural site conditions will not exacerbate wildfire risks.</p> <p>Source: Project Location.</p>				
20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			x	
<p>Discussion: The project does not involve improvements that would exacerbate fire risk or result in impacts to the environment. See further discussion under 20.a. and 20.b., above.</p> <p>Source: Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				

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

Discussion: The project area is relatively flat and located outside of FEMA Flood Zone A. The project site is not in a mapped area known for landslides based on review of the San Mateo County Geographic Information System (GIS). The proposed drainage has been designed to retain stormwater on-site in a manner that would not exacerbate flooding in the project area. The project is conditioned for fire safety improvements and does not increase the risk of wildfires or expose the structures to increased risks as a result of slope instability or runoff.

Source: Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan-Hazards Mapping.

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

Discussion: While the project is not expected to result in significant impacts to special status species and potentially sensitive habitats, mitigation measures are still included to ensure any potential impacts are avoided.

Source: Project Location, Project Plans.

21.b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				x
---	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The proposed project results in low density residential improvements to the existing rural agricultural parcel. The proposed development will be contained onsite and avoids sensitive habitats and flood hazard areas. The existing onsite agriculture will continue and the project results in relatively minimal changes to the 549-acre property.

Source: Project Plans.

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

Discussion: See discussion of 21.a. and 21.b. The project as proposed and mitigated is not expected to have substantial environmental effects on human beings directly or indirectly.

Source: Project Plans, Project Location.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES. Check what agency has permit authority or other approval for the project.

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		x	
Caltrans		x	
City		x	
California Coastal Commission		x	
California Department of Food and Agriculture		x	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		x	
Other: _____		x	
National Marine Fisheries Service		x	
Regional Water Quality Control Board		x	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		x	
Sewer/Water District:		x	
State Department of Fish and Wildlife		x	
State Department of Public Health		x	
State Water Resources Control Board		x	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)		x	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		x	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		x	

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	x	
Other mitigation measures are needed.		x
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u></p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> Upon the start of excavation activities and through to the completion of the project, the applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that the following dust control guidelines are implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. b. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. c. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited. d. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. e. All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. f. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. g. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California Airborne Toxics Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR)). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. h. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. i. Construction-related activities shall not involve simultaneous occurrence of more than two construction phases (e.g., paving and building construction would occur simultaneously). 		

Mitigation Measure 2: Environmental Awareness Training: Prior to the start of work, environmental awareness training should be provided to all construction crew. Training will include a description of all biological resources that may be found on or near the Project Study Area, the laws and regulations that protect those resources, the consequences of non-compliance with those laws and regulations, instructions for inspecting equipment each morning prior to activities, and a contact person if protected biological resources are discovered in the Project Study Area.

Mitigation Measure 3: Wildlife Exclusion Fencing (WEF): At least 14 days prior to the commencement of construction-related activities, California Red-Legged Frog (CRLF) exclusion fencing with exit funnels shall be installed between the riparian corridor and the Project footprint under the direction of a qualified biologist. Following installation, the fence should be inspected weekly by trained construction personnel to monitor and maintain the fence throughout the duration of the Project's ground-disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure 4: Erosion Control Materials: Tightly woven fiber netting or similar material shall be used for erosion control or other purposes to ensure amphibian and reptile species do not get trapped. Plastic mono-filament netting (erosion control matting) rolled erosion control products, or similar material shall not be used.

Mitigation Measure 5: Pre-Construction Wildlife Surveys: Pre-construction surveys for CRLF shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities and within 48 hours of the start of ground disturbance activities. After the Wildlife Exclusion Fence has been properly erected, scoping of any burrows on the site to ascertain the absence of CRLF is recommended in lieu of daily biological monitoring. Surveys are to be conducted by a qualified biologist. If CRLF is detected during the survey, the animal should be allowed to leave the area on its own accord.

