

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et seq.), that the following project: **Nolan-Stevaux New Single-Family Residence**, when adopted and implemented, will not have a significant impact on the environment.

FILE NO.: PLN2024-00210

OWNERS: Katherine and Olivier Nolan-Stevaux, 340 Hazel Avenue, Millbrae, CA 94030

APPLICANT: Toby Long, AIA, 6114 La Salle Avenue, 552 Oakland, CA, USA

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 080-090-030

LOCATION: Pescadero Creek Road, Pescadero, CA, 94060

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Planned Agricultural District Permit (PAD), Grading Permit (GP) After-the-Fact Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and Significant Tree Permits to construct a new 2,466 sq. ft. single-family residence, an attached 568 sq. ft. Garage, and detached 522 sq. ft. pool house and legalization of an existing well into a domestic well. A new septic system and three (3) 4,900-gallon domestic/fire suppression water tanks are also proposed. The project also involves approximately 385 cubic yards (cu. yd.) of grading including 295 cu. yd. of cut and 90 cu. yd. of fill and removal of four (4) Black Walnut trees for the proposed house, pool and new septic tank. The site is located in the Pescadero Road County Scenic corridor. The project is appealable to the California Coastal Commission.

**FINDINGS AND BASIS FOR A NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The Current Planning Section has reviewed the initial study for the project and based upon substantial evidence in the record, finds that:

1. The project will not adversely affect water or air quality or increase noise levels substantially.
2. The project will not have adverse impacts on the flora or fauna of the area.
3. The project will not degrade the aesthetic quality of the area.
4. The project will not have adverse impacts on traffic or land use.
5. In addition, the project will not:

- a. Create impacts which have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.
- b. Create impacts which achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- c. Create impacts for a project which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- d. Create environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The County of San Mateo has, therefore, determined that the environmental impact of the project is insignificant.

MITIGATION MEASURES included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects:

The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:

**Mitigation Measure 1:** Applicant shall plant five (5) 24-inch box Redburn trees or similar indigenous trees along the front property line along Pescadero Creek Road to mitigate any potential view impacts from the neighboring properties and roads. An Encroachment Permit from the Department of Public Works is required for any replacement trees planted within the right-of-way.

**Mitigation Measure 2:** All proposed exterior lighting shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area, including downward-directed and shielded. Manufacturer cut sheets for the exterior light fixtures shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of the building permit.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Final finishes of all exterior materials and/or colors shall be non-reflective.

**Mitigation Measure 4:** The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:

- 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 5:** Environmental Awareness Training

Prior to the start of work, environmental awareness training shall 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 at the site.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** Wildlife Exclusion Fencing (WEF)

At least 14 days prior to the commencement of construction-related activities, 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 7:** 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 materials shall not be used.

**Mitigation Measure 8:** Pre-Construction Wildlife Surveys

Pre-construction surveys for CRLF shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities 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 before work commences.

**Mitigation Measure 9:** Nesting Bird Seasonal Work Window or Surveys

Construction-related activities (including grubbing or ground disturbance) 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, bird nesting surveys should be performed in suitable nesting habitat within 250 feet of the project footprint prior to the start of activities. 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. Surveys are generally valid for 7 to 10 days and should be repeated if there is a lapse in construction-related activities for greater than 7 days during the nesting season.

**Mitigation Measure 10:** In the event that unanticipated cultural, paleontological, or archeological resources are exposed during ground disturbance activities, work within 15 meters (50 feet) of the find must stop and a Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist, must be notified immediately. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified professional for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. Work may not resume until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or tribal consultation may be warranted. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified professional for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate.

**Mitigation Measure 11:** Although not anticipated, there remains the potential for the inadvertent discovery of human remains during ground-disturbing activities. State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The San Mateo County coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If concentrations of prehistoric or historic-era materials are encountered during project activities; all work in the immediate vicinity shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds and make recommendations.

**Mitigation Measure 12:** At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit for review and approval, erosion and drainage control plans that show how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site will be minimized. The plans 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 plans shall include measures that limit the 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 plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

- a) Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b) Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c) Clear only areas essential for construction.

- d) Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e) Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and to control dust.
- f) Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g) Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 ft., or to the extent feasible, from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h) Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i) Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j) Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow.
- k) The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acres or less per 100 ft. of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly, and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 of fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion resistant species.
- l) Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.
- m) Environmentally sensitive areas shall be delineated and protected to prevent construction impacts.
- n) Control fuels and other hazardous materials, spills, and litter during construction.
- o) Preserve existing vegetation whenever feasible.

**Mitigation Measure 13:** No grading shall be allowed during the wet weather season (October 1 through April 30) to avoid increased potential soil erosion, unless the applicant applies for an Exception to the Winter Grading Moratorium and the Community Development Director grants the exception. Exceptions will only be granted if dry weather is forecasted during scheduled grading operations, and the erosion control plan includes adequate winterization measures (amongst other determining factors).

**Mitigation Measure 14:** An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and/or building permit to ensure that the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

**Mitigation Measure 15:** At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form or equivalent measures, as well as Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction, to the extent feasible, including, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

**Mitigation Measure 16:** In the event that the existing well becomes infeasible to serve the proposed development, the applicant shall look into other options such as obtaining a water connection from a service provider or drilling a new well and obtaining all necessary permits from the County to serve the proposed project. Such an application should be at the discretion of the Planning and Building Director.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY CONSULTATION: None

INITIAL STUDY: The San Mateo County Current Planning Section has reviewed the Environmental Evaluation of this project and has found that the probable environmental impacts are insignificant. A copy of the initial study is attached.

REVIEW PERIOD: **Friday, February 13 - Wednesday, March 4, 2026**

All comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this Negative Declaration must be received by the County Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, **no later than 5:00 p.m., March 4, 2026.**

SCHEDULED PUBLIC MEETING OR HEARING:

The Hearing Level public meeting with the Planning Commission will be scheduled after the end of the notice period.

ADDRESS OF AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW: Documents are available at County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063. Please contact Sonal Aggarwal, Planner III, at [Saggarwal@smcgov.org](mailto:Saggarwal@smcgov.org) to view the documents.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration and all documents incorporated by reference are available at: <https://planning.smcgov.org/ceqa-docs>

**CONTACT PERSON**

Sonal Aggarwal, Planner III  
Project Planner, 650/363-1860  
[Saggarwal@smcgov.org](mailto:Saggarwal@smcgov.org)



Sonal Aggarwal  
Project Planner

County of San Mateo  
Planning and Building Department

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

1. **Project Title:** Nolan-Stevaux New Single-Family Residence
2. **County File Number:** PLN2024-00210
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person:** Sonal Aggarwal, Project Planner, 650-363-1860, [Saggarwal@smcgov.org](mailto:Saggarwal@smcgov.org)
5. **Project Location:** Pescadero Creek Road, Unincorporated San Mateo County
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 088-090-030, 86,622 sq. ft.
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Katerine Nolan Stevoux, 340 Hazel Avenue, Millbrae, CA 94030
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** Toby Long, AIA, 6114 Salle Avenue, Suite 552, Oakland, CA 94611
9. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture
10. **Zoning:** PAD/CD (Planned Agricultural District/Coastal Development District)
11. **Description of the Project:** Planned Agricultural District Permit (PAD), Grading Permit (GP) After-the-Fact Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and Significant Tree Permits to construct a new 2,466 sq. ft. single-family residence, an attached 568 sq. ft. Garage, and detached 522 sq. ft. pool house and legalization of an existing well into a domestic well. A new septic system and three (3) 4,900-gallon domestic/fire suppression water tanks are also proposed. The project also involves approximately 385 cubic yards (cu. yd.) of grading including 295 cu. yd. of cut and 90 cu. yd. of fill and removal of four (4) Black Walnut trees for the proposed house, pool and new septic tank. The site is located in the Pescadero Road County Scenic corridor. The project is appealable to the California Coastal Commission.
12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The 86,622 sq. ft. (1.98 acres) undeveloped lot is located at Pescadero Creek Road and is surrounded by rural agricultural lands and single-family residences towards the north and south, Pescadero Creek towards the west and Pescadero Creek Road towards east. A 20-foot roadway private easement also abuts the north of the site and a small portion of the site towards the southern-east corner contains PG&E's easement. Most of the site contains Prime Soils (LCC Class II, CA Storie Index 91 and 95). The site is located in Pescadero Road County Scenic corridor. The rear half of the site is located in Flood Zone A.
13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** NA

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.?:**

Planning staff consulted with the following eight (8) tribes, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC): Amanh Mutsun Tribal Band; Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista; Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe; Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan; Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area; The Ohlone Indian Tribe, Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band and Tamien Nation. On October 8, 2025, a letter was sent to each of the contact persons provided by the NAHC regarding the subject project requesting comments. Muwekma Ohlone Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area requested for a formal consultation on October 21, 2025. Staff conducted the formal consultation on January 12, 2026, and the tribe requested that the Muwekma Ohlone tribal monitors be hired for all subsurface ground excavations for this project in order to ensure that any and all ancestral heritage artifacts, human remains, and subsurface features are carefully addressed and dealt with by the Tribe. Please see further discussion under Section 5 below.

**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.

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

<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located in Pescadero Road County Scenic corridor. It is surrounded by rural residential agricultural properties towards the north and south, Pescadero Creek towards the west and Pescadero Creek Road towards the east. The project site is an 86,622 sq. ft. (1.98 acres) rectangular lot located on Pescadero Creek Road, approximately 4.4 miles east of town on Pescadero. The site is on a slope running west from Pescadero Creek Road down towards the riparian corridor of Pescadero Creek. The creek has thick riparian corridors along Pescadero Creek located at the back of the site, which is dominated by willows and alders, douglas fir, redwood, and box elder trees. Outside the riparian corridor, the project site is primarily dominated by ruderal grassland. The rear 173 feet of the parcel is in Flood Zone A. The proposed new single-family and pool house would be located approximately 166 feet from top of the creek, where 50 feet is the minimum required setback from Pescadero Creek (Perennial Stream). The proposed house would be located at 138'-6" from the front property line, and 267'-6" from the rear property line. As the site slopes down, the proposed house roof ridge of 122.12 feet would be visible from Pescadero Creek Road, as the road height is at a higher elevation of 123.1 feet. However, the project includes the planting of five (5) 24-inch box Redburn trees along Pescadero Creek Road which would help reduce the visibility of the house. The existing Oak trees between the house and road would also help mitigate any potential view impacts. The following mitigation measures would ensure that any view impacts from county roads, existing residential areas, public lands, or waterbodies would be mitigated to less than significant impact.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 1:</b> Applicant shall plant five (5) 24-inch box Redburn trees or similar indigenous trees along the front property line along Pescadero Creek Road to mitigate any potential view impacts from the neighboring properties and roads. An Encroachment Permit from the Department of Public Works is required for any replacement trees planted within the right-of-way.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Site Visit.</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><b>Discussion:</b> The site is currently vacant and there are no historic buildings located at the site. Once the house is built it will be visible from the neighboring properties and from Pescadero Creek Road. The proposed screening of trees along the Pescadero Creek Road may help screen the views from the public road. The following mitigation measure would ensure that any other view impact would be kept to a minimum.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 2:</b> All proposed exterior lighting shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area, including downward-</p>					

directed and shielded. Manufacturer cut sheets for the exterior light fixtures shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of the building permit

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Final finishes of all exterior materials and/or colors shall be non-reflective.

**Source:** Project Plans, Site Visit.

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

**Discussion:** The project is located in a rural area and is surrounded by rural single-family residences and farmlands. The project site is not on a ridgeline, and it slopes backward from Pescadero Creek Road. The development would be screened from Pescadero Creek Road as per Mitigation Measure 1 above. The surrounding properties are also developed with rural residential houses. The proposed house fits well with the surrounding houses. The project does not significantly change the topography of the site or create a new ridge line. The proposed grading of 385 cu. yd. is required for the proposed new driveway, house, pool, septic tanks, and water tanks.

**Source:** Project Location, Project Plans and Site Visit.

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 project plans includes downward-directed light scones at the front and sides of the house. The Mitigation Measure 2 above would further minimize light impacts created from the project to a less than significant impact.

**Source:** Project Plans, Site Visit.

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

X

**Discussion:** See discussion in 1.a above.

**Source:** County GIS, Site Visit, Project Plans

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

X

**Discussion:** The project site is not part of a Design Review District or does not conflict with any applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions.

<b>Source:</b> San Mateo County General Plan, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, County GIS Maps, Project Location.				
1.g. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?		X		
<b>Discussion:</b> As proposed and mitigated, the views from Pescadero Creek Road towards the project site would be screened due to existing and proposed trees in between. See staff discussion in Sections 1.a. to 1.c. above.				
<b>Source:</b> County GIS, Site Visit, Project Plans				

<p><b>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES.</b> 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:</p>				
	<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
<b>Discussion:</b> Not applicable; the subject property is located in the Coastal zone.				
<b>Source:</b> County GIS, Project Plans.				
2.b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
<b>Discussion:</b> The project does not have an open space easement and is not a Williamson Act contracted site. Please see discussion in section 2.a above. Regarding potential conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, see discussion in Section 2.c. below.				
<b>Source:</b> San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, County GIS Maps, Project Plans.				

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><b>Discussion:</b> Based on the categories of the Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program California Farmland Finder (2022 Interactive GIS), the parcel contains “Other Land.” Land not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. Vacant and non-agricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land.</p> <p>However, per County GIS Maps, site contains Prime Soil (LCC Class II, CA Storie Index 91, and 95), the conversion of prime soil to non-farming use is allowed pursuant to meeting the findings in Sections 6353 and 6355 of the San Mateo Zoning Regulations. Staff worked with the applicant during the review process to make sure the development would be sited in a manner to allow for potential future farming uses. Hence, the proposal involves conversion of only a small portion of the land (10,957 sq. ft.) to non-farming purposes and, therefore, agricultural impact would be considered as less than significant.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program California Important Farmland Finder (2016 Interactive GIS, accessed December 16, 2025), County GIS.</p>				
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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The site is located in the Coastal Zone and is zoned a PAD/CD (Planned Agricultural District/Coastal Development District). Majority of the site contains prime soil (LCC Class II, CA Storie Index 91, LCC Class II, CA Storie Index 95). PAD districts allows single-family residential use pursuant to a PAD permit as per Sections 6353 and 6355 of the San Mateo Zoning Regulations. The site is not currently farmed and is not a Williamson Act contacted property. Staff worked with the applicant to locate the house towards the north side of the property which would leave maximum space towards the center and south for any future farming activities.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program California Important Farmland Finder (2016 Interactive GIS, accessed December 16, 2025), County GIS.</p>				
2.e. Results in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Please see discussion under Section 2.a. b. c. and d. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program California Important Farmland Finder (2016 Interactive GIS, accessed December 16, 2025), County GIS.</p>				
2.f. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in				X

<p>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))?</p> <p><i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i></p>				
--	--	--	--	--

**Discussion:** The project site does not contain forestland, timberland, or lands zoned Timberland Production.

**Source:** San Mateo Zoning Regulations, Project Plans.

<p><b>3. AIR QUALITY.</b> 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>				
	<b>Potentially Significant Impacts</b>	<b>Significant Unless Mitigated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>3.a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p>			X	

**Discussion:** The Bay Area 2017 Clean Air Plan (CAP), developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), is the current regulating air quality plan for San Mateo County. The CAP was created to improve Bay Area air quality and to protect public health and the climate.

The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the BAAQMD's 2017 Clean Air Plan. During project implementation, air emissions would be generated from site grading, equipment, and work vehicles; however, any such grading-related emissions would be temporary and localized. Once constructed, use of the development as a single-family residence would have minimal impacts to the air quality standards set forth for the region by the BAAQMD.

The BAAQMD has established thresholds of significance for construction emissions and operational emissions. As defined in the BAAQMD's 2017 CEQA Guidelines, the BAAQMD does not require quantification of construction emissions due to the number of variables that can impact the calculation of construction emissions. Instead, the BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of all feasible construction 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 standard control measures have been included in Mitigation Measure 4 below:

**Mitigation Measure 4:** The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:

- 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:** Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

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:** As of December 2012, San Mateo County is a non-attainment area for PM-2.5. On January 9, 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule to determine that the Bay Area attains 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 BMQMD submits a "re-designation request" and a "maintenance plan" to EPA and the proposed redesignation is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. A temporary increase in the project area is anticipated during construction since these PM-2.5 particles are a typical vehicle emission. The temporary nature of the proposed construction and California Air Resources Board vehicle regulations reduce the potential effects to a less than significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4 in Section 3.a. would minimize increases in non-attainment criteria pollutants generated from project construction to a less than significant level.

**Source:** Project Plans, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as			X	
---	--	--	---	--

defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Any pollutant emissions generated from the proposed project would primarily be temporary in nature. The project site is in a very low-density residential area with few sensitive receptors (i.e., single-family residences) located within the immediate project vicinity. Additionally, the surrounding tree canopy and vegetation on the project site would help to insulate the project area from nearby sensitive receptors. Implementation of <u>Mitigation Measure 4</u> would also help in minimizing any potentially significant exposure to nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location.</p>				
3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project includes construction of a new single-family residence on a PAD/CD zoned parcel. The proposed project has the potential to generate odors associated with construction activities. However, any such odors would be temporary and are expected to be minimal.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans.</p>				

<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> Per the Biological Resources Evaluation Report submitted by Sol Ecology, dated July 10, 2024, Pescadero Creek sustains a thick riparian corridor dominated by willows, alders, Douglas fir, redwood and box elder. Outside the riparian corridor, the site consists of primarily ruderal grassland. The entire property is in designated critical habitat for California red-legged frog (<i>Rana draytonii</i>). Within the ruderal field, non-native species include sow thistle (<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>), wild oat (<i>Avena barbata</i>), sheep sorrel (<i>Rumex crispex</i>), wild geranium (<i>Geranium dissectum</i>), bristly oxtongue (<i>Helminthotheca echioides</i>), hairy cats ears (<i>Hypochaeris radicata</i>) and soft wild brome (<i>Bromus hordeaceus</i>). A few coast live oaks (<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>) and shreve oaks (<i>Quercus parvula</i> var. <i>shrevei</i>) are scattered throughout the site.</p>				

### ***Riparian Corridor***

The riparian corridor associated with Pescadero Creek consists of dense vegetation dominated by a contiguous canopy comprised of a mix of arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), box elder (*Acer negundo*) and red alder (*Alnus rubra*) surrounded by coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) and douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) further to the west over Pescadero Creek. The riparian understory is dominated by a mix of native and non-native shrubs and herbs such as poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), and many invasive species including cape ivy (*Delairea odorata*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), and forget-me-nots (*Myosotis* sp.). Bird activity was found to be high in the riparian corridor. Birds observed included song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*), acorn woodpecker, and Allen's hummingbird (*Selasphorus sasin*). An old San Francisco dusky footed woodrat (SFDFW); *Neotoma fuscipes* (annectens) nest complex was present in the riparian corridor although it may no longer be active. Both Allen's hummingbird and SFDFW are considered special status species.

### ***Special Status Species***

Special-status species include those 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 afford protection to 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. 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, CDFG 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. Lastly, special status species in this report include all rare or unique species listed in the LCP.

Fourteen (14) special status plants have been documented within 5 miles of the Project Study Area (Figure 2, Attachment F). Of these, none are present or have potential to occur on the project site due to the disturbed nature of the site, along with soil and habitat type conditions present. One species, San Mateo woolly sunflower, was documented in an approximate location northeast of the Project footprint in 1929. This occurrence is presumed extirpated after multiple surveys could not relocate it following development in the area. No indirect effects to this species are likely due to lack of suitable habitat.

Eighteen (18) special status animals have been documented within 5 miles of the Project Study Area (Figure 3, Attachment F). Given proximity of the site to Pescadero Creek and its associated riparian habitat and creek corridor to the west, two federal listed wildlife species, and four special status wildlife species along with other migratory bird species protected under the MBTA may be present on the project site, in surrounding habitats outside the proposed project footprint. These species are described in greater detail in Table 1, Attachment F.

Based on the results of this assessment, riparian habitat is present on the western side of the Project Study Area. This riparian habitat is considered ESHA and the avoidance of impacts within a 50-foot buffer of this riparian habitat is required. All Project activities are proposed to occur outside the 50-foot riparian setback associated with Pescadero Creek. This habitat is likely to support at least three (3) special status wildlife species as described in Table 1 in Attachment F. including the federally listed CRLF. While CRLF movements are likely to be restricted to the riparian corridor, CRLF may make overland movements during periods of wet weather. As such, best management practices are provided below to ensure avoidance of any dispersing individuals. Similarly, Allen's hummingbird, and other migratory birds may nest in surrounding habitats, and if present, could be

adversely affected during the nesting season. Incorporation of the following Mitigation Measures would help reduce any potential impacts.

**Mitigation Measure 5:** Environmental Awareness Training

Prior to the start of work, environmental awareness training shall 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 at the site.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** Wildlife Exclusion Fencing (WEF)

At least 14 days prior to the commencement of construction-related activities, 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 7:** 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 materials shall not be used.

**Mitigation Measure 8:** Pre-Construction Wildlife Surveys

Pre-construction surveys for CRLF shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities 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 before work commences.

**Mitigation Measure 9:** Nesting Bird Seasonal Work Window or Surveys

Construction-related activities (including grubbing or ground disturbance) 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, bird nesting surveys should be performed in suitable nesting habitat within 250 feet of the project footprint prior to the start of activities. 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. Surveys are generally valid for 7 to 10 days and should be repeated if there is a lapse in construction-related activities for greater than 7 days during the nesting season.

**Source:** Biological Resources Evaluation Report conducted by Sol Ecology, dated July 10, 2024.

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		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 4.a. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Biological Resources Evaluation Report conducted by Sol Ecology, dated July 10, 2024.</p>				
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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> No wetlands were found at the site. See discussion under 4.a. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Biological Resources Evaluation Report conducted by Sol Ecology, dated July 10, 2024.</p>				
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><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 4.a. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Biological Resources Evaluation Report conducted by Sol Ecology, dated July 10, 2024.</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><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinance. The applicant has applied for a significant tree removal permit to remove four (4) Black Walnut trees.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County Protected Tree Ordinance</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><b>Discussion:</b> The site is not located in an area with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved regional or state habitat conservation plan.</p>				

<b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, San Mateo County General Plan, adopted 1986, California Natural Communities Conservation Plan Map, Accessed December 17, 2025.					
4.g.	Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> The site is not located within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.					
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, National Wildlife Refuge System Locator, Accessed December 17, 2025.					
4.h.	Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
<b>Discussion:</b> No oak woodland are proposed for removal as part of this permit. Also, all existing Oak trees or woodlands would be protected at the site with proper tree protection fencing during the construction.					
<b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location.					

<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project was routed to the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), and in a letter dated August 5, 2024, CHRIS recommended that prior to commencement of project activities, a qualified professional familiar with the architecture and history of San Mateo County conduct a formal CEQA evaluation. A Sacred Lands File Search request was submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for the project area. A response was received on September 30, 2024, stating that the search results were negative but recommending that the tribes on the included list be contacted, as they may have knowledge about the cultural resources within the project area.</p> <p>A formal archeological evaluation was conducted by AHC Archeological and Historical Consultants, dated November 2024, where an archival database search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), Sacred Lands Records search from California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was conducted. The site was also analyzed through a pedestrian survey, and its soil type was also studied. Pescadero Creek runs past the western edge of the project area. The short distance from the perennial water, and gentle slopes of the project area give it moderate sensitivity for archeological deposits on the surface; however archeological survey in conditions of good visibility did not identify evidence of Native American occupation. The shallow soil has low potential for buried sites, and ethnohistoric sources do not identify Native American settlement locations in the vicinity. The project area therefore appears to have low sensitivity for Native American archeological</p>					

resources. The California NAHC also provided a list of tribes who may also have knowledge of the cultural resources in the project area. Staff contacted the following tribes on October 8, 2025:

1. Amah Mutsun Tribal Band
2. Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista
3. Costanoan Rumsen Carmel Tribe
4. Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan
5. Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the SF Bay Area
6. The Ohlone Indian Tribe
7. Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band
8. Tamien Nation

Staff heard back from Muwekma Ohlone Tribe for a formal consultation. Staff met with the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe (Tribe) on January 12, 2026. The tribe requested that the Muwekma Ohlone tribal monitors be hired for all subsurface ground excavations in order to ensure that any and all ancestral heritage artifacts, human remains, and subsurface features are carefully addressed and dealt with by the Tribe. The tribe also highlighted the possibility that the Pescadero Creek riparian corridor was used as a major trading and game trail during aboriginal times. Furthermore, they mentioned that the Archeological Study conducted by AHC, lacked mention of other important publications such as the Ohlone/Costanoan Indians of the San Francisco Peninsula and their Neighbors, Yesterday and Today published for the National Park Service Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California, by Milliken, Shoup, and Ortiz in 2009 which present comprehensive information on the tribal histories of the San Mateo Peninsula. The Muwekma Ohlone Tribe formally requested continued tribal consultation under CEQA, AB 130, SB 30; Senate Bill 18 (Government Codes §65352.3 and §65352.4) and Assembly Bill 52 (Public Resources Codes §21080.3.1 & §21080.3.2), stating that “should the project developer and/or other consultants choose to work with our Tribe for monitoring and, if necessary, burial recovery services, the Tribe is ready to make themselves available for this project.”

The applicant reviewed the information shared by the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe, and submitted a revised Archeological Report and Addendum letter, dated January 27, 2026 (Attachment H). The revised report acknowledged Pescadero Creek’s potential role as a trade and hunting corridor and incorporated references of Milliken, Shoup, and Ortiz’2009 volume on page 8 of the report. It acknowledged that many Native Americans in the bay area, including members of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe, trace their ancestry to the Olijon and other coastside peoples. The Project Archeologist also acknowledged the Tribe’s long struggle to regain Federal recognition, but do not feel the need to hire a tribal monitor as the information shared by Tribe is not directly relevant to the archeological sensitivity of the project area due to the following reasons:

- There is no known native American sites near the project area;
- No information was provided by NAHC or consulting tribes that indicates that a Tribal cultural resource is present on the project area;
- No evidence of Native American land use, artifacts, features, or cultural soils was observed on the project area surface during the intensive field survey, and
- The project area has shallow alluvial soils belonging to the Corralitos and Soquel series, which transition to sterile C-horizons at between 20 to 32 inches, making it unlikely that buried sites are present.

Given this information, the Project Archeologist feels that there is insufficient evidence of archeological sensitivity to justify monitoring during construction.

Conclusion:

The archeological survey did not locate any cultural resources on the project area, and the archeological sensitivity assessment suggests that it has low sensitivity of both buried Native American archeological resources and historic-era archeological resources. Therefore, no historical or unique archeological resources as defined in the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR §15064.5) appear to be present on the project area. Although archaeological sensitivity is low, it is possible that previously unknown archaeological materials may be discovered during construction. If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work should be halted in the vicinity until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the find and recommend appropriate treatment in accordance with PRC §21083.2(i). Staff has added the following standard mitigation measure to require that any unanticipated cultural or historical resource must be handled within the observation of a qualified archeologist.

**Mitigation Measure 10:** In the event that unanticipated cultural, paleontological, or archeological resources are exposed during ground disturbance activities, work within 15 meters (50 feet) of the find must stop and a Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist, must be notified immediately. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified professional for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. Work may not resume until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or tribal consultation may be warranted. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified professional for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate.

**Source:** Project Location, County GIS Maps, California Registe of Historic Resources, California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated August 5, 2024, Archeological Survey Report completed by AHC Archeological and Historical Consultants, dated November 2024.

5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** Refer to section 5.a. for discussion and mitigation.

**Source:** Project Location, County GIS Maps, California Registe of Historic Resources, California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated August 5, 2024, Archeological Survey Report completed by AHC Archeological and Historical Consultants, dated November 2024.

5.c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** Refer to section 5.a. and b. for discussion and mitigation. A standard mitigation measure pertaining to the potential inadvertent discovery of human remains has been added.

**Mitigation Measure 11:** Although not anticipated, there remains the potential for the inadvertent discovery of human remains during ground-disturbing activities. State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The San Mateo County coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If concentrations of prehistoric or historic-era materials are encountered during project activities; all work in the immediate vicinity shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds and make recommendations.

**Source:** Project Location, County GIS Maps, California Register of Historic Resources, California Historical Resources Information System Review Letter, dated August 5, 2024, Archeological Survey Report completed by AHC Archeological and Historical Consultants, dated November 2024.

<b>6. ENERGY.</b> 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	

**Discussion:** Energy conservation standards for new residential and non-residential buildings were adopted by the California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (now the California Energy Commission) in June 1977 and are updated every 3 years (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations). 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. Building permit applications are subject to the most current standards. The project would also be required adhere to the provisions of CALGreen, 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.

**Construction**

The construction of the project would require the consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (e.g., fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles (transportation) and construction 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 and would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure. Most construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas-powered or diesel powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered equipment.

**Operation**

During operations, project energy consumption would be associated with resident and visitor vehicle trips and delivery trucks. The project is a residential development project served by existing road infrastructure. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) provides electricity to the project area. Due to the proposed construction of a single-family residence, project implementation would result in a permanent increase in electricity over existing conditions. However, such an increase to serve a single-family residence would represent an insignificant percentage increase compared to overall demand in PG&E's service area. The nominal increased demand is expected to be adequately served by the existing PG&E electrical facilities and the projected electrical demand would not significantly impact PG&E's level of service. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during operation and construction of the project given the financial

implication of the inefficient use of such resources. As such, the proposed project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

**Source:** Project Proposal, Project Plans.

6.b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.			X	
---	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The project design and operation would comply with State Building Energy Efficiency Standards, appliance efficiency regulations, and green building standards. Therefore, the project does not conflict with or obstruct state or local renewable energy plans and would not have a significant impact. Furthermore, the development would not cause inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption.

**Source:** Project Proposal, 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	

**Discussion:** The property is not mapped with current state of California Seismic Hazard zones for earthquake fault rupture. However, the site is an area of high seismicity, with active faults associated with the San Andreas fault system. The closest active fault to the site is the San Gregorio fault, located approximately 4.5 kilometers to the southwest. Other faults most likely to produce significant seismic ground motions include the San Andreas, Hayward, Rodgers Creek and Calaveras fault.

**Fault Rupture:** The site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone where fault rupture is considered likely (California Division of Mines and Geology, 1976). Therefore, active faults are not believed to exist beneath the site, and the potential for fault rupture to occur at the site is considered low, in our opinion.

The project will be required to comply with all seismic design criteria of the current California Building Code which sets forth the minimum load requirements for the seismic design of structures. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary beyond current Building Code compliance.  
Source: County GIS Maps.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
------------------------------------	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** Per the Geotechnical study prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc, dated January 5, 2024, the site is located in an active seismic area. Moderate to large earthquakes are probable along with several active faults in the greater Bay Area over a 30-to-50-year design life. Strong ground shaking should therefore be expected several times during the design life of the structure, as is typical for sites throughout the Bay Area. The project will be required to comply with all seismic design criteria of the current California Building Code which sets forth the minimum load requirements for the seismic design of structures. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary beyond current Building Code compliance.

**Source:** Geotechnical study prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc, dated January 5, 2024.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** Liquefaction occurs when loose, saturated sandy soils lose strength and flow like a liquid during earthquake shaking. Ground settlement often accompanies liquefaction. Soils most susceptible to liquefaction are saturated, loose, silty sands, and uniformly graded sands. Loose silty sands below a water table were not encountered at the site. Therefore, in Project Geologist’s opinion, the likelihood of liquefaction occurring at the site is low.

**Source:** Geotechnical study prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc, dated January 5, 2024.

iv. Landslides?				X
-----------------	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The site is not located in a mapped landslide zone.

**Source:** County GIS Maps.

v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?  <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>				X
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project site is not located on a coastal cliff or bluff. Therefore, there would be no impact on coastal cliffs or bluff instability or erosion.

**Source:** County GIS Maps.

7.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

**Discussion:** The construction of the project involves approximately 385 cu. yd. of grading. Including 295 cu. yd. of cut and 90 cu. yd. of fill. The following mitigation measures are included to control

erosion during construction of proposed project. With these mitigation measures, the potential impact would be less-than-significant.

**Mitigation Measure 12:**

At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit for review and approval, erosion and drainage control plans that show how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site will be minimized. The plans 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 plans shall include measures that limit the 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 plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

- a) Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b) Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c) Clear only areas essential for construction.
- d) Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e) Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and to control dust.
- f) Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g) Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 ft., or to the extent feasible, from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h) Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i) Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j) Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow.
- k) The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acres or less per 100 ft. of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly, and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 of fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion resistant species.
- l) Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.
- m) Environmentally sensitive areas shall be delineated and protected to prevent construction impacts.
- n) Control fuels and other hazardous materials, spills, and litter during construction.
- o) Preserve existing vegetation whenever feasible.

**Mitigation Measure 13:** No grading shall be allowed during the wet weather season (October 1 through April 30) to avoid increased potential soil erosion, unless the applicant applies for an Exception to the Winter Grading Moratorium and the Community Development Director grants the exception. Exceptions will only be granted if dry weather is forecasted during scheduled grading operations, and the erosion control plan includes adequate winterization measures (amongst other determining factors).

**Mitigation Measure 14:** An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and/or building permit to ensure that the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

**Source:** Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, Geotechnical study prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc, dated January 5, 2024.

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	
--	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** Pursuant to the discussions in Sections 7.a and 7.b, the associated Mitigation Measures would minimize the potential for an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse. Therefore, the mitigation measures would minimize impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Source:** Geotechnical study prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc, dated January 5, 2024.

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
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** Based on the soil borings conducted by Sigma Prime Geosciences, the subsurface conditions of the site consist of 8 feet of loose sand silty sand over stiff clay and medium dense sandy soils. Very dense inner alluvial fan deposits comprised of very dense gravel were encountered at depths of 12.5 feet to 17 feet. Expansive soil was not observed by the Project Geologist during the site analysis.

**Source:** Geotechnical study prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc, dated January 5, 2024.

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
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project involves a new septic system at the rear of the parcel, and a secondary septic system located within the front setback. Per the project geologist, if all the suggested measures of the Geotechnical Report are followed then the site is capable of the proposed development.

<b>Source:</b> Geotechnical study prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc, dated January 5, 2024.					
7.f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Per the Archeological Survey Report completed by AHC Archeological and Historical Consultants, dated November 2024, no paleontological resource or unique geological feature was observed on site. Staff has included <u>Mitigation Measures 10 and 11</u> to mitigate any potential future discoveries during the execution of the project.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Archeological Survey Report completed by AHC Archeological and Historical Consultants, dated November 2024 and January 2026.</p>					

<b>8. CLIMATE CHANGE.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon (carbon monoxide; CO2) air emissions from vehicles and machines that are fueled by gasoline. Project-related grading and construction of the proposed residence will result in the temporary generation of GHG emissions along travel routes and at the project site. In general, construction involves GHG emissions mainly from exhaust from vehicle trips (e.g., construction vehicles and personal vehicles of construction workers). Even assuming construction vehicles and workers are based in and traveling from urban areas, the potential project GHG emission levels from construction would be considered minimal. Although the project scope for the project is not likely to generate significant amounts of greenhouse gases, the mitigation measure provided in Section 3.a would ensure that any impacts are less than significant. Construction of the proposed house would include approximately 385 cu. yd. of grading to prepare the site. There is insufficient evidence to suggest that this activity will exceed the screening threshold for GHG emission established by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The District’s CEQA Threshold of Significance Guidance states that any stationary source that generates more than 10,000 Metric Tons of GHG emissions per year is considered a significant impact. The average U.S. Household is estimated to generate 7.5 tons of GHG emissions per year. To ensure new development projects are compliant with the County’s General Plan Climate Element, the County provides the Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form (Form). According to the Applicant-completed Form, the project incorporates several measures, such as use of solar panels, trash, recycling and composting collection enclosures, use of grey, rain and recycled water for landscape purposes, thoughtful water-efficient landscaping with native plants, compliance of construction equipment with BAAQMD guidance for idling, and electrification of outdoor household equipment. The project would be required to comply with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). While the above described measures would reduce GHG emissions associated with project construction and</p>					

operation, the BAAQMD encourages lead agencies to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction, including, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. These Best Management Practices have been included in Mitigation Measure 15 below in order to further reduce project related GHG emissions. Compliance with and/or consideration of the Climate Element and BAAQMD measures is required in order to reduce project related GHG emissions.

**Mitigation Measure 15:** At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form or equivalent measures, as well as Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction, to the extent feasible, including, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

**Source:** BAAQMD CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, 2017, CCFPD Fact Sheet.

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
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** As discussed above, the BAAQMD has determined that a project that generates GHG emissions above the 1,100 metric ton threshold would be in violation of the District's Clean Air Plan. Given that the proposed use is a single-family dwelling (which generate on average 7.5 tons of GHG emissions per year), there is insufficient evidence to support a conclusion that future development of this parcel will conflict with applicable climate action plans.

**Source:** BAAQMD CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, 2017, CCFPD Fact Sheet.

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
---	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project parcel and surrounding area are not considered forest land. Therefore, the project has no impact.

**Source:** BAAQMD CEQA Thresholds of Significance Guidelines, 2017, CCFPD Fact Sheet.

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
--	--	--	--	---

**Discussion:** The project site is not located on a coastal bluff. However, it does involve installing a new septic system on site, which will be located outside the riparian setback of the creek.

**Source:** Project Plans, County GIS Maps.

8.e. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located next to a perennial creek (Pescadero Creek), and the rear 173 feet of the parcel is located in Flood Zone A. The remaining of the site is located in Flood Zone X (Area of Minimal Flood Hazard, Panel No.06081C0390E, effective October 16, 2012). FEMA Flood Zone X areas have a 0.2 percent annual chance of flooding, with areas with one percent annual chance of flooding with average depths of less than 1-foot. Apart from the primary septic leach fields, all developments (house, water tanks, septic tank, garage, etc.) would be located outside the flood zone. Therefore, the proposed project poses no impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, County GIS Maps.</p>				
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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion in 8.e. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, County GIS Maps.</p>				
8.g. Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion in 8.e. and f. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, County GIS Maps.</p>				

<b>9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project does not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. The proposed project involves the construction of a new single-family residence.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion in 9. a. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The emission or handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste is not proposed with this project.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, 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><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and therefore would not result in the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not within 2-miles of a public airport or land use airport.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location.</p>				
9.f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed single-family residence would be located on a privately-owned parcel. This parcel is accessed through Pescadero Creek Road. There is no evidence to suggest that the</p>				

<p>project would interfere with any emergency response plan. All work in the public right-of-way, including temporary traffic control plans, will be reviewed and approved by the County Department of Public Works through their requirement for an encroachment permit prior to the start of work. Therefore, the project has no impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps.</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><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is located within a Very High fire risk, State Responsibility Area. The project was reviewed by County Fire and received conditional approval subject to compliance with the California Building Code.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, California State Fire Severity Zones Maps, County of San Mateo Fire Department's Review letter, dated July 30, 2024.</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><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 8 e. f. and g. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, County GIS Maps.</p>					
9.i.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under 8 e. f. and g. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, County GIS Maps.</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
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The rear half of the site is located in Flood Zone A. As discussed in Section 8. e. f. and g. above, the proposed single-family and associated developments would be located outside Flood Zone A, and would be located in an area zoned as Flood Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard. There is no levee or dam in the near vicinity of the site, hence, the proposed project will not 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.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, San Mateo County Hazards Maps.</p>					
9.k.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

**Discussion:** The project site is not located within a San Mateo County General Plan mapped tsunami and seiche inundation area.

**Source:** Project Plans, Project Location, County GIS Maps, San Mateo County Hazards Maps.

**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 proposed site disturbance is less than 1-acre, where 0.45 acre would be disturbed with the proposed project. The proposed project has the potential to generate polluted stormwater runoff during site grading and construction-related activities. The project would be required to comply with the County's Drainage Policy requiring post-construction stormwater flows to be at, or below, pre-construction flow rates. A Drainage Report was prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences Inc., dated May 2, 2025, detailing the proposed drainage system. The drainage calculations show that post-development runoff would be greater than pre-development runoff. However, with the mitigation measures listed under Mitigation Measures 12 to 14, the potential impact would be less-than-significant.

**Source:** Project Plans, Drainage Report prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated May 2, 2025.

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	
--	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The proposed project is not expected to deplete any groundwater supplies or interfere with the groundwater recharge. The project does contain legalization of an existing agricultural well into a domestic well through an After-the-Fact CDP. The existing well has a depth of 38 feet with a standing water level of 25 feet as per the report submitted by Simms Plumbing and Water Equipment Company, dated December 12, 2023. The submitted report was reviewed by the County Environmental Health services and received conditional approval.

**Source:** Well Report by Simms Plumbing and Water Equipment, dated December 12, 2023.

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><b>Discussion:</b> The project involves the creation of approximately 9,567 sq. ft. of new impervious surface associated with the construction of the single-family, pool house, pool and garage attached. The proposed development on the project parcel will include drainage features that have been conditionally approved by the Building Inspection Section's Civil Section. With <u>Mitigation Measures 12 to 14</u> to address potential impacts during construction activities, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the site or result in substantial erosion or siltation. Upon mitigation, the project will have a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Drainage Report prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated May 2, 2025.</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><b>Discussion:</b> The project was reviewed by County's Drainage Section and conditionally approved. The mitigation measures included in <u>Mitigation Measures 12 to 14</u> would reduce the impact to less than significant.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Drainage Report prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated May 2, 2025.</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	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Compliance with the County's Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Permit is mandatory and would prevent the creation of significant additional sources of polluted runoff.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Drainage Report prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated May 2, 2025.</p>				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project would not impede or redirect flood flows after the implementation of <u>Mitigation Measures 12 to 14</u>.</p>				

<b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Drainage Report prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated May 2, 2025.				
10.d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X	
<b>Discussion:</b> The project site is not located in an area mapped for floor hazard, tsunami, or seiche area. <b>Source:</b> Project Location, County GIS Maps.				
10.e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	
<b>Discussion:</b> The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) of 2015 requires local regions to create groundwater sustainability agencies (GSA's) and to adopt groundwater management plans for identified medium and high priority groundwater basins. San Mateo County has nine identified water basins. These basins have been identified as low priority, are not subject to the SGMA, and there is no current groundwater management agency or plan that oversees these basins. Also, see discussion in Section 10.b.  The project includes an on-site drainage system that complies with the San Mateo County Water Pollution Prevention Program (SMCWPPP) which enforces the State requirements for stormwater quality control. <b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Office of Sustainability, Groundwater Website <a href="https://www.smcsustainability.org/energy-water/groundwater/">https://www.smcsustainability.org/energy-water/groundwater/</a> .				
10.f. Significantly degrade surface or groundwater quality?			X	
<b>Discussion:</b> The project involves a new septic system and legalization of an existing agricultural well into a domestic well. The required septic leach field and septic system for the proposed house would be located outside the 100 feet radius from the well, hence, the proposed new septic system would not degrade the quality of the ground water. No discharge or run-off would be allowed from the proposed development towards the surface water of the Pescadero Creek with the implementation of erosion control measures under <u>Mitigation Measure 12 to 14</u> . <b>Source:</b> Project Plans				
10.g. Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?		X		
<b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project would increase impervious surfaces. Pursuant to the discussion in Section 10. a., post-development runoff would be greater than pre-development runoff. With implementation of <u>Mitigation Measures 12 to 14</u> , the proposed project impact would be less-than-significant <b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Drainage Report prepared by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc., dated May 2, 2025.				

<b>11. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project doesn't involve subdividing the parcel. There is no development proposed that would result in the division of an established community. The proposed project is located on a developed parcel and is surrounded by properties with rural residential development. Thus, the project would not result in the division of an established community.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location.</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><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project complies with the land use and zoning of the site and complies with the PAD/CD Zoning District developments standards and criteria such as site development criteria, clustered development, utilities, etc. The project will have no significant environmental impact or conflict with the adopted land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, San Mateo County Zoning Regulations.</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><b>Discussion:</b> The land is currently undeveloped, and with the proposed project a new single-family home would be built at this site. There is already a PG&amp;E line that passes along the front of the site, which also serves the existing residential properties adjacent to this parcel. The site will be served by an on-site septic system and a well, apart from getting a new electrical connection, no new public utility line would be required to be expanded for this project.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Site Visit, Project Plans.</p>				

<b>12. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed project neither involves nor results in any extraction or loss of known mineral resources. Therefore, the project has no impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location.</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><b>Discussion:</b> There are no known mineral resources on the project parcel; therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site as delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County General Plan, adopted 1986.</p>				

<b>13. NOISE.</b> Would the project result in:				
	<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><b>Discussion:</b> The residential nature of the project would not produce any long-term significant noise source. However, the project would generate short-term noise associated with grading and construction activities. The short-term noise during grading and construction activities would be temporary, where volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code for Noise Control.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, San Mateo County Ordinance.</p>				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?			X	

**Discussion:** Per the Geotechnical Study conducted by Sigma Prime, dated January 5, 2024, a pier and grade beam foundation with piers extending down to the very dense gravel is recommended for this project, which would create temporary noise during the grading and construction activities. However, such noises will be temporary, where the volume and hours are regulated by Section 4.88.360 (Exemptions) of the County Ordinance Code. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4 above would ensure that the impact during construction is reduced to less than significant.

**Source:** Project Plans, Project Location.

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 within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

**Source:** Project Plans, Project Location.

**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 project site is zoned as PAD/CD and contains prime soil. A single-family residence is allowed use on PAD zoning pursuant to an issuance of a PAD Permit. The adjacent sites are also developed with rural residential properties. The site is already served with a public road, and a PG&E line also passes along the front of the parcel, which also serves adjacent lots. Hence, no new extension of any public utilities would be required for the proposed project.

**Source:** Project Proposal, Site Visit.

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

**Discussion:** As stated above, the proposed project would construct a new single-family residence. The site is currently vacant and has no existing tenants. Hence, the project will have no impact.

**Source:** Project Plans.

<b>15. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The proposed new single-family is being developed in an area already developed with other single-family homes in the surrounding vicinity. No new fire station, police station, school or park would be required for the proposed single-family home, and all other public utilities such as water and sewage systems would be provided at site. Also, the payment of development fees, such as school fees, user fees, and additional property taxes generated, will allow the maintenance of the existing service levels. Hence, the project will have less than significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, Site Visit.</p>				

<b>16. RECREATION.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that significant physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. A new parcel is not being created as part of this project.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not include any recreational facilities as proposed development is limited to constructing a new single-family residence.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans. Project Location.</p>				

<b>17. TRANSPORTATION.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The traffic trips (comprised of both owners of and guests/visitors) generated by the new residence would not introduce any significant increase in vehicles on Pescadero Creek Road and thus will pose no significant safety impact to other vehicles, pedestrians or bicycles. The adequacy of access to and from the site has been reviewed by the County Department of Public Works, who have conditionally approved the project. The project was also approved by County Fire Protection District and received conditional approval.</p> <p>Per the Screening Thresholds for Land Use Projects section of the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA document published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, the proposed project "may be assumed to cause a less-than significant transportation impact" because it generates or attracts fewer than 110 trips per day. Due to the low number of traffic trips anticipated with single-family residential use, the proposed project would remain well under the threshold. Therefore, project would result in a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Plans, Project Location, County Fire Review Letter, dated August 30, 2024.</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><b>Discussion:</b> Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines provides specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts. A project's effect on automobile delay does not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA. Per Section 15064.3, an analysis of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) attributable to a project is the most appropriate measure of</p>				

transportation impacts. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel.

**Source:** Project Location, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (c) Applicability, Screening Thresholds for Land Use Projects Section of the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA.

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

**Discussion:** The project would create a new driveway off of Pescadero Creek Road that was reviewed and approved with conditions by County Fire and Department of Public Works. The project would not require the construction of a new road, nor does it propose to alter any existing roadway in a way that would create a hazard due to sharp turns or dangerous intersections. Additionally, the construction and operation/habitation of the project does not propose permanent utilization of equipment that would be incompatible with the existing vehicular traffic on Pescadero Creek Road or any other connecting roads. No mitigation is necessary. Also, see discussion in Section 17.a. above.

**Source:** Project Plan, Project Location, County Fire Review Letter, dated August 30, 2024.

17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

X

**Discussion:** The project proposes a new 20-foot wide driveway off of Pescadero Creek Road, which was reviewed and conditionally approved by County Fire and Department of Public Works. Additionally, all work within the County right-of-way, including temporary traffic control plans, will be reviewed and approved by the County Department of Public Works through their requirement of an encroachment permit prior to the start of work. Thus, the project would have less-than-significant impact.

**Source:** Project Plans, County Fire Review Letter, dated August 30, 2024.

**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><b>Discussion:</b> The project site is vacant, and it is not listed in California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k). See discussion under question 5.a. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, County GIS Maps, Archeological Survey Report completed by AHC Archeological and Historical Consultants, dated November 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 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.)			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> See discussion under question 5.a. and b. above.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, County GIS Maps, Archeological Survey Report completed by AHC Archeological and Historical Consultants, dated November 2024.</p>				

<b>19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b> 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><b>Discussion:</b> The project is required to demonstrate compliance with the County’s Drainage Policy and Provision C.3.i of the San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Regional Permit, which require the construction of new site design measures to reduce stormwater runoff and associated negative environmental impacts. The project proposes a new on-site wastewater treatment system (OWTS)</p>				

which will only serve the subject site. Please see Section 7.a.iv for potential significant unless mitigated impacts related to construction and operation of the OWTS.

The project proposed three new 4,900-gallon plastic water tanks that will be filled by an existing well to serve the proposed development. The proposed new septic tanks, leach fields and well certification report was reviewed by the County Environmental Health Division and received conditional approval. The project would not require new electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

**Source:** Project Plans, San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.

19.b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

**Discussion:** Per the well testing report submitted by Simms Plumbing and Water Equipment, Inc. dated December 12, 2023, the approximate depth of the well is 38 feet, and it has approximately 25 feet of standing water. The existing agricultural well is being converted into a domestic well through an After-the-Fact CDP, which was reviewed by Environmental Health Services of San Mateo County and has received conditional approval. Hence, the project appears to have sufficient water supply available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Staff has added the following mitigation measure to make sure that the proposed house continue to have sufficient water supply in the future.

**Mitigation Measure 16:** In the event that the existing well becomes infeasible to serve the proposed development, the applicant shall look into other options such as obtaining a water connection from a service provider or drilling a new well and obtaining all necessary permits from the County to serve the proposed project. Such an application should be at the discretion of the Planning and Building Director.

**Source:** Project Plans, San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.

19.c. Result in a determination by the waste-water 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	
---	--	--	---	--

**Discussion:** The project is not located within any waste-water service provider boundary. It will be served by an onsite 1,500-gallon septic tank and a primary and secondary leach field system. The primary on-site septic system is adequate to serve the proposed three (3) bedroom house. A total of six leach fields are proposed (A, B and C) located at the rear of the site would serve as the primary leach fields and leach fields (D, E, and F) located at the front of the site would serve as the secondary expansion leach fields if required for any future use. Any future expansion of the house or increase in the number of bedrooms would require another review by the County's Environmental Health Services Division.

**Source:** Project Plans.

19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the			X	
---	--	--	---	--

capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The construction of the proposed project would generate some solid waste, both during construction and after completion (on an ongoing basis typical waste generated by residential uses). Similar to all other properties in the area, the residence would receive municipal trash and recycling pick-up service from Recology. The County's local landfill facility is the Corinda Los Trancos (Ox Mountain) Landfill, located at 12310 San Mateo Road (State Highway 92), a few miles east of Half Moon Bay. This landfill facility has permitted capacity/service life until 2034. Therefore, the project impact is less-than-significant.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.</p>				
19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Solid waste generated by a new single-family residence is expected to be minimal. The project site would receive solid waste service by Recology. The landfill cited in Section 19.d. is licensed and operates pursuant to all Federal, State and local statuses and regulations as overseen by the San Mateo County Health System's Environmental Health Services. Therefore, the project would have less-than-significant impact.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> San Mateo County Environmental Health Services.</p>				

<p><b>20. WILDFIRE.</b> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</p>				
	<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><b>Discussion:</b> The project is located within a Very High Fire Hazard, State Responsibility Area as identified by the County's GIS maps. The proposed new house would be required to have an automatic fire-sprinkler system as required by San Mateo County Fire Department. No revisions to the adopted Emergency Operations Plan would be required as a result of the project. There are two public service Fire Stations located near the site (San Mateo County Fire Station 59, located at 1200 Pescadero Creek Road, located at 5 miles from the site, and Loma Mar Volunteer Fire Company, 9979 Pescadero Creek Road, Pescadero, located at 2.4 miles from the site). Primary access to the fire stations and all major roads would be maintained during construction. As discussed in Section 9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), the proposed project would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts would be less-than-significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Google Maps, Project Plans, County GIS Maps.</p>				

<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?</p>			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> Pursuant to the discussion in Section 20.a, the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, Project Plans.</p>				
<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?</p>			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project does not involve a new road, fuel break, or other associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, Project Plans.</p>				
<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?</p>			X	
<p><b>Discussion:</b> While the house is located outside the flood zone, and on a leveled area, the overall parcel slightly slopes down from the Pescadero Creek Road towards the creek at the back. The proposed on-site drainage facilities have been sized and appropriately placed to retain the stormwater on-site and would allow it to percolate into the ground as determined by the County's Drainage Section. As the project would not increase the risk of wildfire or the severity of wildfires, the project would not expose these structures to significant risk of wildfire or the severity of wildfires, the project would not expose these structures to significant risk from flooding or landslides, as a result of run-off, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> Project Location, Project Plans, San Mateo County Drainage Section.</p>				

<b>21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
	<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		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project as proposed with all the recommended mitigation measures discussed in the previous sections minimize potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> All applicable sources previously cited in this document.</p>				
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		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project as proposed with all the recommended mitigation measures discussed in the previous sections would minimize potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> All applicable sources previously cited in this document.</p>				
21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		
<p><b>Discussion:</b> The project as proposed with all the recommended mitigation measures discussed in the previous sections would minimize potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.</p> <p><b>Source:</b> All applicable sources previously cited in this document.</p>				

**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 (CCC)	X*		*Only if appeal filed to CCC
California Department of Food and Agriculture		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
Other: NA		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	

<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>		
	<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><b>Mitigation Measure 1:</b> Applicant shall plant five (5) 24-inch box Redburn trees or similar indigenous trees along the front property line along Pescadero Creek Road to mitigate any potential view impacts from the neighboring properties and roads. An Encroachment Permit from the Department of Public Works is required for any replacement trees planted within the right-of-way.</p>		

**Mitigation Measure 2:** All proposed exterior lighting shall be designed and located so as to confine direct rays to the subject property and prevent glare in the surrounding area, including downward-directed and shielded. Manufacturer cut sheets for the exterior light fixtures shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of the building permit.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Final finishes of all exterior materials and/or colors shall be non-reflective.

**Mitigation Measure 4:**

The applicant shall require construction contractors to implement all the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, listed below, and include these measures on permit plans submitted to the Building Inspection Section:

- 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 5:** Environmental Awareness Training

Prior to the start of work, environmental awareness training shall 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 at the site.

**Mitigation Measure 6:** Wildlife Exclusion Fencing (WEF)

At least 14 days prior to the commencement of construction-related activities, 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 7:** 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 materials shall not be used.

**Mitigation Measure 8:** Pre-Construction Wildlife Surveys

Pre-construction surveys for CRLF shall be conducted prior to initiation of project activities 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 before work commences.

**Mitigation Measure 9:** Nesting Bird Seasonal Work Window or Surveys

Construction-related activities (including grubbing or ground disturbance) 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, bird nesting surveys should be performed in suitable nesting habitat within 250 feet of the project footprint prior to the start of activities. 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. Surveys are generally valid for 7 to 10 days and should be repeated if there is a lapse in construction-related activities for greater than 7 days during the nesting season.

**Mitigation Measure 10:** In the event that unanticipated cultural, paleontological, or archeological resources are exposed during ground disturbance activities, work within 15 meters (50 feet) of the find must stop and a Secretary of the Interior qualified archaeologist, must be notified immediately. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified professional for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate. Work may not resume until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the significance of the find. If the discovery proves significant, additional work such as archaeological testing, data recovery, or tribal consultation may be warranted. The applicant shall be required to retain the services of a qualified professional for the purpose of recording, protecting, or curating the discovery as appropriate.

**Mitigation Measure 11:** Although not anticipated, there remains the potential for the inadvertent discovery of human remains during ground-disturbing activities. State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The San Mateo County coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If concentrations of prehistoric or historic-era materials are encountered during project activities; all work in the immediate vicinity shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds and make recommendations.

**Mitigation Measure 12:**

At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit for review and approval, erosion and drainage control plans that show how the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from and within the project site will be minimized. The plans 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 plans shall include measures that limit the 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 plan shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines," including:

- a) Sequence construction to install sediment-capturing devices first, followed by runoff control measures and runoff conveyances. No construction activities shall begin until after all proposed measures are in place.
- b) Minimize the area of bare soil exposed at one time (phased grading).
- c) Clear only areas essential for construction.
- d) Within five (5) days of clearing or inactivity in construction, stabilize bare soils through either non-vegetative Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as mulching, or vegetative erosion control methods, such as seeding. Vegetative erosion control shall be established within two (2) weeks of seeding/planting.
- e) Construction entrances shall be stabilized immediately after grading and frequently maintained to prevent erosion and to control dust.
- f) Control wind-born dust through the installation of wind barriers such as hay bales and/or sprinkling.
- g) Soil and/or other construction-related material stockpiled on-site shall be placed a minimum of 200 ft., or to the extent feasible, from all wetlands and drain courses. Stockpiled soils shall be covered with tarps at all times of the year.
- h) Intercept runoff above disturbed slopes and convey it to a permanent channel or storm drains by using earth dikes, perimeter dikes or swales, or diversions. Use check dams where appropriate.
- i) Provide protection for runoff conveyance outlets by reducing flow velocity and dissipating flow energy.
- j) Use silt fence and/or vegetated filter strips to trap sediment contained in sheet flow.
- k) The maximum drainage area to the fence should be 0.5 acres or less per 100 ft. of fence. Silt fences shall be inspected regularly, and sediment removed when it reaches 1/3 of fence height. Vegetated filter strips should have relatively flat slopes and be vegetated with erosion resistant species.
- l) Throughout the construction period, the applicant shall conduct regular inspections of the condition and operational status of all structural BMPs required by the approved erosion control plan.
- m) Environmentally sensitive areas shall be delineated and protected to prevent construction impacts.
- n) Control fuels and other hazardous materials, spills, and litter during construction.
- o) Preserve existing vegetation whenever feasible.

**Mitigation Measure 13:**

No grading shall be allowed during the wet weather season (October 1 through April 30) to avoid increased potential soil erosion, unless the applicant applies for an Exception to the Winter Grading Moratorium and the Community Development Director grants the exception. Exceptions will only be granted if dry weather is forecasted during scheduled grading operations, and the erosion control plan includes adequate winterization measures (amongst other determining factors).

**Mitigation Measure 14:**

An Erosion Control and Tree Protection Pre-Site Inspection shall be conducted prior to the issuance of a grading permit "hard card" and/or building permit to ensure that the approved erosion control and tree protection measures are installed adequately prior to the start of ground disturbing activities.

**Mitigation Measure 15:** At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the measures indicated on the applicant-completed Climate Beneficial Actions by Project Developers Form or equivalent measures, as well as Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce GHG emissions during construction, to the extent feasible, including, but are not limited to: using alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment of at least 15 percent of the fleet; using local building materials of at least 10 percent; and recycling or reusing at least 50 percent of construction waste or demolition materials. Such measures shall be shown on building plans.

**Mitigation Measure 16:** In the event that the existing well becomes infeasible to serve the proposed development, the applicant shall look into other options such as obtaining a water connection from a service provider or drilling a new well and obtaining all necessary permits from the County to serve the proposed project. Such an application should be at the discretion of the Planning and Building Director.

**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.

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.



(Signature)

**Date:** February 11, 2026

**Sonal Aggarwal**  
Project Planner

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Project Plans
- C. Arborist Report, prepared by Insideout Design, dated June 19, 2024
- D. Drainage Report by Sigma Prime Geosciences, Inc, dated May 2, 2025
- E. Existing Well Pump Testing Report and Analysis
- F. Biological Resources Evaluation by Sol Ecology, dated July 10, 2024
- G. Geotechnical Study by Sigma Prime Geosciences, dated January 5, 2024
- H. Archeological Survey Report and Addendum by Daniel Shoup, Jennifer Ho and Graham Goodwin Archeological and Historical Consultants, January 27, 2026