Mitigation Measure 6: Nesting Bird Seasonal Work Window or Surveys: Tree and vegetation removal activities should be initiated during the non-nesting season from September 1 to January 31 to the extent feasible. If work cannot be initiated during this period, then nesting bird surveys shall be performed in suitable nesting habitat within 250 feet of the project footprint. If nests are found, a no-disturbance buffer should be placed around the nest until young have fledged or the nest is determined to be no longer active by the biologist. The size of the buffer may be determined by the biologist based on species and proximity to activities but should generally be between 50 feet for songbirds and up to 250 feet for nesting raptors.

Mitigation Measure 7: In the event that unanticipated cultural resources are exposed during disturbance activities, work within 15 meters (50 feet) of the find must stop and a Secretary of the Interior (SOI)-qualified archaeologist (the SWCA Project Manager must be notified immediately). Work may not resume until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find; however, disturbance activities may continue in other areas. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or consultation with stakeholders may be warranted.

Mitigation Measure 8: The discovery of human remains during the course of the project is a possibility. If human remains are encountered, then the procedures outlined by the NAHC, in accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and PRC Section 5097.98, would be followed. If the monitor determines that a discovery includes human remains:

1. All ground-disturbing work within the immediate vicinity (25 feet) of the find would halt.

2. The archaeologist would contact the San Mateo County Coroner: San Mateo County Coroner 50 Tower Road, San Mateo, CA 94402 Phone: 650/ 312-5562
3. As a courtesy, the County Coroner would also notify the NAHC: Native American Heritage Commission 915 Capitol Mall, Room 364 Sacramento, California 95814
Phone: 916/ 373-3710, Email: nahc@nahc.ca.gov

The County Coroner would have two (2) working days to examine the remains after being notified in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the San Mateo County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American and are not subject to the County Coroner's authority, the County Coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC of the discovery. The NAHC would immediately designate and notify the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD), who will have 48 hours after being granted access to the location of the remains to inspect them and provide recommendations for the treatment of them.

Mitigation Measure 9: In the event that cultural, paleontological, or archaeological resources are encountered during site grading or other site work, such work shall immediately be halted in the area of discovery and the project sponsor shall immediately notify the Director of Planning and Building of the discovery. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified archaeologist for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. The cost of the qualified archaeologist and of any recording, protecting, or curating shall be borne solely by the project sponsor. The archaeologist shall be required to submit to the Director of Planning and Building for review and approval a report of the findings and methods of curation or protection of the resources. In addition, an archaeological report meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards detailing the findings of the monitoring will be submitted to the Northwest Information Center after monitoring has ceased. No further grading or site work within the area of discovery shall be allowed until the preceding has occurred.

Mitigation Measure 10: If a newly discovered resource is, or is suspected to be, Native American in origin, the resource shall be treated as a significant Tribal Cultural Resource, pursuant to Public Resources Code 21074, until the County has determined otherwise with the consultation of a qualified archaeologist and local tribal representative.

Mitigation Measure 11: Prior to commencement of the project, the application shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval, an erosion and drainage control plan that shows how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutant from and within the project site shall be minimized. The plan shall be designed to minimize potential sources of sediment, control the amount of runoff and its ability to carry sediment by diverting incoming flows and impeding internally generated flows, and retain sediment that is picked up on the project site through the use of sediment capturing devices. The plan shall limit application, generation, and migration of toxic substances, ensure the proper storage and disposal of toxic materials, and apply nutrients at rates necessary to establish and maintain vegetation without causing significant nutrient runoff to surface waters. Said plans shall adhere to the San Mateo County Wide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Guidelines," including:

- a. Delineation with field markers of clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.
- b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.

- c. Performing clearing and earthmoving activities only during dry weather.
- d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30.
- e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.
- f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses.
- g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.
- h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.
- i. Limiting and timing application of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.
- j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.
- k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.
- l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.
- m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving the site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.
- n. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until the corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time.

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared by the Planning Department.

x

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

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

Olivia Boo

Olivia Boo (Signature)

10/7/24

Planner

Date

(Title)

Attachments

A.Plans

B. Sol Ecology Biological Resources Evaluation

C. Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc.